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INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

In this new edition of Gieseler's Church History a thorough revision of the translation has been made, with additional references to the English and later German works. The alterations are numerous, giving more exactly the sense of the original, and correcting frequent mistranslations.

The entire history to the epoch of the Reformation will be comprised in three volumes, following the divisions of the original German. The subsequent history, to 1848, can probably be embraced in two additional volumes. At the time of Gieseler's decease, his work was completed to the year 1648, in three volumes, subdivided into six parts, each of which was separately issued. The history is to be continued under the editorial supervision of his colleague, Dr. E. R. Redepenning. The volume for the period from 1814 to 1848 is just published; we have taken from it, with slight abridgments, an account of Gieseler's life and writings. The narrative of the ecclesiastical events of this period was written out by Gieseler himself; unlike the previous volumes, it is an extended history, with comparatively few notes. The intervening volume, for the period from the Peace of Westphalia, 1648 to 1814, is promised for the next year. Thus the work will form a complete and authentic history of the Christian Church, to A.D. 1848, composed with abundant and careful learning, especially adapted to the wants of students, and indispensable as a guide to any who would examine the original sources. The aid it gives in the critical investigation of the original authorities is its chief merit, apart from its use as a text-book for classes in Theological Seminaries. It is cold, but cautious; it is more rational than sympathetic; it has not the warmth of Neander's incomparable work, but it is more complete; it has not the
vividness of Hase’s delineations, but it is more full, and gives copious extracts from the sources, such as can nowhere else be found.

The first three volumes of the present edition correspond with volumes one and two of the original. The first extends to the year 726. The second will be from 726 to 1305; the third from 1305 to 1517. The whole period, 726 to 1517, was published by Gieseler as his second volume, in four subdivisions. The third volume of the German, in two parts, will be the fourth in this translation; and a fifth volume will probably embrace the fourth and fifth of the original.

In the German edition, both parts of the first volume, and also the first two divisions of the second volume (to 1305), are in their fourth edition; the third division of the second volume has reached a second edition; its fourth division, and the whole of the third volume (1517 to 1648), are still in their first edition; and the publisher states that a new one is not to be expected, as a sufficiently large number of copies was struck off to meet the demand.

The first English translation of Gieseler’s work was well executed from the third edition of the earlier volumes by Francis Cunningham, and published in Philadelphia, in 1836, in three volumes, extending to the Reformation. The version published in Clark’s Library, from which this edition is in part reprinted, is by different translators: the first and second volumes are by Dr. Davidson; the third and fourth by Rev. J. W. Hull. The Edinburgh edition is inconveniently arranged; the first volume breaks off in the middle of the second period; the second, in the midst of the third period; and the fourth, about two hundred pages short of the Reformation. This defect is remedied in the present edition, and a translation added of the portion needed to complete the history to the Reformation. This will be followed, as soon as practicable, by a translation of the additional volumes.

The least satisfactory portion of Dr. Gieseler’s work is undoubtedly that of the first century. It is disproportionately concise; and the bias of the author is more marked. But here, too, the sources for correcting his opinions are near at hand to all our students.

New York, Sept. 1, 1855.
THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF GIESELER.

Both the father and grandfather of Dr. Gieseler were clergymen. His grandfather, John Arend Gieseler, born at Minden in 1726, was a pastor at Lahde, and afterward at Hartum, in the principality of Minden. He received his theological education at Halle. The family records describe him as wholly in sympathy with the practical Christian tendencies reintroduced by Franke and Spener, though not devoted to the peculiarities of "pietism;" as a true adherent of the symbols of Lutheranism; as a very earnest, active, and orderly man, yet cheerful, and of great hilarity with the right sort of people. These characteristics reappear in the grandson. The grandmother, of the family of Haccius, shared her husband's piety and love of order.

These qualities also distinguished their son, George Christopher Frederick Gieseler, born in 1770, who was a preacher in Petershagen, near Minden, and afterward in Werther, not far from Bielefeld. He was a man of a marked intellectual character. Though deaf from his fourteenth year, so that in the University he was often obliged to transcribe from his neighbor's manuscript, and though thus almost deprived in later life of social intercourse, he yet attained the most thorough culture and self-discipline. His infirmity seemed to forbid his entering the clerical profession; but, as if born for a minister, he would be that, and nothing else. In his eleventh and twelfth years he held meetings on Sunday afternoons, in a garden-house of his father, which were attended in large numbers from the village, and not without good results. When only thirteen, he took for a time the place of a sick teacher in the chapel at Holtzhausen, conducting the singing and catechetical exercise. He, too, was educated at the University of Halle, and taught in several private families, until he became a
pastor at Petershagen in 1790. He was devoted to his congregation, yet ever earnest in his studies. He published several works, but more remain in manuscript, upon Theology, or rather Theosophy, the Revelation of John, and Education. With much that is original, these writings contain also one-sided and erratic views.

John Charles Louis Gieseler was born at Petershagen the third of March, 1793, the oldest of ten children. When four years old, death deprived him of the faithful and loving care of his mother, whose maiden name was Berger, a woman of great practical sagacity. His earliest instruction was from his grandfather, who taught him in an easy, sportive way, to be a good reader in his fourth year. His father's peculiarities contributed to the formation of that independence of character which in early life distinguished him, and in later years came to his aid in so many difficult circumstances. In his tenth year he was sent to the Latin school of the Orphan-house at Halle. Here he soon enjoyed the counsels and care of Niemeyer, whose friendship in after years never deserted him. He aided him in his studies, and after their completion promoted him to the post of teacher in the Orphan School. He had hardly been a year in this position, when, in October, 1813, he followed the call of his father-land, became a volunteer in the war for Germany's freedom, and was present at the raising of the siege of Magdeburg. After the peace in 1815, he resumed his office as teacher; two years later he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy: he became co-rector of the gymnasium at Minden in the same year, and in 1818 director of the gymnasium at Cleve. At Michaelmas, in 1819, he was appointed "professor ordinarius" of Theology in the newly-established Frederick-William's University of Bonn, having already received from that University, on the third of April of the same year, the doctorate of divinity through Augusti's influence.

This rapid promotion he owed to his "Critical Essay upon the Origin and earliest History of the written Gospels," published in 1818. This exposition set aside the hypothesis of one written original Gospel as the common source of the synoptical Gospels, and confirmed the positions laid down by Herder, Lessing, and others, which are at the basis of the whole recent criticism of the Gospels. This important work of Gieseler was soon out of print; yet
he could never decide upon issuing a second edition. He shunned that confusion of hypotheses, many of them wholly groundless, which afterward sprung up on this subject, and also thought that the time had not come for new and definitive results.

His thorough philological culture is proved by his treatises published in the second volume of Rosemüller's "Repertorium," which helped to enrich the science of the grammar of the New Testament, then in its infancy. His Essay upon the "Nazarenes and the Ebionites," in Stäudlin and Tzschirner's "Archiv" (Bd. iv. St. 2), showed his peculiar talent in disentangling confused problems. From this time forth he dedicated his powers almost exclusively to his loved studies in church history. Neander's "Genetic Development of the Gnostic Systems" was the occasion of his penetrating review (in the "Hallische Lit. Zeitung, 1823"), which cast much new light upon this chaos. The next year he commenced the publication of his "Text-book of Church History." With Lücke, he also edited the "Zeitschrift für gebildete Christen," four numbers being issued in the years 1823, 4.

At that time the yet youthful University of the Rhine enjoyed a fresh and free life; Protestants and Catholics were not rent asunder; Gratz and Seber still taught without hinderance their independent exegesis and theology, assailed only by Hermes; they, with Ritter, the Roman Catholic church historian, were in constant intercourse with Gieseler; all were of one heart and one soul; robust powers were working peaceably together; the University was in the perfect blossom of its spring-time. In his family Gieseler was blessed in a high degree, attached with incomparable truth and devotion to his early loved and early lost wife, Henrietta, of the Feist family in Halle. The blessing of many children was theirs, and with these came many a care. But trusting in God, relying upon his own power of labor, untiringly active, most conscientious in all his work, not troubled by little things, in the midst of his cares he kept his heart open to every joy.

For twelve and a half years he stood in this post of special influence as a teacher of church history, and enjoying the confidence of his colleagues, who had just committed to him the rectorship of the University, when the Georgia Augusta called him to her service; and certainly, in no other University could he have
been so wholly in his place as at Göttingen. In its fundamental character, as the nurse of the empirical and historical sciences, and in the manifold practical services to which it called him, it corresponded entirely with his own bias. Mere learned investigation would not have filled up the measure of his activity. It is difficult to say which in him was predominant, his capacity for learning, or his practical sagacity and inward fitness to organize and govern; both, without doubt, went hand in hand. As he was in life, so was he in science, clear, definite, foreseeing, conscientious; in expression concise, at times laconic, in all things a man of one piece—a man in every sense of the word. This was felt as soon as you came in contact with him and put confidence in him. The University frequently committed to him, and in times of trial almost always to him alone, the dignity of pro-rector; with hardly an interruption, he was a member of one or several academical courts. His counsel must be sought upon propositions for the revival of the University statutes, or in making new regulations. He was a constant member of the Library Commission. The city corporation chose him for its speaker, an office, however, which he afterward declined. He was curator of the Göttingen Orphan-house, and had the administration of many other charitable foundations, especially the scholarships. The Göttingen Academy of Sciences, of which he was a member, committed to him the direction of the Wedemeyer prizes. In union with Lücke, he directed the Theological Ephora. But the Orphan-house was the special joy of his heart. With few exceptions, he was there every day, and hence knew exactly the disposition, conduct, and faults of each child, had for every one friendly words and counsel, and kept the pupils in his eye long after they had left the institution. They, in return, were attached to him, and manifestly eager to give him pleasure; only in a very few cases did he fail of success in his noble efforts for the rescue of the abandoned, undertaken with so bold a faith.

He gave much time to the lodge of the Order of Free-masons, and undoubtedly knew why he did this. In his last days he was violently assailed on this account, in a way which detracts as little from his good name as from the prosperity of the order.

The interests of his country were ever dear to his heart. The last volume of his church history, embracing the period from
1814 to 1848, shows in many passages what his wishes were. His judgment upon the revolutionary movements of 1848 runs through the whole narrative, in which is also seen the calm hope with which he looked to the future in the midst of the storms that robbed so many of their self-possession.

In the affairs of the Church, as well as of the State, he loved to see a constant and ever judicious advance; he would not have any of the threads severed which bind together the new and the old. Hence he declared against the so-called "Constituent Synods," projected in 1848; and these, in fact, would only have done injury, had they been, as he conceived them to be, courts sitting in judgment upon what was henceforth to be received as the doctrines of the Church. But such a tendency might have been easily avoided; and when we think how much has been lost by nearly forty years of neglect, and the difficulty of its restoration, we can only desire that efforts for the building up of our Protestant Church should not again be undervalued; there may at least be progress in the ecclesiastical order and arrangement of the individual churches, so that, when there is greater clearness in doctrine, we may find the foundations ready for the future structure.

The question whether Gieseler was a rationalist, was answered in the negative, immediately after his death, by a Theologian of high standing, his colleague, Dr. Dorner;* and he certainly was never what we now most commonly understand by that word. From the beginning to the end of his literary career, he held immovably to the truth of justification through faith alone, the fundamental idea of the Protestant system, understanding by this, the free personal reception of the divine truth and grace that come through the mediation of Christ, and are manifested in Him. He did not put the knowledge given by human reason above the divine truth given us in Christ; he acknowledged him only to be a Christian who saw in Christ the sum of all the highest truth, never to be surpassed by any one here below. But when, on the other hand, any one detracted from the right and obligation of human reason to appropriate, examine, and grasp this truth, to free

it from the letter and receive it as spirit and truth, he became a bold and strong champion for this right, which no one ever undervalued without punishment; for reason is that light in us which can not become darkness, without plunging the whole man into darkness (Matth. vi. 22. 23; Luke, xi. 34. 35). In this sense Gieseler was a rationalist, and had in full measure the claim to be honored with that appellation by those who so readily give it to all who hold to clear and logical thinking, and to a wise separation between what is scientifically certain and all arbitrary fancies. He was ever averse to what some love to call profundity of doctrine, to that empty speculation which is either ignorant of or overthrows the empirical basis on which it should rest, and which runs a tilt against all logic without respect; he laughed in a quiet way at one and another who, without the capacity, considered themselves to be speculative theologians. Every philosophical position had for him value only in the degree of its real certainty; it was one of his prime convictions, that in theology nothing is now more important than the difficult, yet not impossible sundering of the spheres of faith and knowledge (πίστις and γνώσις), of that which is the object of faith, and that which is but a human elaboration of the materials, necessarily changing with the progress of time, and always developing itself with many a fluctuation.

His whole treatment of church history rests upon this distinction. His sole aim was to exhibit the historical developments as they were: he combined in one view whatever was internally connected; he made the agencies and counter-agencies apparent, and pointed out the aim and tendencies of events; but he held himself aloof from the construction of arbitrary schemes and divisions, and from all merely subjective judgments. Starting from the position to which the investigations had already advanced, he penetrated to the problems under the guidance of previous leaders, and had a singular gift of quickly finding the way that led to the goal, without taking any fruitless step. It might be said that the intellectual traits of his Westphalian father-land—where is ever found so much unperverted practical sense, quickly seizing upon the right point—were his own in the highest perfection in his scientific explorations. To the outward form he assigned a subordinate value, as well in his own writings as in his critical
investigations. He was sagacious in conjecturing the right words of original documents; many such emendations of high value are due to him. Perhaps, however, in the question of the genuineness of this or that work, he allowed too little influence to its external form—its diction.

The plan and arrangement of his church history are not one symmetrical whole, or, rather, a change in the original plan was made with the second volume. At first intended to be in three volumes of about the same size, the work in the second was so extended, that it lost in some measure its original destination as a guide in the University lectures. The disproportion was to be made up by a more concise history of the period from the Peace of Westphalia, 1648, to the year 1814. But who laments this enlargement of the work? In the very form which the author gave it, it has become the mine from which is drawn so much learning in church history; without it a mass of our later outlines of church history would, doubtless, not have appeared, or at least would not have offered so rich materials.

In another place will be found a designation of the more salient parts of this church history.* In the history of the ancient church Gieseler's assiduity and preference were specially devoted to the Greek Theology. Our acquaintance with it has been materially enlarged by his Programmes upon the opinions of the "Alexandrian Clement and of Origen as to the Body of the Lord," upon the pseudopigraphic "Vision of Isaiah," upon the doctrines of the "Monophysites," as well as by his edition of the "History of the Manichees" by Petrus Siculus, and of the "Panoply" of Euthymius Zygadenus (Tit. 23). In the medieval times he entered into the most thorough and successful examination of the sources of the history of the Cathari, of the Waldenses, of the reforming parties and tendencies before the Reformation, of the cultus, and even of many portions of political history, so far as involved in that of the Papacy. But the crown of his labors in church history is the second division of the third volume (in the German), which exhibits the doctrinal development in the period of the Reformation to the Peace of Westphalia. We there find in the most

* In the "Protestant. Kirchenzeitung für das evangelische Deutschland," Jahrg. i. 1854, No. 30.
compressed expression, in many points exhausting all the sources, rich instruction upon the mutual relations of the two great branches of the Reformation, the Swiss and the German, upon the growth of Luther's views, upon the clerical office and the shaping of the Protestant church government.

Gieseler also wrote upon ecclesiastical matters of immediate interest. During the controversy of the Prussian State with the Archbishop of Cologne, he published a work, enumerating the concessions which each party must make to re-establish permanent peace. He gave these counsels under the name of Irenaeus. He retained the same name in another pamphlet, in which he exposed the wondrous perverseness of the times, as seen in those who, in their zeal for so-called "confessional truth," insisted upon it that even their ecclesiastical opponents should be equally zealous for their own confessions; as when, for example, a Lutheran maintained that Calvinists or Catholics must hold stiffly to the distinguishing doctrines of their own communions, while he at the same time rejected them himself as soul-destroying poison. Under his own name he published his acute investigations upon the "Lehnin Prophecy," whose warning words seem still to announce to Prussia impending misfortunes in the perilous position in which that great state is now entangled.

Gieseler also took the liveliest interest in the neighboring Dutch and French Churches. In 1840 he introduced to the German public a work on the "Disturbances in the Dutch Reformed Church," whose author did not wish to be named; and in 1848, a still larger work, the "History of the Protestant Church in France, from 1787 to 1846." His last literary labor was a discriminating review of the Essays of Chastel and Schmidt, to which the French Academy of Moral Sciences awarded prizes, upon the "Influence of Christianity on the Social State of the Roman Empire," a subject which also involves the question of the restorative means offered by Christianity for the social oppressions and perils of our own times.

This question was one which he examined in the most various aspects. He was a man with a clear eye and an open heart for all who are straitened and in distress: science did not take him away from life, it was rather a means of his better preparation for the
most various and useful practical service. From manifold experience Gieseler had become acquainted with the life and the relations of the laboring classes, the difficulties and deprivations with which so many are now contending, and not through their own fault; his strong and manly sense of right made him sympathize with all human needs, even those of the guilty. He first called into life in Göttingen a society for the aid of dismissed convicts; he wrote the statutes for the large funds of the "Von Hugo Stipends," which were under his direction as long as he lived; and so wisely did he administer them, that they can now be completely and permanently applied to many a beneficent object. There have probably never lived many men who have rendered more efficient aid than he, or in a more unassuming, sympathizing, and obliging way.

He possessed in a high degree the faculty of order and practical organization, and was wise in the direction of entangled affairs. He seemed born to take the lead. In the critical state of the University fifteen years ago, he showed his discretion and firmness to the full satisfaction of all who were able to understand without prejudice the actual state of the case. Gieseler was also willing to rule, but, we must add, he was without any trace of lordliness; he gave his reasons, he convinced, and if at any time outvoted, he seemed to question again for a moment his own opinion, which, however, he seldom changed, even when he did not refer to it anew. He gave his counsel only when asked; he helped and cared for many a one before they came to him.

He was a very faithful friend. He did not lightly withdraw his confidence from any one to whom he ever gave it.

He never seemed proud of the numerous honors which were bestowed upon him during his life. Far from all vanity, he had a noble, manly self-respect; he felt his own worth without being distinctly conscious of it. He stood firm for the right good cause, not troubled by the sacrifices it might cost. He took the most lively part in the struggle for the maintenance of the Union (between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches), and rejoiced with all his heart in the new light that seemed to break in upon the darkness before his departure. He felt assured that in the kingdom of the Lord new and fair days of prosperity would come, though they be delayed.
Faithful to the welfare of the Church and of his country, and ministering with love to the necessities of others, he was also visited with many a care in his own house. After the death of his first wife in the year 1831, which soon followed his transference to Göttingen, he found compensation for a loss he ever deplored, in his second marriage with a relative of the deceased, Amelia Villaret, whom he chose as his companion and the guardian of his children. This marriage, too, was unusually fruitful in children. Care for their education was added to the necessity of providing for his other sons and daughters, already grown up. But to the last day of his life he had constant experience of the truth of Him who has said to his house, My eyes shall be open upon it both night and day.

On his dying bed he saw all his sons and daughters gathered around him, with the exception of two, who could not come for the distance, and took his last farewell of them, comforted by that firm trust in God which was the leading trait of his character. Until that time sound in soul and body as are few, retaining a vigorous manly form of youthful freshness even to his sixty-third year, he sank only by slow degrees under the violence of the abdominal disease by which he was suddenly attacked. His vigorous body resisted long the pangs of the assault, till its powers were exhausted, and a still and peaceful decease brought to its close his active life on the eighth of July, 1854, in the earliest dawn of morning. Three days later he was interred. Both the city and the University equally felt his loss. The long funeral retinue showed that a place was vacant which another would not soon fill with equal power and honor.

The name of Gieseler will not be forgotten in the history of Göttingen, in science, or in the Church. Whoever knew him as he was, preserves his memory thankfully and faithfully, as a costly treasure among his dearest memories. He, however, separated from us, and regretted with deep sorrow in the ranks of his fellow-champions for the dear and noble freedom and unity of our Evangelical Church, still acts among us by his works and by his life, and thus, like the oldest of all the witnesses for God (Heb. xi. 4), although he is dead, he yet speaketh.
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PREFATORY NOTICE.

DR. GIESLER'S Compendium of Ecclesiastical History is marked by peculiar excellencies. It occupies an important position of its own. The text is very brief and condensed, marking the results at which the learned author has arrived; while the accumulated materials in the notes enable the reader to see at once the basis on which the statements of the text rest. If the student be not convinced of the correctness of the assertions made by the historian, he can easily draw his own conclusion by the help of what is presented to him. The work is characterized by immense research, and by striking impartiality. In the latter respect, indeed, the author has been blamed by some, his spirit of impartiality preventing him from expressing a decided opinion, where it would be desirable to throw the weight of his authority into the side of truth. There is also an air of dryness diffused over the work, inseparable perhaps from its exceeding brevity, but also indicating a deficiency in vivid sketching. The excellencies, however, far outweigh any minor faults that may be supposed to belong to it. Its rigid impartiality is its chief recommendation; and the abundant references and quotations in the notes supply the want of a library such as very few have within their reach.
The work in the original consists of several volumes published at different times. The first division of the last volume, containing a portion of the history of the Reformation in different lands, appeared in 1840. In 1844 and 1845 a fourth edition of the first volume was published, one part in each year, greatly improved and enlarged. The author states, in the preface, that this volume first appeared twenty years ago, and that during the interval he has not been inattentive to the subject, but has endeavored to conform his book to the latest investigations. On comparing this edition with the third, we have observed a great improvement, and a large number of new notes.

It may be proper to apprize the reader, that an American translation of the history, down to the time of the Reformation, appeared at Philadelphia in 1836, *professedly* taken from the third edition of the original, the fourth, however, is so different from the third (if, indeed, Cunninghame's version was made from the latter), that it was deemed desirable to make a new version.

The Translator has adhered closely to the original text. His simple aim has been to give the sense of his author. He has not endeavored to make the narrative smooth or elegant, for in that case he should have been compelled to resort to paraphrase, Professor Gieseler being by no means an elegant writer. On the contrary, his style is loose, and his sentences evidently constructed without any view to effect. It must be always remembered, that the book is a *text-book*, not an extended history, like Neander's. As such, the Translator reckons it invaluable. In truth, there are only two ecclesias-
tical histories at the present time that deserve to be read and studied, viz. those of Neander and Gieseler, both *ex fontibus hausti*, as Bretschneider once remarked to the writer. Gue-rike's is one-sided; and Hase's, alas is too short. The Translator, on looking about for a text-book which he could put into the hands of his students as the substratum of lectures on ecclesiastical history, could find none so suitable to his purpose as the present; and he accordingly recommended the enterprising publishers to bring out a new version of the new edition, that students might not be obliged to apply to the American translation, the cost of which is very considerable.

It is almost superfluous to state, that the Translator does not coincide with all the sentiments of Dr. Gieseler. He has occasionally inserted in brackets a reference to books with which the German professor is probably unacquainted.
INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

THE CHURCH.


The Christian Church¹ (ἡ ἐκκλησια τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matt. xvi. 18, ἡ ἐκκλησια τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. x. 32, Gal. i. 13) is a religious-moral society, connected by a common faith in Christ, and, which seeks to represent in its united life the kingdom of God announced by Christ (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σιουροῦ). This kingdom it hopes to see at one time realized, and strives to prepare itself for becoming worthy of having a part in it.² The church bears the same relation to the kingdom

¹ The German word Kirche, which was originally applied to the building alone, is most probably derived from the Greek, τὸ κυριακὸν. Walrad Strabo (about 840), De rebus ecclesiasticis, c. 7, Quomodo theotisice domus Dei dicatur (in Melch. Hittorp. de Divinis Cathol. Eccles. offisii varii vetust. Patrum liber, Colon. 1568, fol. p. 395): Ab ipsis autem Graecis Kyrech a Kyrios—et alia multa accepimus.—Sicut domus Dei Basilica, i. e. Regia a Rege, sic etiam Kyrica, i. e. Dominica a Domino nuncupatur.—Si autem quaeritur, qua occasione ad nos vestigia haec graecitatis adverterint, dicendum,—praecepi a Gothis, qui et Getae, cum eo tempore, quo ad fidem Christi, licet non recto itinere, perduci sunt, in Graecorum provinciis commorantes, nostrum, i. e. theologicum sermonem habuerint. It appears from Ulphilas, that Greek appellations of Christian things were generally adopted by the Goths (see Zahn's Ulphilas, Th. 2, S. 69, ff.; also aiklesjon, ἐκκλησια, Phil. iii. 6. in the fragments published by Maius). The Greek origin of the word is favored not only by its occurrence in all German dialects (Swedish Kyrka, Danish Kyrke, &c.), but also in the dialects of the Slavonian nations converted by the Greeks (Bohemian cyrkw, Polish kerkiew, Russian zerkow). Other derivations of the word are Kieren (Kiesen), from the Gothic, Kolik, a tower, &c. Compare Jacobson's work, p. 68, ff.

² The idea of the church is an individual idea, given historically, for which we can not substitute the general notion (viz. that of a religious society) under which it falls. See Jacobson, p. 116. Ullmann in the Studien und Kritiken, 1833, iii. 607.
of God as the Israelitish church (יִשְׂרָאֵל, Numb. xx. 4) had to
the ideal theocracy expected by it. And as the divine kingdom
of Christ is the purified and spiritual antitype of the theocracy, so
is the Christian church the antitype of the Jewish. Differences
relating to the objects of Christian faith and ecclesiastical life
early separated the church into various distinct societies, each of
which commonly assumed to itself exclusively the name of the
"true church of Christ," and branded the others with the titles
heresy and schism (haeresis, schisma).

While the old unreformed church associations are continually
prejudiced by this particularism, Protestants, on the contrary,
acknowledge every ecclesiastical society which holds Christian
truth in greater or less purity and clearness, to be a preparatory
institution for the kingdom of God, and as such belonging to the
universal Christian church, whose true essence is the invisible
church, the entire number of all true believers throughout the

§ 2.

DEFINITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY—ITS PARTS—GENERAL
HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

8—Ch. W. Flügge Einleit. in das Studium u. in die Literatur der Religions- u. Kirchen-
geschichte, besonders der christlichen. Göttingen. 1801. 8.

The object of ecclesiastical history is to give a pragmatic view
of all the changes and developments through which the Christian
church has passed, and the influences which it has exerted on
other human relations, and thus to lay the foundation for an ethical and teleological estimate of it. As time consists of moments,
so is history made up of circumstances connected together as
cause and effect. Every condition of the church rests on a two-
fold relation. To its internal relations belongs, first of all, that
religious faith which forms its bond of union, both in its scientific
development and in its life in the members; next the character
of the public religious exercises; and thirdly, the form of gov-
ernment. To the external relations of the church belong its diffusion and its relation to other associations, particularly to
the state. Though these several relations are not independent
of one another, but are developed by constant mutual action, they admit of separate historical developments. We have, therefore,

I. A history of the church's external relations (external church history), viz.:—

1. History of its spread and limitation.¹
2. History of its relation to the state.²

II. A history of its internal relations (internal history of the church), viz.:—

1. History of the teaching of the church.
   (a.) As an object of science.
   History of doctrines (Dogmengeschichte).³
   History of ethics.⁴

16  INTRODUCTION. § 2. GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

History of the theological sciences. 5
(b.) As living and working in men.
History of religious and moral life. 6
2. History of ecclesiastical worship. 7
3. History of the internal constitution of the church. 8
A description of the worship, ecclesiastical usages, and constitution of the ancient church, is included in the somewhat vague appellation, ecclesiastical antiquities, or archaeology, 9 although these departments do not embrace merely one point of time, but a longer or shorter period, and ought, therefore, to belong to history.

The materials of ecclesiastical history are also divided by a reference to particular countries, and to separate ecclesiastical societies, 10 whose special developments are presented in special

---

6 The history of religious and moral life among Christians is difficult, and has been neglected down to the latest times. Formerly there appeared only one-sided representations of the life of the first Christians, for example, by W. Cave, Gottfr. Arnold, Peter Zorn. The history of morals is interwoven with it in Staudlin's history of the moral teaching of Christ. (Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu; see note 4.) For the history of Christian life see Nenänder's Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christentums und des christlichen Lebens. Berlin. 1823, ff. 3 vols. [A third edition of the first volume has been lately published.]
10 The history of parties separated from the catholic church has been confined with too much one-sidedness merely to their controversies with the catholic Church. C. W. F. Walch's Vollständige Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen u. Religionsstreitigkeiten bis
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histories. But yet in the progress of development, the separate ecclesiastical relations, and also the national and separate ecclesiastical societies of particular lands, are constantly acting upon each other in a greater or less degree; so that no special history, or description of individual ecclesiastical relations, can be wholly separated from the rest of the history. It is the object of the general history of the Christian church\(^{11}\) to exhibit the general steps in its progress, so that its relation to the ideal of the church,

auf die Reformation. Leipzig. 1762. 11 Thle. 8 (reaching as far as the image-controversy). [Lardner’s History of the Heretics. Burton’s Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age, being the Bampton Lecture for 1829.]

\(^{11}\) Works on the general history of the Christian Church.

I.—BY PROTESTANT WRITERS.


J. S. Semler Historiae Ecclesiae selecta capita cum epitome canonum, excerpit dogniticis et tabulis chronologicis. Halac. 1773–78. 3 Bde. 8, to the end of the fifteenth century.


H. P. C. Heineken’s Allgemeine Gesch. der Christl. Kirche, fortgesetzt von J. S. Vater. Braunschweig. 1788–1830. 8 Thle. 8, of the first and second parts, the fifth edition, 1818–20; of the third and fourth, the fourth edition, 1806. The history since the Reformation (parts 3–8) is comprised in a third volume by Vater, 1823.


J. G. V. Engelhardt’s Handbuch der Kirchengesch. 4 Bde. Erlangen. 1833, 34.

A. F. Größner’s Allgem. Kirchengesch. für die Deutsche Nation. 4 Bde. (Stuttgart. 1841–5.)

the kingdom of God, may be perceived. Accordingly, such historical data alone as refer to this general progress, are important in its view; while those data which have only a more limited significance, are left to special histories.


[English works are, Priestley's General History of the Christian Church to the present time, 6 vols. 4to. London. 1780-1800. Milner's Church History, continued by J. Scott. Jones's History of the Christian Church. Waddington's History, originally published in the Library of Useful Knowledge; to which was afterward added, a History of the Reformation, in 3 vols. See also Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History.]

II. BY CATHOLIC WRITERS.

Caes. Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici. Rome. 1598-1697. 12 Bde. fol. reaches to 1198; the edition of Mogunt. 1601, was improved by the author himself, and has, consequently, been made the basis of succeeding editions. Among the continuators of Baronii, has been most valued Odoricius Raynaldus Ann. Eccles. Tom. xiii.-xxi. Rom. 1646-77. (Tom. xxi. was suppressed by Roman censorship till 1659. Of Tom. xiii.-xx. a new and improved edition was published by the author at Colon. 1685, ss.), reaches to 1565. This was continued by Jac. de Laderchio. Ann. Eccles. T. xxi.-xxv. Rom. 1728-39, embracing the years 1566-71.


§ 3.

RELATION OF CHURCH HISTORY TO OTHER HISTORICAL STUDIES.

Ecclesiastical history forms a part of the general history of culture\(^1\) and of religion,\(^2\) and requires attention to other departments of study, that we may judge rightly of the importance of Christianity in relation to general culture, and of its contests with other religions. It is scientifically co-ordinate with political history,\(^3\) the history of philosophy,\(^4\) and the history of literature,\(^5\) with which it stands in so close relationship, that, to be fully understood, it can as little dispense with their aid as they can dispense with it. Besides, it requires, as other histor-

---


ical studies do, historical geography, chronology, philology, diplomacy, numismatics, heraldry, and derives special assistance from ecclesiastical geography and statistics.


In addition to the well-known chronological distinctions ab urbe condita, according to the consuls, emperors, &c., the following eras are important in church history. Aera contradictionum or Seleucidarum, beginning a.d. 312, 1st October, formerly the most common in the east, and to this day the ecclesiastical era of the Syrian Christians. Aera Hispanica begins 716 A.D., 39 B.C., abolished in Spain in the fourteenth century, in Portugal not until 1415. Aera Diocletiana or aera Martyrum, begins 29th August, a.d. 264, used in the Christian Roman empire, and still current among the Copts. Cycloos indictionum, a fifteen years' cycle constantly recurring, which first began on the 1st September, 312, but in the middle ages assumed the usual commencement of the year. Aera Constantinopolitana reckons from the creation of the world, the 1st September, 5508 a.c., since the council of Trullo (692), in civil use among the Greeks, among the Russians abolished in 1700. Besides the different commencements of the year must be noticed in the reckoning of time. Comp. Ideler's Handbuch ii. 325, ff.


§ 4.

OF THE SOURCES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

The sources of ecclesiastical history, like those of every other history, may be traced back to private testimony, original documents, and monuments. To the first belong not only the records of ecclesiastical events which are original to us,¹ and biographies of remarkable persons in the history of Christianity, particularly of hierarchs² and saints,³ but also other works of Christian writers, especially the theological,⁴ and even many


² Especially of the popes. The oldest collection of the biographies of them is Anastasii Bibliothecarii (abbot in Rome about 870) Liber Pontificalis. This, together with the following collections, has been inserted in Muratorii Rerum Ital. Scriptores, T. iii.
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Writings proceeding from persons not Christians, who came in contact with Christians.

Among the original documents the following must be particularly examined: the laws of different states, as far as they have exerted an influence on the Christian church, or have themselves arisen under the influences of the church itself; the acts and ordinances of ecclesiastical councils; the official writings of the heads of churches, especially of the popes; the rules of monastic orders; confessions of faith, liturgies, &c. Memoranda of ecclesiastical buildings, monuments of the dead.

1840. J. Chr. F. Bühr die christl. römische Theologie. Curarulo. 1837, and his Gesch. de römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter, 1840 (a second and third supplementary volume, to his History of Roman Literature).


Patres eclesiæ are, in the opinion of Catholics, the orthodox ecclesiastical writers as far as the thirteenth century (these, however, are not of normal authority, like the Doctores Ecclesiae, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura). Protestants usually restrict the appellation to the first six centuries, as the purer period of the church. The works of the fathers not included in separate collections are found in the large collections, such as: Magna Bibliotheca vett. Patrum. Paris. 1654. 17 Tomi. fol. Maxima Bibliotheca vett. Patrum. Lugdun. 1677. 27 Tomi. fol. Andr. Gallandii Biblioth. vett. Patrum. Venetiis. 1765. ss. 14 Tomi. fol.


§ 5. USE OF THE SOURCES.

The object of investigations in church history is to reproduce, directly from the original sources, the facts belonging to the sphere of the church, in its external and internal life, in their manifestations as well as their grounds, and also in their causal connections. For this purpose the historian requires not only a penetrating and unbiased interpretation of the sources which present themselves, but also historical criticism, to enable him to judge of the genuineness, integrity, and credibility of the sources, not only in general, but in each particular case.¹ This criticism must be the more watchful, since distortions of historical truth frequently appear in the province of ecclesiastical history, produced by credulity and ignorance, by prejudice and partisanship, by the desire to adapt it to certain ends, and even by deceit. In those cases in which the sources afford nothing at all, or what is false, relative either to single facts or their causal connection, the inquirer must have recourse to historical conjectures, whose probability may border very nearly on truth, but often, perhaps, may rise very little above other possibilities. In forming such historical conjectures, he must be guided by a careful consideration of existing relations, of the character of the period and persons, by analogy, and even by the false data of the sources. The ecclesiastical historian must renounce party interest, as well as prejudices arising from the peculiarities of his time. On the other hand, he can not penetrate into the internal character of the phenomena of church history without a Christian religious spirit, because one can not generally comprehend aright any strange spiritual phenomenon without reproducing it in himself. It is only investigation of this nature that can discover where the Christian spirit is entirely wanting,

¹ Ernesti de fide historic a recte aestimanda (in his Opusculis Philologico-Criticius, ed. 2. Lugd. Bat. 1776. p. 64, ss.) Griesbachii Dias. de fide hist. ex ipso rerum quae narrantur natura judicanda (in his Opusc. Acad. ed Gabler. Jenae. 1824. vol. i. p. 167, ss.)
where it is used merely as a mask, and what other spirit has taken its place. Wherever it exists it will not be mistaken, although it should manifest itself in such ways as are foreign to the spirit of our own times.

§ 6.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE MATERIALS OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.—HISTORIC REPRESENTATION.

The old methods of arranging the materials of ecclesiastical history according to years, or of dividing them into centuries, have been rightly abandoned. The division into periods, by means of epochs, has been generally adopted, although great difference prevails in fixing these periods. We assume four periods: the first, To the time of Constantine, the first development of the church under external oppression; the second, Till the beginning of the image controversies, the development of Christianity as the prevailing religion of the state; the third, Till the Reformation, the development of the Papacy prevailing over the state; the fourth, The development of Protestantism. The contents of each period may be arranged either chronologically or according to a general scheme taken from the different relations of the church. (§ 2.) Both methods used exclusively have their advantages and disadvantages. In the chronological arrangement things similar are often too widely separated, and the lines of development are torn asunder. In the other arrangement, when the periods are large, the mutual influence which the development of separate ecclesiastical relations has on each other at different times is obscured, and the survey of the entire condition of one particular time is rendered difficult. We must therefore endeavor, as far as possible, to unite the advantages of both methods, and to avoid their disadvantages. Although every period has its definite ecclesiastical character, yet this

1 The following have been used as epochs by different ecclesiastical historians, for the purpose of limiting their periods:—The destruction of Jerusalem, 70; Commencement of Constantine’s reign, 306; or the Council of Nice, 323; Gregory the Great, 604, or Muhammad, 622; Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, 715, or the beginning of the image controversy, 724; Charlemagne, 800; Gregory VII., 1073; Removal of the papal residence to Avignon, 1305; Reformation 1517; Founding of the University of Halle, 1693.
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character undergoes many modifications during the lapse of the whole period. Hence the division of periods into small sections of time is justified. The materials of these smaller sections are best arranged chronologically, as long as the church in its first beginnings has not yet formed its internal relations; afterward they may be disposed according to a division taken from these internal relations. In every section of time there prevails the development of one or of several ecclesiastical relations, so that the development of all the other relations of the church is thereby controlled. It is therefore suitable to dispose the history of the different relations in the church in every minor period, according to their relative importance, and their influence on the whole.

The mode of writing ecclesiastical history must be worthy of the subject. The phenomena make a continual demand upon our moral and religious feelings. Where moral greatness is manifested, they excite our admiration; where they bear witness to errors, they excite our compassion; where they evince immoral designs and motives, they stir up our indignation; but they never furnish a fit subject for ridicule.

§ 7.

VALUE OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:

Church history has a universal interest for men, as it forms the most important part of the religious history of humanity. For the Christian it has a peculiar interest, since it discloses to him the later transformations of Christianity, with their causes and effects, and guides him to a safe judgment with regard to what is original and essential in it. On this account, it is indispensable to the Christian theologian who desires to acquire a scientific knowledge of Christianity. ² It is also of importance


to the scholar, because of its essential connection with the history of learning, philosophy, morals, and the arts. It is obvious, that a fundamental acquaintance with ecclesiastical law, and the legislative enactments of Christian states, is impossible without it.\footnote{J. H. Boehner Diss. de necessitate et utilitate Stud. Hist. Ecclesiast. in juris ecclesiastici prudentia (in the Observatt. sell. ad Pet. de Marca libr. de concordia sacerdotii et imperii. Francof. 1708. fol.)}
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which was founded on critical principles, is frequently a work upon Eusebius rather than a translation. Still it is not unimportant in the criticism of the original (comp. E. J. Kimmelii de Rufino Eusebii interprete, libb. ii. Gerae. 1838. 8). With the history of Eusebius are connected, even in the editions of Valesius and Zimmermann, his εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως λόγω δ', ed. F. A. Heinichen. Lips. 1830. 8.

III. All the Christian writers of this period. The fragments of those whose works have been lost are collected in J. E. Grabe spicilegium SS. Patrum ut et haereticorum saeculi i. ii. et iii. Tom. i. s. Saec. i. ed. 2. Oxon. 1700. Saec. ii. t. i. 1700. 8. (A new edition in 3 Tom. Oxon. 1714.) M. Jos. Routh reliquiae saecræ, sive auctorum fere jam perditorum secundae tertisque saeculi fragmenta, quae supersunt Oxonii. 1814–18. 4 vols. 8. vol. 5, 1848.


WORKS.


On the spread and persecution of Christianity:


FIRST DIVISION.
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Leipzig. 1788. 8. (J. A. Starck's Geschichte der christlichen Kirche des ersten Jahr-

INTRODUCTION.

OF THE CONDITION OF THE WORLD, ESPECIALLY ITS RELIGIOUS AND
MORAL STATE, AT THE TIME OF CHRIST'S BIRTH, AND DURING THE
FIRST CENTURY.

I.

CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS.

C. I. Nitzsch üb. den Religionsbegriff der Alten, in the theol. Studien und Kritiken, Bd. 1
Religion zum Besten der Menschheit entwarf. Wittenberg. 1781. 4te Aufl. 1798. 8.
[Translated into English, and published at Andover, 1831, 15mo.] A. Tholuck über das
Wesen und den züglichen Einfluss des Christenthums, besonders unter den Griechen u.
Römern, mit Hinsicht auf das Christenthum (in A. Neander's Deuwürdigkeiten aus
[Translated in the American Biblical Repository for 1832, by Professor Emerson.
Neander's Kirchengesch. I. I. 7, ff. Especially: Der Fall des Heidenthums von Dr.
H. G. Tschirner, herausg. v. M. C. W. Niedner. Bd. 1. (Leipzig. 1829) S. 13, ff. [Le-
land's Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation.]

§ 8.

The Roman empire, in the first century, extended not only
over the whole civilized world, but almost over the known world.
Beyond it little was known besides the Germanic tribes in the
north, and the Parthians in the east. In the western half of
that great empire, the language and customs of the Romans had
become prevalent; but in the eastern, Greek cultivation asserted
the superiority it had obtained since Alexander's conquests, and
under the emperors penetrated more and more even into Rome.1

1 Cicero pro Archia, c. 10: Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus,
exiguis sane, continentur. How the Greek had incorporated itself with the language of
conversation among cultivated Romans, may be seen in Cicero's Letters to Atticus, and
It is obvious, how much the union of so many nations under one government, and the general diffusion of the Greek language, must have favored the heralds of Christianity.

§ 9.

OF THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CHARACTER OF THE ANCIENT NATIONS IN GENERAL.

Polytheism can not, from its very nature, be favorable to morality. Its deities can only be finite beings, and resembling man, because it separates the divinity into many parts. Every nation gives expression to its character, its virtues, and its vices, in the deities it worships; and therefore the divinity, so disfigured, can not lead men to a higher moral elevation. The heathen stand only in an external relation to their gods; and their entire religion is consequently nothing more than an external worship, which leaves untouched not only theological speculation, as long as it does not attack existing forms, but also moral sentiment. Human deities will be worshiped, propitiated, and reconciled, in the way of men; and for this purpose moral elevation is not needed so much as a kind of prudence. They can not inspire respect and love, but fear only. Their worship is nothing more than a barter, in which man expects mercy, protection, and greater gifts, in exchange for demonstrations of respect, and offerings. This general character of polytheism is found in all heathen religions at the time of Christ. A mythology partly immoral, sanctified many vices by the example of the gods. The worship of several deities was attended with immoral deeds. Thus, the worship of Bel in Babylon, of Aman in Thebes, of Aphrodite in Cyprus, Corinth, and many other places, elevated lewdness to the position of a religious service;¹ and the

in Augustus's letters in Suetonius, &c., Claudius c. 4. Comp. Ovidii Ars amandii ii. 121, Dial. de oratoribus c. 29. Juvenal. Satyr. iii. 58. xv. 110, vi. 185, ss. speaking of the Roman ladies:—

Nam quid rancidius, quam quod se non putat ulla
Formosam, nisi quae Tusca Graecula facta est ¹
Hoc sermone parent, hoc iuram, gaudia, curas,
Hoc cuncta effundunt animi secreta.

worship of other deities excited, at least, sensuality in a high
degree.² In like manner, human sacrifices were customary, in
several places, as yearly expiations; but every where, on occa-
sion of extraordinary threatening dangers, for the purpose of
propitiating the enraged deities.³ Religious motives existed
only to promote the exercise of the duties belonging to citizens;⁴
and whatever of a higher nature appears in the case of indi-
gudal Greeks and Romans was owing, not to the religion of the
people, but to their better moral nature.⁵ In general, the feel-
ing of man's dignity and rights was wanting, while in place of
it was found nothing but a partial national conceit, joined to a
profound contempt for everything foreign, and propped up by
religion, since every nation had but the expression of its own
nationality in its deities. Hence the horrible debasement of man
as a slave.⁶ When the national pride was humbled by subju-
gation and oppression, the people readily lost along with it every
noble feeling of self-respect, and sank into slavish abjectness.
Woman lost among the Greeks the respect due to her, because
of her political insignificance, since public virtue was deemed
of the highest importance with that people.⁷ Among eastern
nations, polygamy had the same effect to a much greater
extent.

² Tholuck, as above, S. 143, ff.
³ Tholuck, S. 221, ff. Octavian caused 300 men to be slaughtered on the altar of Caesar.
(Sueton. Oct. c. 15, Dio Cassius, 49, 14). Sextus Pompeius ordered that persons should be
thrown into the sea as a sacrifice to Neptune (Dio Cassius, 49, 48). According to Porphyry,
de abstin. carnis, ii. c. 56, human sacrifices ceased to be offered in different nations at the
time of Hadrian; but even in his day (about 280 A.D.) a human victim was yearly offered
to Jupiter Latialis in Rome. Lactantius (about 300) Divin. Instit. i. c. 21: Latialis
Jupiter etiam nunc sanguine colitur humano. Comp. Lipsius de Amphib. c. 4. (Opp.
iii. 1003), van Dale de Oraclibus Gentilium, p. 443. Lamb. Bos, Heidenreich, Pott ad 1
Cor. iv. 13.
⁴ Cicero de Legibus, ii. c. 7: Utiles esse autem opiniones has, quis neget, cum intelligat,
quam multi fermentur jurejurando; quantae salutis siut foederum religiones; quam multos
divini supplicii metas a scelero revocaret; quamque sancta sit societas civium inter ipsos,
diis immortalibus interpositis tum judicibus, tum testibus.
⁵ As Cicero, de fin. ii. c. 25, judges of Epicurus and his philosophy.
⁶ Tholuck, S. 197, ff. Gladiators. As late as the time of Claudius, that emperor was
obliged to forbid the exposing or putting to death sick slaves. Suetonius in Claudius,
cap. 25.
⁷ Tholuck, S. 203, ff.
§ 10.

RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE GREEKS.

Histoire de la civilisation morale et religieuse des Groes par P. van Limburg Brouwer.

The Greek deities were ideal Greeks, whose sentiments and conduct were Grecian. By their will and example they exhorted to those virtues to which the Grecian character was disposed, or which were found necessary for the state and for social life. But so far were they from imaging forth a pure morality, and so little freed from the national vices of the Greeks, that the mythology granted even by the Greek philosophers was able, for the most part, to influence morality only in the way of injury. After the subjugation of Greece, when national honor, love of country, and patriotism had ceased to be powerful motives, we find Greece in the condition of the deepest moral degradation. Religion became with the people scarcely any thing but an enjoyment of art, wanting too often in all that partakes of a moral spirit. Hence it was unable to elevate the deteriorated nation above their external destiny. How much the cultivation of the intellect and taste was preferred to morality, even in the flourishing times of Greece, is proved by the general estimation in which clever courtesans were held; while the rest of the female sex were, for the most part, neglected, as far as

---

1 In opposition to Tholuck, in the work already quoted, who traces the corruption of religion and morality to Grecian art, see Fr. Jacob's über die Erziehung der Hellenen zur Sittlichkeit, in his vermischte Schriften, Th. 3. An intermediate course is taken by Dr. C. Grüneisen über das Sittliche der bildenden Kunst bei den Griechen, in Illgen's Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie, iii. ii. 1. But another aspect must not be overlooked. Though it be possible that so much elevation and dignity as is represented by some was reflected in the divine forms, yet they necessarily referred the beholder to their mythology, and the impression that so much immorality could be united with such external excellence must have been highly corrupting to the morals. Cf. Augustinus de civ. Dei. iv. 31: Varro dicit etiam, antiquus Romanus plus quam annos centum et septuaginta deos sine simulacro coluisse. Quod si adhuc, inquit, mansisset, castius dixi observaretur. Cujus sententiae suas testem adhibet inter eastera etiam gentem Judaeam, nec dubitabit cum locum ita concludere, ut dicat, qui primum simulacra deorum populi posuerunt, eos civitatis suis et metum dempississe, et errorem addidisse.

2 Plato (de repub. ii.) wishes to banish the immoral mythology from his republic; Aristotle (Politie, vi. 8) proposes that the young at least should be excluded from witnessing immoral rites.
their spiritual culture was concerned. The love of boys, which was so general, and inspired so many poets, shows how art ministered even to unnatural vices. The mysteries were far from presenting a better esoteric religion than that of the people. They offered nothing but a secret mythology which attached itself to the popular religion—a secret ritual to be practiced in worshiping the gods—directions for the purification of the initiated, accompanied, it is true, by several moral precepts, but all for the purpose of making the deities peculiarly propitious to the initiated.

§ 11.

RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE ROMANS TO THE TIME OF AUGUSTUS.


The religion of the Romans was of a more grave and moral character, although in it the Grecian element was mixed up with the Etrurian. We find the ancient Romans distinguished not only for their political but their domestic virtues, and for a chastity rarely found in the bosom of heathenism. As long as Grecian art was unknown at Rome, so long, too, did the Grecian mythology with its poisoning influence remain unknown; but after the destruction of Carthage and Corinth, the national character generally, and the Roman religion along with it, underwent by degrees a great alteration for the worse. The riches which flowed into the city, the knowledge of Asiatic lux-

---


4 As Warburton (the Divine Legation of Moses. Lond. 1742. Translated into German by J. Chr. Schmidt. Frankf. u. Leipz. 1751. 3 Bde.), Thl. 1. Bd. 2, and many after him assume. On the other side see especially Chr. Ang. Lobeck, Aglaophamus s. de theogiae mysticae Graecorum causis, libb. iii. t. i. Regiomontii Pruss. 1829. 8.


2 Hartung, i. 249. Ambrosch, S. 69.
urics, and the mode of instruction followed by Greek masters, led to licentiousness and excesses; while the Grecian mythology, incorporated with Grecian art, was diffused by the poets, and entirely extinguished the old Roman character with its rigid virtue.²

§ 12.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION OF THE ROMANS.

It was an universal principle among the ancients, that the gods themselves had arranged the peculiar form of their worship in every country. Hence all polytheistic religions were tolerant toward each other, as long as every worship confined itself to its own people or country. This toleration was also observed by the Romans.¹ On the other hand, to introduce strange gods and modes of worship without the sanction of the state was tantamount to the introduction of a superstition prejudicial to the interests of the community.² When, therefore, after the extended conquests of the Romans, foreign modes of worship were more and more introduced into the city, partly lessening, by that means, attachment to the national religion, and partly promoting even immoral practices, the laws against the sacra peregrina were frequently renewed.³ Religious societies of foreign

² Hartung, i. 231. Dr. K. Hoeck's röm. Geschichte vom Verfälle d. Republik bis zur Vollendung der Monarchie unter Constantia. (Braunschweig. 1842, f.) Bd. i. Abth. 2. S. 216 u. 371.
³ Cicero de leg. ii. c. 8: Separatim nemo habessit deos; neve novos, sed ne advenas, nisi publice adactos, privatis colunt.
origin could not easily hold out against such prohibitions, since, coming under the Roman idea of collegia, they were also opposed by the laws against collegia illicita, and since all nocturnal associations were forbidden under pain of death. On the other hand, the private worship of strange gods was not so easily eradiated.

§ 13.

RELATION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THE POPULAR RELIGIONS.

As soon as philosophy was cultivated in Greece, the unity of

---

4 Collegia, sodalisit, sodalitates, συνάδαι. The Greeks and Romans were fond of such connections, which had their basis partly in relationship (comp. the Roman gentes and curiae, the Athenian φθαρίας), partly in similarity of profession (so the collegia tificinum, auriforum, architectorum, &c., at Rome). They had both their own sacred rites, a common fund, and secret meetings and fasces (σφαῖρας). Thus the priests of the same deities not only formed collegia of this nature (comp. sodales Augustales, Aureliani, &c.), but unions for the worship of certain deities were also reckoned collegia (for example, for the solemnization of the rites of Bacchus, see note 3). So Cato says, in Cicero de senectut. c. 13: Sodalitates me questore constitutae sunt sacris Idaeis Magnae Matris acceptis. So speaks Philo, in Flaccum, of the ἐτυρείας καὶ συνάδως in Alexandria, at ἡι προφανεῖς θεων ἐστιν τοις πράγμασιν ἐμπαρονοῦσας. Cf. Salmassii observant. ad jus Rom. et Atticum, c. 3 u. 4. J. G. Stuckii antiquitatum convivialium, lib. i. c. 31. (Opp. tom. i. Lugd. Bat. et Amstel. 1695. fol. p. 173, sqq.) H. E. Dirksen, histor. Bemerkungen über den Zustand der juristischen Personen nach röm. Recht, in his civilist. Abhandlungen (Berlin. 1820). Bd. 1. S. 1, ff.


6 Tab. ix. Lex 6: Sei quei endo urbe coitus nocturnus agitasit, capitall estod. This determination was renewed by the lex Gabinia (Leges xii. Tabularum restitutae et illustratae a J. N. Funccio. Rintellii. 1744. 4. p. 400).
God was expressed in most of the schools, and morality was placed on a more becoming and a religious foundation. But while philosophy could not fail of producing a high religious feeling in the narrow circle of the initiated, it occasioned a crude skepticism among the more numerous class of the half instructed. Although Plato and Aristotle directly expressed their sentiments regarding the popular religion in a reserved and cautious manner, and even conformed externally to its requirements, yet their theology afforded a standard by which, when many parts of the popular faith were judged, they must necessarily vanish into nothing. The Stoic pantheism endeavored to preserve the current mythology by considering the deities as the fundamental powers of the universe, and explaining the myths allegorically; but it destroyed, at the same time, all religious feeling by its spirit of pride. The Epicurean philosophy, as far as it removed all connection between the gods and the world, making the latter originate in chance, destroyed all religion and morality; and though this was not its tendency in the eyes of the founder, it was certainly the aim of his later disciples. The skepticism of the middle and new academy exerted no better influence, at least in the larger circles.

Soon after Greek literature had been introduced at Rome after the time of Livius Andronicus (about 240 B.C.), skeptical doubts manifested themselves there also. Subsequently, the

---


2 Sénècle’s Gesch. der Moralphilosophie, Hannover, 1822, in many passages. Limburg Bower’s work already quoted in § 10.

3 F. A. Carus hist. antiquior sententiarum Ecclesiae graecae de accommodacione Christo imprimis et Apostolis tributa, diss. Lips. 1793, 4. p. 12, ss. For the manner in which the Grecian states judged respecting every departure from the public religion, see F. W. Titzmann’s Darstellung der griechisch. Staatsverfassungen. Leipzig. 1822. S. 97, ff.


5 They appeared first of all in Ennius (239-168 b.c.) Cf. Cicero de Nat. Deor. i. 42.
academy, the porch, and epicureanism, finding a more general reception, from the time of the famous Athenian embassy, (Carneades, Diogenes, Critolaus, 155 B.C.), the flourishing philosophy tended not only to weaken the popular religion, but to destroy the religious faith of many. But although skepticism spread more and more, yet the unbelieving politicians and philosophers themselves agreed, that the native religion must be upheld with all their powers, as the support of the state, and of all the relations of life. With the multitude, no philosophy could take the place of the religious motives which lay in the popular religion; and of foreign religious rites the opinion was, that they destroyed national feeling, and produced an inclination to foreign customs and laws. Hence, even Scaevola (about 100 B.C.) wished to confirm anew the religion of the state by separating it from philosophy and mythology, whence proceeded its

Euhemerum noster et interpretatus et secutus est praeter caeteros Ennius. Ab Euhemerio autem mortem et sepulturam demonstrarum deorum. Besides Ennius translated Epicharmus's representation of the Pythagorean doctrine respecting God, nature, and the soul; comp. Dr. L. Krahmer's Grundlinien zur Gesch. des Verfalls d. röm. Staatsreligion bis auf die Zeit des August (a school-programme). Halle. 1837. 4. S. 20, ff. Ennius's own religious views are given in Cic. de Divin. ii. c. 50:

Ego Deum genus esse semper dixi, et dicam caelestum:
Sed eos non curare opinor, quia agat humanum genus.

4 Cic. de invent. i. 29: In eo aetem, quod in opinione positum est, haudamodi sunt probabilis: eos, qui philosophiae dent operam, non arbitrari Deos esse. Idem pro Cluentio, e. 61. Do Nat. Doct. ii. c. 2. Tuscul. Quaest. i. c. 5. 6.

5 In Sallustian in Catilina, c. 51, Caesar says: In ira atque miseris mortem serenarum requiem, non cruciatum esse: eam cuncta mortuum male dissolvere: ultra neque curae neque gradio locum esse. And Cato says, in reference to Caesar's speech, c. 52: Bene et composite C. Caesar paulo ante in hoc ordine de vita et morte dissersuit; falsa, credo, existimas, quas de inferis memorabunt: diverso itinere malos a bonis loca tetra, inculta, foeda atque formidola habere.

6 Cicero de leg. ii. 7. See above § 9, note 4, de Divin. ii. 33: Non sumus ii nos augures, qui avium reliquorumque signorum observatione futura dicemus. Erravit enim multis in rebus antiquitas, quas vel usu jam, vel doctrina, vel vetustate immutatas videmus. Retinuerunt autem et ad opinionem vulgi, et ad magnas utilitates reipublicae mos, religio, disciplina, ius augurum, collegii auctoritas.

7 Strabo, in geograph. i. c. 3, pag. 19: Οὐ γὰρ ἡλιόν τε γυαλίων, καὶ παντὸς χυδαίων πλήθους ἔποιησεν λόγων δυνάμεως, καὶ προσκόλλησεμοι πρὸς εὐφέβειαν, καὶ ὁμορρητός καὶ πίστιν, ἀλλὰ δεὶ καὶ δία δειπτομονίας· τούτῳ δέ ἢκ οὐκ ἔνω κηδεμονίας, καὶ τερπείας.

8 Comp. the advice of Maecenas to Augustus, according to Dio Cassius, lib. iii.: τὸ μὲν θεὸν πάντες πάντως αὐτῷ τὸ σέβον κατὰ τὰ πάριν, καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τιμῶν ἀνώγκος· τὸν δὲ θεὸν ἕξεις τις ἐρωτεύεσθαι τις πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ μίσει καὶ κλαίει, μὴ μόνον τῶν θεῶν ἔσκει, ὡς καταφρονήσῃς αὐτὸ ἄλλων ἄλλων προς προσκύνησιν, ἀλλ' ἢτι κατὰ τῶν διάμονων οἱ τιμῶν ἀντιστέφοντες, πολλὰς ἀνετίθοσιν ἄλλοτροφωμεῖς· κάκων τούτων καὶ συνομοσίατι καὶ αναπτύσσῃς ἑμαυτός τις γέγονται. ἄπερ ἤμοι μονοχρήμα συμβέρει· μήτι οὖν ἄθετοι τινί, μήτε γόντι συγχρόνης εἶναι.
INTRODUCTION I.—HEATHEN NATIONS. § 13. PHILOSOPHY.

...corruption;\(^{11}\) and \textit{M. Terentius Varro}, abiding by that separation (about 50 b.c.), endeavored to prepare for it a new basis out of the doctrine of the Stoics.\(^{12}\)

\(^{11}\) Augustin. de civit. Dei, iv. 27: Relatum est in littera, doctissimum pontificem Scaevolam disputasse tria genera tradita deorun; unam a pothis, alteram a philosophis, tertium a principibus civitatis. Primum genus nagatorum dicit esse, quod multa de dis fingantur indignis: secundum non congrueri civitatis, quod habeat aliquam superacum, aliquam atiam quae obisset populis esse (namely, non esse deos Herculum, Aesculapium, &c.—c. qui sint ilii, non habere civitates vera simulacra—verum Deum nec sexum habere, nec etatem, nec definita corporis membra). Haec pontific ex populo nostro non vult, nam falsa esse non putat. Com. Krahmer, S. 45.

\(^{12}\) According to Augustinus de civ. Dei vi. 2, Varro said in his Reorum Divinarum, lib. xvi., the second part of his Antiquitates: se timere, ne (di) peraret, non incurrat, sed civium neglecta: de qua illos velut ruina liberarum a se dicit, et in memoria honorem per hujusmodi libros reconditi atque servare. He also distinguishes (l. c. vi. 3) tria genera theologice, namely, mythicum, quae maxime utuntur poetae, physicum, quae philosophi, civile, quae populi. Primum, quod dixi, in eo sunt multa contra dignitatem et naturam immortali facta. Secundum genus est, quod demonstravi, de quo multis libros philosophi reliquerunt. In quibus est: dixi qui sunt, ubi, quod genus est. (Augustin. addis: Nihil in hoc genere culpavit. Removit tamen hoc genus a foro i. e. a populis: scholis vero et parietibus clausit. Illud autem primum mendacissimum atque turpissimum a civitatis non removit). Tertium genus est, quod in urbis cives, maxime sacerdotes, nosse atque administrare debent. In quo est, quos deos publico colere, quos sacra et sacrificia facere quemquam pur sit. Prima theologica maxime accommodata est ad theatrum, secunda ad muntem, tertia ad urbem. (Plutarch also, Amator, c. 18, and de placitis philosoph. i. 6, distinguishes this threefold theology, τὸ μυθικὸν, τὸ φυσικὸν and τὸ πολιτικὸν). Respecting the religion of the Roman state, Varro, as reported by Augustin. l. c. iv. 31, said: non se illa judicio suo sequi, quae civitatem Romanam instituisse commemorat; ut, si eam civitatem novam constituerent, ex naturae potius formula deos nominque deorum se fuisse dedicatorum non dubiet coeitleri. Sed jam quaquam in vetere populo essent accepta, ab antiquis nominum et cognominum historiam tenere ut tradita est debere so dicit, et ad eum hanc illam scribere ac perscrutarini, ut potias eos magis colere, quem despescere vulgus velit. L. c. vii. 6: Dicit ergo idem Varro adhue de naturali theologica praetoquin, Deum so arbitrari esse annorum mundi, quasi Graeci vocant κόσμον, et hunc ipsum mundum esse Deum. Hic videtur quoquo modo coeitleri unum Deum, sed ut plures etiam introducunt, adjungunt, mundum dividi in duas partes, caelestium et terrarum; et caelestium bifarum in astera et aera, terrarum vero in aquam et humum. Quas omnes quatuor partes animarum esse plenas, in aethere et aere immortaliis, in aqua et terra mortalium: a summo autem circuitu caeli usque ad circulum lunae aethereis animas esse astra ac stellas, eosque caelestes deos non modo intelligi esse, sed etiam videri. Inter lunae vero gyrum et nimborum ac ventorum cacumin aereas esse animas, sed ex animo, non oculis viseri, et voci et voce, et lares, et genios. Haec est videlicet breviter in ista praelocutione prorsus theologica naturalis, quae non hunc tantum, sed et multis philosophis placuit. Tertullian's second book, ad Nationes, is directed against this theology of Varro. Comp. Hartung, i. 274. Krahmer, S. 49.
§ 14.

REVOLUTION OF RELIGIOUS MODES OF THINKING UNDER THE EMPERORS.


In the reign of the emperors the national deities, who were obliged to divide their honors with the most miserable of men, sank by degrees still lower in the faith of the people. The attachment to traditional customs and institutions, decaying along with liberty, could no longer afford these gods a protection. Politics and habit secured them nothing more than a lukewarm, external worship. The relations of the times did not lead men away from the error that had been abandoned, toward a somewhat purer religion, but to a still grosser superstition. The cowardly weaklings, who were the offspring of a luxury surpass-

1 According to Polybius, 5, the custom of honoring benefactors with sacrifices and altars appeared first among the Asiaties, the Greeks, and Syrians. Similar honors were frequently paid to proconsuls in their provinces. (Cicero ad Atticum v. 21. Sueton. Oct. c. 59. Montagu, in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Insr. t. 1. p. 335, ss.) Caesar caused these honors to be decreed to him by the senate in Rome also. (Suet. Caes. 76). Augustus accepted in the provinces temples and colleges of priests (Tacit. Annal. i. 10, Suet. Oct. c. 59); and so did all his successors, with the single exception of Vespasian. Domitian even began his letters with: Dominus et Deus noster hoc fiori jubes (Suet. Domit. 13).

J. D. Schoepflini comm. de apothesi s. consecrationes Impp. Romanorum (in ejusd. comment. hist. et crit. Basil. 1741. 4. p. 1, 8.).


3 Seneca de superstitionibus, apud Augustin. de civit. Dei, vi. c. 10: Quae omnia sapiens servavit tanquam legibus jussa, non tanquam Diis gratia. Omnen istam ignobili Deorum turbam, quam longo sevo longa superstitione congescit, sic adorabimus, ut meminerimus, cultum ejus magis ad mortem quam ad rem pertinere.

ing all bounds, must have stood open to every superstition, especially as dangers daily threatened them from those in power. Curiosity, and an inordinate longing for the secret and the awful, contributed to increase the superstition. To this must be added the decline of the earnest study of the sciences (law and juridical eloquence being almost the only studies of the time); but, above all, the excessive corruption of the age.\textsuperscript{5} Cowardly vice sought partly to make magical rites subservient to its will,\textsuperscript{6} while it was, in part, driven to more powerful purifications by the stings of conscience. Already had the religions of the east, by their mysterious, fantastic worship, and the asceticism of their priests, made an impression on the superstitious disposition of the Romans, so that they had been restricted and opposed by the laws. But the current of the time that set in now broke through all laws. Foreign modes of worship and priests found their way into the state with a power that could not be repressed. In addition to them, a great number of astrologers (mathematici), who pretended to be initiated into the secret sciences of the east, interpreters of dreams, and magicians, spread themselves through the empire.\textsuperscript{7} The object of such per-

\textsuperscript{5} Compare especially the satires of Persius and Juvenal. Seneca de Ira, ii. 8: \textit{Omnia sceleribus ac vitii plena sunt; plus committere, quam quod possit coercitio sanari.} Certatur ingenti quodam nequitiae certamine: \textit{major quotidie peccandis cupiditas, minor verecundia est.} Expulso mollioris aequioriasque respectu, quocunque visum est, libido se inpingit. \textit{Nec furtiva jam scelera sunt: praeter oculos est: adeoque in publicum missa nequitia est, et in omnium pectoribus evaluit, ut innocenti non rara, sed nulla sit. Nam-quid enim singuli aut pauci rupe rege legem \textit{undiique, velit signo dato, ad fas nefasque miscendum coorti sunt.}}

\textit{— Non hospes ab hospite tuto,}
\textit{Non sacer a sacer.} \textit{Fruitur quoque gratia rara est,}
\textit{Imminet exitio vir conjugis, illa mariti.}
\textit{Lurida terribiles miscet aconsita soverae.}
\textit{Filiius ante diem patris inquirit in annos.}

(from Ovid. Metam. i. v. 134, ss.) \textit{Et quota para ista scelerum est! \&c.} Comp. ejusd. Epist. 93. Pauli Epist. ad Rom. i. 21, ss. Comp. Corn. Adami de malis Romanorum ante praedicationem Evangelii moribus (in his Exercitationes exegeticae. Groening. 1712. 4, the fifth exercit.). Meinens ubi supra, Schlosser's Universalhist. Übersicht der Gesch. der alten Welt. iii. i. 122, ff. 326, ff. Hoeck's röm. Gesch. vom Verfall der Republik bis zur Vollenquung der Monarchie unter Constantin. i. ii. 301, ff.

\textsuperscript{6} Diodorus Sic. bbl. hist. xx. c. 43, p. 755: \textit{Δεπαράδεμενας γάρ οἱ μελλόντες ἐξερευ̣νε} 
\textit{ταῖς παραφωσι καὶ μεγάλαις πράξεσι.}

\textsuperscript{7} Of foreign deities Serapis and Isis (43 B.C.) were the first who had a temple in the city. The fruits of superstition were shared with the priests of Isis, who was particularly revered by the Galli, the priests of Dea Syra, the Magi, Chaldæi (s. Genetlibiani, qui de motu deque positiva stellaram dicere posse, quae futura sunt, probability, Gellius, Noct. Att. xiv. 1, where a copious refutation of these arts may be found), Mathematici (genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quid in civitate nostra et vetabitur
sons was to turn the prevailing superstition, as much as possible, to their own advantage, and at the same time to strengthen it. The laws of the first emperors against foreign customs were of less avail, because they themselves believed in their efficacy, followed them in private, and were only afraid that they should be abused to the prejudice of their own persons. 8

This superstition was promoted in no slight degree by philosophy making it subservient to its purpose. 9 The more boldly philosophical skepticism had attacked not only the popular religions, but also the general truths of religion, so much the more zealously did the later dogmatism endeavor to put together systems framed in part from earlier ones, and in part from the materials themselves of the popular religion. In these newly-invented systems every superstition found shelter. Under Augustus, the long-forgotten doctrines of Pythagoras were suddenly revived in the most wonderful form by Anaxilaus, who was soon followed by the still more adventurous Apollonius of Tyana. 10


8 Meiner, l. c. S. 278, fl. The example of the elder Pliny shows how unbelief and superstition united in the educated class. He says, Nat. Hist. ii. c. 5: Irridiendum vero, agere curam rerum humanarum illud quicquid est summum. Annæ tam tristi atque multiplici ministerio non poili credamus dubitamus! vii. c. 58: Omnibus s suprema die cadem, quae ante præsumus: nec magis a morte secus illius aut corpori aut animae, quam ante natalo. He speaks, however, in his Second Book in a very believing tone respecting portentas, ex. gr., cap. 86: Nunquam urbs Roma tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id praemium esset. Comp. Tacit. Ann. vi. c. 22.

9 Tschirner, Fall des Heidentums. Bd. 1. S. 137, ff.

10 Apollonius lived from 3 A.C. till 96 A.D. Celsus does not name him among the wonder-workers (Aristea, Abaris, &c.), whom he compares with Christ (Origen against Celsus, iii.). In the second century Lucian (in Alexander) and Apuleius (Apologia, Opp. ed. Elmenhorst, p. 331) describe him as a famous magician. In the same light did he also appear to his oldest biographer, Moraenes, who speaks besides of his influence with the philosophers (Origenes c. Cels. vi. ed. Spencer, p. 392), so that he appears to have given a philosophical basis to magic. From the beginning of the third century, when a religious eclecticism gained ground, the memory of Apollonius became prominent.
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While these men endeavored to restore, out of its own sources, the Pythagorean philosophy, as if it had proceeded from the mysteries of Egyptian priests, and looked upon Platonism as an efflux of the doctrine of Pythagoras, a singular, heterogeneous philosophy of religion grew up under their hands, in which all popular religions, no less than all magic arts, found their justification. From this time onward even the Platonic school forsook the skepticism of the new academy, attaching itself to those modern Pythagoreans, though it sought to assimilate its dogmatism to other systems also, particularly the Aristotelian. The mode of life among the Pythagoreans was not attractive to many, and consequently this new Platonism formed the prevailing philosophy. With it, as the philosophy of superstition, Epicureanism almost alone, as the philosophy of unbelief, divided the dominion over the minds of men generally. Of the pure Peripatetics there was always but a small number; and though the Stoics could boast of so distinguished men at this time (Seneca, Dio of Prusa, Epictetus), yet their system of morality excited admiration, instead of exerting an influence on the life. The Cynics had lowered themselves so much by

Caracalla dedicated a sanctuary to him (Dio Cassius, lxxvii. 13); Severus Alexander set him up in his collection of household gods (Aelius Lamprid. in vita Sev. Al. c. 29). Julia Mammea, in particular, was a great admirer of him. Into her hands came the memorabilia of Damis, a companion of Apollonius, which Philostratus the elder, in his life of Apollonius (Philos. opera gr. et lat. ed. G. Olearius. Lips. 1709. fol.), wished to bring into a more acceptable form (vita Ap. i. 3) by using a work of Maximus of Aege. Here Apollonius appears as a wise man and a favorite of the gods, furnished with wonderful powers in working miracles, and commissioned by the gods themselves to reform the popular religions. On the other hand, the older representation of Morgenes is designated as almost useless. Dio Cassius, however, continually enumerates Apollonius among the magicians and impostors. That the work of Damis is spurious, and originated probably in the third century, may be proved not only from the absurdity of the contents, but also from anachronisms (Prideaux’s Connection, Hug’s Introduction to the N. T.). Cf. Mosheim de existimatione Apollonii Tyranni (in his Commentationes et Observationes variis argumentis, ed. J. P. Miller. Hamburgi. 1751. 8. p. 347), de scriptis A. T. (l. c. p. 453), de imaginibus telesticis A. T. (l. c. p. 465). Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus, od. d. Verhältniss d. Pythagoreismus zum Christenthum von Dr. Baur (in the Tubingen Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1832. Heft. 4, also printed separately).

11 These Platonists also exercised the profession of astrology. So Thrasybulus, the soothsayer of Tiberius (Sueton. in Tib. c. 14. 62. Tac. Ann. vi. 29).


San, in fortunate qui casibus omnia posunt,
Et nulli eredant mundum rectore moveri,
Natura volente vices et iudicis et amini;
Alque idea intrepidii quaequeque altaria tangunt.

13 Cicero, Orat. pro Murena, c. 39: arripuit—disputandi causa—magna pars. Respecting the customs of the philosophers of this time generally compare in Seneca, epist. 28,
their shamelessness that their influence on the age was of little consequence.

II.

CONDITION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE.


§ 15.

IN PALESTINE.

After the Babylonish captivity the Jews were successively subject to the Persians, Egyptians, and Syrians, and then formed (from 167-63 B.C.) an independent state under the Maccabees, till the last of that race, Hyrcaus, was obliged to acknowledge the Roman sovereignty. After his death Herod, the Idumean (from 40-4 B.C.), ruled over the land in dependence on the Romans, and afterward divided it among his three sons, so that Archelaus was ethnarch of Judea, Idumea, and Samaria, while Philip, and Herod Antipas, as tetrarchs, received possession—the former, of Batanea, Ituraea, and Trachonitis—the latter of Galilaea and Perea. After the banishment of Archelaus (6 A.D.), his territories became a Roman province, and were governed under the proconsul of Syria, by a procurator, (the fifth, Pontius Pilate from 28-37 A.D.) The tetrarchy of Philip did not continue long after his death in the hands of the Romans, but was consigned to Herod Agrippa (37), who

the reason why he doubts of gaining over a wit, Marcellinus, to philosophy: Scrutabitur scholas nostras, et objiciet philosophis congiaria, amicas, gulam: ostendet mihi aliquam in adulterio, aliquam in popina, aliquam in aula. Hos mihi circulares, qui philosophiam honestissimis neglexissent, quam vendent, in faciem ingeret. Juvenal. Sat. ii. i.uit.
united it to the tetrarchy (39) of the banished Herod Antipas, and was finally elevated by Claudius even to be king of all Palestine (41). After his death, his entire kingdom again became a Roman province, managed by procurators, (Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius, Alexander, Ventidius Cumanus, Claudius Felix, Porcius Festus, Albinus, Gessius Florus). His son, Agrippa II., afterward obtained the kingdom of Chalcis (47), which he was soon obliged to change for the tetrarchy of Philip (52); while, at the same time, the superintendence of the temple at Jerusalem was intrusted to him as a Jew. With him the race of Herod became extinct († 100 at Rome). 1

Oppression under a foreign yoke, and especially the persecution of religion by Antiochus Epiphanes, had produced among the Jews a strict separation from all that was unjeewish, inflaming their contempt and hatred for all foreign customs, and, at the same time, raising to a high degree their national feelings and attachment to the religion of their fathers. But, alas! a spiritual feeling for religion had expired with the spirit of prophecy. The priesthood, finding no longer any opposing obstacle, connected, with one-sided aim, the renovated zeal of the people with the external law, and, in particular, with the Levitical worship which was always enlarging itself, in which alone the priests, as such, had an interest. Even the synagogues that arose after the Babylonish captivity,2 adapted as they were to promote a more spiritual religion, served still more to advance the legal spirit of the Levitical code. Hence, there arose at this time the most obstinate attachment—yea, a fanatical zeal for the Mosaic ceremonial, apart from any real religious feeling and moral improvement, and accompanied rather by a more general and deeper corruption of the people.3 With this disposition, which was directed only to the external, their pride in

3 Comp. Josephus in several passages; for example, de B. J. v. 10, 5, he declares: μητε πολις ἄλλη συνάντα πεπονθήτω, μητε γενεάν ε ἄλονος γεγονότα κακίας γαυματόφρου. Ibid. v. 13, 6. Ibid. vii. 8, 1: ἐγένετο γὰρ πω α ἡ χρόνος ἄλονος παντοδαπής ἐν τοῖς Ἰσραήλ συνήθης παλαιόφρου, ὡς μπηκαν κακίας ἐργαν ἅρματον καταλείψαν, ἐφ’ εἰς τις ἐνδιαφάνεις θεδρεύσεις εχεῖν ἐν τι καινότερον ἔξωρεῖν. ὅπως ὁμι τε καὶ κοκυί πάντες ἐνάθησαν, καὶ πρὸς ἐπερβάλλειν ἄλλην ἐν τοίς τοῖς πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁστεῖας, καὶ τοῖς ἐς τοὺς πλησιόν ἄδικαις ἐφισονείκησαν.
transmitted privileges, and in the peculiar favor of Jehovah, increased equally with the hope that God would soon free his favorite people from the yoke of the heathen, and under the dominion of Messiah elevate them to be the rulers of the earth. These earthly expectations and views, which the people painted to themselves in a highly sensuous degree, must have been very prejudicial to the inward religious feelings. At the same time, the opinion was not rare, that it was unworthy of the people of God to obey a foreign power. On the other hand, the prejudices and national pride of a people despised by the Romans, infused hatred into the minds of the procurators and other Roman officials, which was often exhibited in provocations and oppressions. Hence arose frequent rebellions against the Roman power, till at last the general insurrection under Gessitus Florus (65) led to the devastation of the whole land, and the destruction of Jerusalem, (70). By this means the strength of the people was broken for a time, but their disposition and aims were not changed.

It remains for us to notice three sects of the Jews: the Pharisees, in whom the Judaism of that time, with the new doctrinal sentiments acquired in exile, and its own continued culture of the Levitical law, presented itself in a completed form. All the traits of the national character were presented by this sect in a still more cultivated degree, and hence it was the greatest favorite among the people. The Sadducees en-


5 Judas Gaillaeus and his adherents, μόνον ἥγεμων καὶ δισπότης τῶν θεῶν σπειρήστες (Jos. Ant. xvii. 3, 6). Τοῦτος εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνώπιον τούς ἐπιχοροίς, κακίστως, εἰ φῶτον τέτοιον τελεῖν ἑπομένως, καὶ μετὰ τῶν θεῶν ὀλόσως θυητοίς δισπότας (de B. J. ii. 8, 1). cf. Deut. xvii. 15.


7 Winer's bibl. Realwörterbuch, ii. 299.

8 Chr. G. L. Grassmann, de philosophia Sadduceorum, Part iv. Lips. 1836-38. 4, is of
deavored to give prominence to the old Hebraism, as it appears in the written law of Moses. *The Essenes* led an ascetic life in retirement, and exerted but little influence over the people.

§ 16.

**SENTIMENTS OF THE HEATHEN NATIONS TOWARD JUDAISM.**

Judaism was respected by the heathen as an old, popular religion; and Jehovah, as the God of the Jews, received, particularly from the different rulers of this country, the honors due to the deity of the land. But the Jews did not respect the religions of other people in the same manner, inasmuch as they treated their deities as nonentities, avoided all intercourse with foreigners as unclean, and expected that their own only true God would one day triumph over all other nations. Hence opinion that, though Philo does not mention the Sadducees, there are many references to them in his works, whereas the parties whom Philo combats are to be looked for in Alexandria (comp. Schreiter in Koell’s u. Tschirner’s Analecten i. 1, u. ii. 1). Comp. Winer ii. 415.

2 Respecting them see Philo quod omnis probus sit liber, Josephus in several places, Plinius Nat. Hist. v. 15. J. J. Bellerman’s geschichtl. Nachrichten aus dem Alterthume über Essäer u. Therapeuten. Berl. 1821. 8. Jos. Sauer de Essenis et Therapeutis disqu. Vratislav. 1829. 8. A. Gfrörer’s Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie, ii. 299. A. F. Dähne’s geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandr. Religionsphilosophie i. 469. Neander’s K. G. 2te Aufl. i. 1. 73. According to Gfrörer, they were Therapeutae who had come into Palestine, and whose opinions were there modified. According to Baur (Apollonius of Tyana, p. 123), they were Jewish Pythagoreans. Dähne is of opinion that the Essenes had at least an Alexandrian basis for their sentiments. Neander, on the contrary, thinks that the peculiar tendency which characterized them had been formed independently of external circumstances out of the deeper religious meaning of the Old Testament, but that subsequently it received foreign, old-oriental, Parisc, and Chaldean, but not Alexandrian elements.

1 Even Alexander is said to have offered sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem according to the direction of the high priest (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, 5). So also Ptolemy Euergetes (c. Apion. ii. 5). Seleucus Philopator (2 Macc. iii. 1-3) and Augustus (Philo de Logat. ad Cajum. p. 1036) appointed a revenue for the daily sacrifices. Vitellius sacrificed in Jerusalem (Jos. Ant. xviii. 5, 3). Tertullian. Apolog. c. 26: cujus (Judaee) et deum victimas, et templum donis, et gentem sacerdotum aliis modo, o Romani, honorasti.

2 Certainly the Jewish idea of the Messiah was known to the heathens in general, but we must not derive the measure of this knowledge from the passages: Sueton. Vespas. c. 4: Percreuerarat Oriente tota vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaæa profecti rerum potinrentur. Tacit. Hist. 5, 12: Pluribus persuasio inera, antiquæ sacerdotum litteris contineri, etc ipso tempore fore, ut valerent orium, profectis Judaææ rerum potinrentur. Both these historians have here manifestly copied Josephus (de B. J. vi. 5, 4: μν γραμματεῷ οἰκείῳ Οριντίῳ εν τῷ ίερῷ εύημερον γραμματισάτω, ἐγ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνων ὑπὸ τῆς χώρας τῆς αὐτῶν ἀμέσως τῆς ὁλοκληρωμένης), as is proved not
they were despised and hated, especially since antiquity was accustomed to estimate the power of the gods by the condition of the people that served them. They were most hated by the neighboring nations, particularly the Egyptians. In the eyes of the proud Romans, they were rather an object of contempt.

We find, therefore, no attempt, under the dominion of the Romans, to extinguish this hostile religion, such as that made by Antiochus Epiphanes, although, once and again, there seems to have been a design to make Roman customs universal in opposition to the national prejudices. This hatred and contempt produced singular stories respecting the origin and history of the Jews, as well as absurd notions of their religion; and

only by the similarity of the words and the common reference to Vespasian, but also the express mention of Josephus and his prophecy in Sueton. Vesp. c. 5. But Josephus, in this case, gave a Grecian expression to the Jewish notion of the Messiah, and the flattering application to Vespasian was made for the purpose of giving importance to the writer’s nation and himself, and to remove suspicion from them, for the present at least. Tacitus makes frequent use of Josephus in his history of the Jews, though he always marks a Roman point of view.


4 The oldest sources of these fables are the fragment of Hecataeus Milesius (doubtless Abderita), in Photius’s bibl. cod. 154, and the more malignant representation of the Egyptian Manetho (about 280 B.C.), ap. Joseph. c. Apion. i. 26, comp. 14. The saying afterwards repeated with manifold remodelings by the Egyptian Cherawn (at the time of Augustus, ap. Jos. i. c. c. 92), by Eusebius (about 100 B.C., ibid. c. 34), Justin (Hist. 36, 2), and Tacitus (Hist. v. c. 9). Comp. J. G. Müller in the theol. Studien u. Kritiken. 1843, iv. 893. Josephus wrote his two books against Apion in reparation of these calumnies against his countrymen.

5 Particularly concerning the object of their worship. Many, indeed, saw in Jehovah their Zeus or Jupiter: Varro ap. Augustin. de consensu evangel. i. 22. Aristob. de legis divinæ interpr. historia, p. 3, τῶν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτάσεων θεῶν οὕτω σέβονται, ὥσπερ καὶ πάντως, ὑμεῖς δὲ μάλλον, προσονομαζομενες ἐπόκρας Ζέαν. According to another opinion the Jews worshiped the heaven (Juvenal. Sat. xiv. 97, nil praeter nubes et coeli
these in their turn contributed to increase the contempt of which they were the offspring.

§ 17.

CONDITION OF THE JEWS OUT OF PALESTINE.


The Jewish people were by no means confined to Palestine. Only the smaller part of them had availed themselves of the permission of Cyrus to return to their native land, and therefore numbers had remained behind in Babylonia, who, doubtless, spread themselves farther toward the east, so that in the first century they were very considerable (οὐκ ἄλλην μνημόνευ, Jos. Ant. xv. 3, 1). In Arabia, the kings of the Homerites (about 100 B.C.) had even adopted the Jewish religion, and subsequently it had reached the throne of Adiabene, by the conversion of King Izates, (about 45 A.D., comp. Jos. Ant. xx. 2). At the building of Alexandria, Alexander the Great brought a colony of Jews to settle there, (Jos. de B. J. ii. 36); more were brought by Ptolemy Lagus to Egypt, Cyrene, and Lyibia, (Jos. Ant. xii. 2, 4); and the Jews were very numerous in these places, (1,000,000, Philo in Flacc. p. 971. In Alexandria two-fifths of the population, ibid. p. 973). By trade they soon became rich and powerful. 1 Many Jewish colonists had also been carried into Syria by Seleucus Nicanor (Jos. Ant. xii. 3, 1), especially to Antioch, where, in after times, a great part of the population consisted of Jews (Jos. de B. J. vii. 3, 3). Antiochus the Great was the first who sent a Jewish colony to Phrygia and Lydia (Jos. l. c.), and from these two countries they had spread themselves not only over the whole of Asia
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Minor, but also over Greece. The first Jews in Rome had been brought as prisoners of war by Pompey. They afterward obtained their freedom (therefore they were styled libertini, Philo de legat. ad Caj. p. 1014, Tacit. Ann. ii. 85), received permission from Julius Caesar to erect synagogues (Jos. Ant. xiv. 10, 8), and soon occupied the greatest part of the city beyond the Tiber (Philo l. c.). Thus, at the time of Christ it was not easy to find a country in the whole Roman empire in which the Jews did not dwell (Strabo, xiv. c. 2, Philo legat. ad Caj. p. 1031).

All these widely dispersed Jews (ἡ διασπορά) considered Jerusalem as their common capital, the sanhedrim of that place as their ecclesiastical supreme court; and sent not only yearly contributions in money (δίδομα), and offerings to the temple (Philo de Monarch. lib. ii. p. 822, in Flacc. 971, legat. ad. Caj. 1014, 1023, 1031, Cicero pro Flacc. 12, Tacit. Hist. 5, 5), but also frequently repaired thither to the great festivals (Philo de Monarch. lib. ii. p. 821), without detriment being done to this common sanctuary by the temple built in Leontopolis (152 B.C.) by Onias.² They obtained peculiar privileges, not only in the places where they settled as colonists at the desire of the princes of the country, but Caesar had allowed them the free exercise of their religion,³ in a series of regulations enacted for the purpose, while he granted them several favors in relation to their law.⁴ But these very distinctions merely served to make them still more hated by their fellow-citizens, with whom, therefore, they had frequent quarrels.

² The temple of Onias was as far from causing a schism among the Jews as the dispute between the Pharisees and Sadducees, although the building of it was disapproved by the Palestinian Jews.
³ By this, therefore, their synagogues were put into the class of collegia licita (see above, § 12). Comp. the decree of the Praetors C. Julius ap. Joseph. Ant. xiv. 10, 8: Τά γάρ Καίσαρ, ὁ ἡμετέρος στρατηγὸς καὶ ὑπάτος, ἐν τῷ διατάγματι κολλῶν θυσίας συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλεις, μόνον τοῦτον οἶκ έκολογενέσθαι, οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν, οὔτε σύνδεσθαι σαντίνα. ἡμῶν δὲ κάγος τούς ἄλλους θυσίας κολλῶν τοῦτον μόνον ἑπετρέπω κατὰ τὰ πάτρια θη καὶ νόμιμα συνάγεσθαι τε καὶ ἵστασθαι. So also Augustus (Philo de legat. ad Cajum, p. 1035, 1036).
In the mean time, Judaism had been introduced in many ways among the heathen. It is true that only a few became complete converts to it by submitting to circumcision (proselytes of righteousness); but several, particularly women, attached themselves to it for the purpose of worshiping Jehovah as the one true God, without observing the Mosaic law (proselytes of the gate), which was sufficient for those who were not Jews, according to the opinion of the more liberal Jewish expositors. Others, on the contrary, especially in Rome, which longed after foreign rites, felt themselves attracted, not so much by the religion, as by the religious ceremonial of the Jews. These individuals observed Jewish ceremonies without separating themselves on that account from heathen forms of worship, kept Jewish festivals, and trusted in Jewish conjurations. There

3 I. c., right, complete proselytes. Of such speaks Tacitus, Hist. v. 5: Circumcidere genitalia instintere, ut diversitate noscantur. Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quidquid prius imbuent, quam contemnere doce, exuere patriam; parentes, liberos, fratres villia habe. Juvenal. Sat. xiv. 96, ff.

4 Qualis sortitu metuentem sabbata patrem,
Nil praeter rubes, et coeli numen adorant:
Nec distare putant humana carnis suflam,
Quo pater abstinent, mox et precepta ponunt.
Romanos autem soliti centenare leges,
Judaeicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuant jus,
Tradidit arcano quodcumque volumine Moses.

5 A list of existing proselytes is given by Causse in the Museum Haganum L. 549.

6 So almost all the women in Damascus, Joseph. de B. J. i. 20, 2; so was Fulvia in the time of Tiberius, at Rome, νομίζουσι προσελαμβανθα τοις Ἰουδαίοις, Ant. xviii. 3, 5. So were many Judaizers in Syria, de B. J. ii. 18, 2, comp. the inscriptions in Hug. Echil. in d. N. T. iii. i. 339. Act. xiii. 50, xvii. 4. Comp. Strabo above, § 14, note 7.

7 Such was the name originally given to those who were not Jews, but to whom permission was granted to dwell as sojourners in Palestine, under the condition of observing certain laws (Levit. xvii. 8, ff., ἐκκαι δικαιος ἱερος, Exod. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14). But now, under altered circumstances all heathens who attached themselves to Judaism by the voluntary observance of those precepts, received the same appellation. These precepts, which, in the opinion of the Jews, were delivered even to Noah (comp. Genesis, ix. 4, ff.), and in him to the whole human race, are said to be seven. 1. A prohibition of idolatry; 2. Blasphemy; 3. The shedding of human blood; 4. Incest; 5. Theft; 6. The command to practice righteousness; 7. To eat no blood, and no animal in which the blood still remains. See Seldenus de jure nat. et gent. lib. i. c. 10. In the New Testament these proselytes are called φυλογενευς τοις θεον, σεβομενοι τοις Θεοις.

8 The school of Hillel, to which Gamaliel, Paul's preceptor, belonged, allowed these proselytes a part in the kingdom of the Messiah; the school of Shammai excluded them from it—both with reference to Ps. ix. 18. See E. M. Roeth epistolam vulgo ad Hecyraes inscriptam non ad Hecyraeos sed ad Ephesios datum esse. Francof. ad M. 1836. 8. p. 117. 129, ss. At the conversion of King Izates, Ananias was of the milder, Eleazar of the stricter views, Joseph. Ant. xx. c. 2. The later rabbins follow the opinion of Hillel, as they do in all disputes between these two schools. Ohonlis lexicon rabbin. p. 243. Roeth, p. 129.
soon appeared, also, Jewish jugglers, who ministered to this heathen superstition as conjurors and soothsayers. 9

At the same time, intercourse with the pagans could not exist without exerting some influence on the Jews. It must have partly smoothed away many rough points of their national character, and have partly communicated to them a great portion of the cultivation of the nations among whom they lived. A philosophical mode of treating their religion was developed especially at Alexandria, under the Ptolemies, in consequence of the study of Grecian philosophy, and thence a peculiar philosophy of religion, which may be traced from Aristobulus (about 160 B.C.), through the Book of Wisdom, 10 and the Therapeuta, 11 to its most distinguished representative Philo.

9 On account of many impostors of this kind, Tiberius expelled the Jews from Rome, Jos. Ant. xviii. 3, 5. The Jewish festivals were kept by the heathen, Horat. Sat. i. 9, 69:

—— boli tricesima sabbata: vin’ tu
Cartis Judaeis oppedere! Nulla mihi, inquam,
Religio est. At nd: sum paulo inferius, unus
Multorum.

The women in particular frequented them.


Arcetum Judæa transeit mendient in aurem,
Interpres legum Solymarum, et magus exercitare
Arboris, ne summi fida interiusstia coeli:
Implet et illa manum, sed parcitius. Aere minuto
Qualicunque voles Judæi summis vendunt.

In this way the Jewish names for deity came into the formulae of heathen impostors, though at a later period; and were supposed to possess a peculiar magical power in union with the heathen appellations of God (Origines c. Cels. iv. p. 183, v. p. 202), and were found on gems; see my remarks in the Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken. 1830, Heft 2, p. 403. To this influence of Judaism Seneca refers, de superstitionibus (ap. Augustin. de civit. Dei, vi. 11): Cum interim asque de sceletarissiamæ gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnem jam terras, recepta sit, victi victoribus leges dedereunt. Illi tamen causas ritus sui noverunt, sed major pars populi factit, quod cur faciât ignorat. It might be expected that with this heathen tendency many should make a more external profession of Judaism. Hence we can explain why the Talmudists passed so severe a judgment on the Pharisees, although the latter were still very zealous in making proselytes at the time of Christ (Matth. xxviii. 15): Pascale impeditum adventum Messiae, sunt sicut acies Israel, & c. Othonis lexicon rabbin. p. 491. Wagensellii Sots., p. 734.

10 In regard to these traces, see generally, Gfrörer’s Philo, ii. and Dübne’s jüdisch-alex.

Religionsphilosophie, ii.

11 Philo de vita contemplativa. The writings of Bellermann and Saucer mentioned in § 15, note 9. Gfrörer ii. 380. Dübne, i. 443. Later writers, by drawing unhistorical conclusions, have discovered Christian ascetics in the Therapeutæ. So Eusebius Hist. eccles. ii. 17,
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(† 41 a.d.)

Though Philo’s Platonic Judaism in this complete form was only the property of a few, yet the general ideas contained in it were widely diffused among the Hellenic Jews at that time, and afterward gained an important influence over the philosophy of religion which formed itself within the bosom of Christianity. This is especially the case with regard to the doctrine of Philo concerning the Logos, the God revealing himself in the finite, in whom the Mosaic creative word, and the Platonic ideal world, were united. 13

§ 18.

THE SAMARITANS.

The mixed people 1 who had grown up into a society after the and all succeeding authors except Photius, cod. 194. The same opinion was held after the Reformation by most of the older historians of the Catholic and Episcopal English church (see the writings on both sides in Triglandi synagoga, see above, § 13, note 6), even Bern. de Montfaucon (not. ad Philem. de vit. contempt.), and L. A. Muratori (sceendet. graec. p. 330). The dispute of the former respecting this point, with Jo. Bouhier: Lettres pour et contre sur la fameuse question, si les sallitaires appellez Therapeutas etoient Chrestiens. Paris. 1712. 8. Even Philo is said to have been on friendly terms with Peter at Rome, under Claudius (τις ἤλκας ἥδειν Πέτρον, Euseb. l. c. Hieron. catal. 11), from which afterward arose the fable that he had embraced Christianity and afterward forsook it (Photius cod. 100). Cf. Mangey praeef. in Phil. Opp.


13 I can not agree with the prevailing view, that the strictly monotheistic Philo thought of the Logos as hypostatically different from God. Since the infinite can not be revealed in the finite, God was under the necessity, so to speak, of making himself finite for this purpose, i. e., of separating from his own infinite perfections a finite measure of ideas and powers. God, in this aspect, is the Logos. Accordingly, the Logos is less than God, the revealed God less than deity in himself, but not, on that account, a hypostasis different from God.

1 In opposition to Hengstenberg, who (Beitr. zur Einleit. ins. A. T. ii. 1, 5) affirms, that
destruction of the kingdom of Israel, in the tract belonging to it (2 Kings xvii. 24, פֶּן, סָנַפְרָת), had constantly been an object of detestation to the Jews, because of their religion, which had been at first compounded of Judaism and heathenism. The Samaritans, indeed, under the direction of the Jewish priest Manasseh, supported by the Persian viceroy San-ballat, had retained the Pentateuch, (409 B.C.), erected a temple on Gerizim, established a levitical priesthood—in short, the whole of Judaism as it then was; but all served merely to increase the hatred of the Jews against them, although they were united from this time onward, not only by neighborhood, but also by a similar religion, and a series of like fortunes. This hatred entertained by the Jews, which the Samaritans seemed not to have returned with like virulence, was not abated in their native land by the destruction of the temple on Gerizim by John Hyrcanus (109 B.C.); it was transferred to Egypt where Jewish and Samaritan colonies had been planted by Alexander and Ptolemy Lagus, and has continued to the latest times.

The Samaritans held fast by Judaism, as it had come to them by Manasseh, with rigid strictness; and therefore the later developments of it among the Jews remained unknown to them, as they did also to the Sadducees. Besides, in the history of the Samaritans were originally a heathen people, who accommodated themselves by degrees to the Mosaic institution, see Dr. Kuller's treatise, die Samaritaner ein Mischvolk, in Pelt's theolog. Mitarbeit. Jahrg. 3, Heft 3. (Kiel. 1849) p. 24.—[Kittel's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, art. Samaritans.]


3 Samaritan warriors were transplanted into Thebais by Joseph (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, 6), into Lower Egypt and Alexandria by Ptolemy Lagus (Jos. l. c. xii. 1). A controversy between the Jews and Samaritans at Alexandria is related by Josephus, l. c. xiii. 3, 4. Concerning their doctrines see Philastrius de haer. cap. 7. Epiphanius de haer. 9. Eccliius de sectis. c. 8. Their pentateuch was printed along with the Samaritan translation in the Paris Polyglott, 1629. A more accurate knowledge of their condition and doctrines in modern times has been obtained from the letters of the Samaritans to Jos. Scaliger, 1589; to men at Oxford, through the medium of Robert Huntingdon, 1671; to Job Ludolf, 1684 (see these letters in Eichhorn's Repertorium ix. and xiii.); and to De Sacy (since 1808), comp. Sylv. de Sacy mémoire sur l'état actuel des Samaritains. Paris. 1812 (translated into German in Staudlin's and Taschirner's Archiv. for Kg. l. iii. 40). These were revised, and along with the recent letters containing two of 1830, republished by De Sacy in the Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibli. roy. T. xii. Paris. 1829. In addition, a letter of 1700 was made known by Hamaker in the Archief voor kerkelijke Geschiedenis door Kist en Royards, v. 1 (Leiden. 1824). Besides this, Samaritan poems exist, which
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this people there was no ground for the same degree of national arrogance and hatred of every thing foreign as existed among the Jews. And while among the Jews the extravagant national feeling fostered a more sensuous apprehension of the doctrine of a special Divine providence in favor of their nation, and of the Messiah, and by this means favored a worldly view of the doctrines of religion; that smaller measure of national pride existing among the Samaritans was the cause of their looking at Judaism more in its spiritual aspect. This tendency was certainly promoted by the connection of the Samaritans with those of the same faith who had settled in Alexandria, and who were then partakers of Grecian culture. Still, however, the spiritual tendency which characterized the constantly oppressed people received no scientific improvement. But yet in Samaria there appeared in the first century in succession three founders

belong to the times of the Arabs, and were first used in Gesenius de Samaritanae theologia ex fiantibus ineditis comm. (Weihnachtsprogramm, Halle. 1822. 4), and subsequently published: Carmina Samaritana e codd. Londinensibus et Gothanis ed. et illustr. Gull. Gesenius. Lips. 1824. 8.

Hence Josephus blames them (Ant. xi. 8, 6): εἰςών αἱ Σαμαρείται τοιούτην τὴν φύσιν, ἐν μὲν ταῖς συμφοραῖς ἔστησα τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀρροῦται συγγενεῖς ἔχεις, ὁμολογοῦτες τότε τὴν ὁλίθραν. ὅταν δὲ τι περὶ αὐτῶν λαμπρόν ἢσον ἐκ τίχας, ἤξαρνῃ ἐπιπήδαιοι εἰς τὴν κοινωνία, προσέχων αὐτοῖς λέγοντες, καὶ εἰ τῶν ἱερῶν γενναλογοῦσιν αὐτῶν ἑγὼν Ἰδραμών καὶ Μανισσών. So too, they are said to have professed themselves to Alexander, Ἰοβᾶιον μὲν εἶναι, χρηματίζειν δὲ εἰν Σικύωνι Σιδανίων (Joseph. l. c.). On the contrary, to Antiochus Epiphanes as ὄντες τὸ ἀνήκαθεν Σιδανίων (Joseph. Ant. xii. 5, 5). In like manner, they are said to have escaped threatening danger under this king by calling their temple ἱερον Δῶδος Εὐληρίων, but without making other change in their worship, Joseph. l. c. cf. 2 Macc. vi. 2.

In the later Samaritan writings a progressive development of several doctrines by the influence of the Alexandrian peculiarities can not be mistaken. The characteristics of Samaritan theology are strict Monotheism, aversion to all Anthropomorphism (Gesenius de theol. Sam. p. 12, ss.), both which were manifested even in their Pentateuch (Gesenius de pentat. Sam. p. 58, ss.). According to Leontius de sectis, they denied the doctrine of angels, i. e., the improved Jewish doctrine regarding them. In the later poetical writings angels appear as uncreated influences proceeding from God Ἐνέπληθος συνάψεως, comp. Gesenius de theol. Sam. p. 21, which belongs to a gnostic development, of which the first trace appears to be in Acts viii. 10. They magnified Moses and the law, rejecting all the later prophetic writings. The Sabbath and circumcision were regarded as the most important pledges of the covenant with Jehovah. The temple on Gerizim was the only true one (Deuter. xxvii. 4, ἱερον μετομενολ ἔστησα, Deut. p. 61). According to the fathers, they denied immortality and the resurrection, i. e., they maintained the insensible state of the soul in Sheol. We find among them afterward a resurrection to a life entirely different from the present (Gesenius de theol. Sam. p. 28). The Messiah Αἴμων or Αἴμων Ges. l. c. p. 44 (reductor, conversor), probably the same, will lead the people to repentance, and then to happiness, the nations will believe in him, and by him will be won over to the law, and to the temple on Gerizim. (Compare John iv. 23.)
of sects, of whom *Dosithueus*\(^7\) departed from the prevalent Samaritan Judaism in a very few particulars. *Simon Magus*\(^8\) drew the germ of his syncretic magical system from the philosophical opinions then current, probably at Alexandria, and unfolded them farther, instigated, perhaps, by Christianity, which had lately appeared. In the third place, *Menander*,\(^9\) the disciple of Simon Magus, departed little from the footsteps of his master. All three led behind them sects which continued for several centuries. The followers of Simon and Menander were often confounded with Christians by the heathen,\(^10\) and actually endeavored to insinuate themselves into the Christian church after Christianity had become the prevailing religion.\(^11\)

---

\(^{7}\) Mosheim ii. c. 376, ss. *Δόσιθεος* gave himself out to be the prophet promised in Deut. xviii. 18. The church fathers falsely ascribe to him many peculiar doctrines which were held by all the Samaritans. (According to Jewish tradition, the priest sent by Semachereb, 1 Kings xvii. 27, 28, was one R. Dosthai. Darius de sectis Jud. iii. 4. It is probable, therefore, that the two persons were confounded. (A strict, ascetic life, and an overscrupulous observance of the Sabbath were peculiar to him. Orig. de princ. iv. c. 17, quo quisque corporis sita in principio sabbathi inventus fuerit, in co ad vespem usque ipsi permanendum esse, manifestly a literal interpretation of Exod. xvi. 29. As late as the year 588, the Dosithians and Samaritans had a controversy in Egypt about Deut. xviii. 18. (Eulogius ap. Phot. bibl. cod. 230.)

\(^{8}\) Mosheim i. c. p. 289-432. Walch's *Historia der Ketzerien*, i. 135, ff. *Neander's gnostische Systeme*. Berlin. 1818. S. 338, ff. Lebeu u. Lehre Simons d. Magiers, by Dr. A. Simson (in *Illum's Zeitschr. für hist. Theol.* 1841, iii. 15). Act. viii. 9, 10, *Σίμων—μαγεύων και ἐξειστών τὸ θύσιν τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναι τινα ἐαυτῷ μέγαν*. By the people he was looked upon as *ἡ δύναμις τῶν θεῶν ἡ μεγάλη* (\(^7\)Ι Σεφ. 29, 30) of. Probably the *Σίμων Ἰονδαῖος, Κύπριος δὲ γένος, μάγος εἶναι σχετόνων apud Joseph. Ant. xx. 7, 2. Fabulous accounts of his death at Rome (first found in the *Apostol. Constitut.* vi. 9, and in *Ambrosius*, ii. c. 12) were perhaps occasioned by the occurrence related in Sueton. in *Neron*, c. 12. *Juvénal. Sat.* iii. 79, 80. The statue on the island in the Tiber, as Justin relates, *Apol*. maj. c. 26 and 56, with the inscription *Simoni sancto Deo*, was found in 1574, and has on it, *Semoni Sauno Deo Fido Sacram. &c.* (See *Baronius* ad ann. 44 n. 55.) On *Semo Sanctus* *Sanguis*, comp. Ovid. *Fast.* vi. 213. Justin's mistake is apparent, although Barisonis, Thirlby, Maranus, especially Foggiasch de *Romano Divi Petro* Hincerti et episcopatis, *Florcenc. 1741. 4to. p. 247, ss., wish to justify his account; and *Braun* (S. Justini *M. Apologiae*. Bonnse. 1830. p. 97) has promised a new defense of it. The followers of Simon must be regarded as Samaritan Gnostics (*Justin M. Apol. maj.* c. 26: καὶ ἐκεῖνον πάντες μὴν Σαμαρείας, ὕλην ὅς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθεσαν, ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν ἐκείνον ἡμαγαθήνες, ἐκείνον καὶ προσκυνοῦντα), whose system may have been developed parallel with the Christian *Gnosis*. Among Christians Simon has always been looked upon as the master and progenitor of all heresies (Irenæus adv. haer. i. 37, ii. præf.), and although he never was a Christian yet, in times past, he was thought to be the first heresiarch. In the Clementines he is the representative of *Gnosis* generally, and the system there attributed to him is a compound of the most striking *Gnostic* positions, and must not be considered genuine (see *Baur's christl. Gnosis*, p. 302).

\(^{9}\) Mosheim i. c. 432-438.

\(^{10}\) *Justin. Apol.* ii. p. 70.

\(^{11}\) Regarding the Simonians see *Euseb. Hist. eccl.* ii. 1, 4. For the Menandrians, iii. 26, 2.
§ 19.

RELATION OF THE TIMES TO CHRISTIANITY IN ITS INFANCY.

From the view that has been given it may be seen, that the popular religions of the heathen had become superannuated at the time of Christ, and that unbelief and superstition were on the point of putting an end to all true religion. It is further apparent, that Judaism, losing more and more its spiritual character, threatened to sink down in externalities. Under these circumstances many heathens must have longed for a religion which put an end to their doubts and agitations, satisfied the demands of their moral nature, and afforded them consolation and inward peace. The circumstance of Christianity coming from the East, whose mystical religions had at that time attracted general attention to itself, must have facilitated at least the introduction of it. Not could it be otherwise than that many Jews felt the emptiness of their ceremonial service, especially as they had been already guided to a more spiritual worship of God by many passages in their own prophets. On the other hand, expectations of the Messiah prepared the way for Christianity among the Jews.

But however much there was in the circumstances of these times which must have promoted Christianity, there was not less to obstruct it. Among the Jews, national pride, earthly hopes of Messiah, and habituation to an almost external religion; among the heathen, unbelief as well as superstition, which prevailed at this time, the stain attaching to Jewish origin, and the political grounds which, in the universal opinion, rendered it necessary to abide by the national religion. Christianity could reckon on toleration on the part of the state, agreeably to the principles of the Romans, only as long as it was confined to the Jewish people. But a religion which, like the Jewish, did not only declare all other national religions false, but was likewise gathering adherents among all nations in a more suspicious degree than the Jewish, and was threatening to extinguish all others, could not be endured by the Roman government without an abandonment of the old state religion. The
toleration which all philosophical systems and foreign superstitions found at Rome could not, therefore, be expected by Christianity;¹ for an external observance of the state religion was at least consistent with the nature of such systems and superstitions.²

FIRST CHAPTER.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.


F. V. Reinhard Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christl. Religion zum Besten der Menschen entwarf. 5te Ausg. with additions by Heubner. Wittenb. 1830. 8. G.

¹ Although the Christian apologists often appeal to it, Justini M. Apol. maj. c. 18, 24, 25. Tertulliani Apologeticus, c. 24, 46.
² In opposition to the wrong views taken by Voltaire Traité sur la tolérance, 1763, c. 8–10, (Oeuvres éd. Deux-Ponts. Tom. 40, p. 371, sq.), relative to the toleration of the Romans, and the exclusive fault of the Christians in bringing persecutions on themselves, Hegewisch made very just remarks in his treatise on the epoch in Roman history most favorable to humanity. Hamburg. 1800. p. 173.


§ 20.

CHRONOLOGICAL DATA RESPECTING THE LIFE OF JESUS.


The only definite date in the evangelical history2 is in Luke iii. 1, relating to the appearance of John the Baptist.2 On the supposition that Jesus appeared in public half a year after John, as he was born half a year after him, the designation of his age in Luke iii. 23 gives nearly the time of his birth, which, perhaps, may be still more closely determined by the circumstance that it must have happened before the death of Herod († shortly

1 According to Wieseler, Christ was born in February 750 A.D. (4 B.C.), baptized in spring or summer 780, (37 A.D.), crucified on the 7th April 783 (30 A.D.). A work so acute and learned as that of Wieseler can not be sufficiently characterized in a few words. The exact coincidence, however, of different investigations produces more doubt than conviction, since the separate data may be bent, on account of their vacillating nature, in subservience to one object, without completely removing scruples in regard to them. In particular, ὁ υἱός, in Luke iii. 23, p. 126, appears to be taken too strictly; it is incredible that the chronological designation of Luke iii. 1, should reach to the captivity of the Baptist, p. 197; and the computation of the Jewish calendar, taken from Wurm for the purpose of ascertaining the year of Jesus' death, appears to be wholly uncertain, according to Wurm's explanations.


3 Augustus died 19th August, the year 14 of our era. and thus the 15th year of Tiberius's reign fell between the 19th August, 29, and the 19th August, 29 (781-2, A.D.), Wurm in Bengel's Archiv. II. 5.
before the passover, 750 A.U.), Matth. ii. 1, 19. Even in the first centuries accounts of the year of Jesus’ birth are given; but the Romish abbot Dionysius Exiguus (525) reckoned, independently of them, the period of the incarnation for the purpose of fixing by it the years in his table for Easter, making the first year from the incarnation coincide with the year 754 A.U. of the Varronian computation. This Dionysian era, applied first of all under the Anglo-Saxons, then by the Frankish kings Pepin and Charlemagne, begins at least four years after the true date of Christ’s birth. The day of birth can not be determined.

The ministry of Jesus was supposed by many of the older church fathers, after the example of the Alexandrians, to have

---

4 On the year of Herod’s death see Klaiber’s Studien d. evang. Geistlichkeit Wirttemberg’s, i. 1, 50. Wurm in the same, i. ii. 298. A list of the various opinions concerning the year of Christ’s birth may be seen in Fabricii bibliographia antiquaria, ed. 2, Hamb. 1716, 4to, p. 187, ss., continued in F. Münter’s der Stern der Weisen u. s. w. Kopenh. 1827, p. 109. The latest important investigations unite in the year 747 A.U. So Henr. Sanclementii de vulgaris aeneae emendationes libb. iv. Romae. 1793, fol., solely on historical grounds. Münter on the same grounds, and, also, because he regards with Keppler the star of the wise men as the great conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces, which happened on that year. Ideler Chronol. ii. 394, ff., Piper i. c., Schubert Lehrb. d. Sternenkunde, s. 222, Winer bibl. Reallwaterbuch, i. 614, assent to these results. Compare, however, on the other side, Wurm in Klaiber’s Studien, i. ii. 211, ff.

5 Irenaeus, iii. 25, and Tertull. adv. Jud. 8, give the 41st year of Augustus, 731 A.U. On the other hand, Clemens. Alex. Strom. i. p. 339, the 28th year (namely, after the conquest of Egypt), with whom agrees Euseb. hist. eccl. i. 5, Epiph. haer. ii. 22, and Orosius histor. i. 1, the 42d year, 732 A.U. —Sulpicius Severus hist. sacr. ii. 57, gives the 33d year of Herod, Coss. Sabinus and Radius (which does not suit, as Sab. and Ruf. were consuls 751 A.U. Herod died after a reign of 37 years, 750 A.U. An Egyptian monk, Panodorus (after 400), placed the birth of Christ in the year 5493 of his era, i. e., 754 A.U. (Ge. Synceuli chronographia, ed. Paris, p. 25, 326).

6 The Incarnatio, σάρκωσις, always means in the fathers the annunciation. Dionysius, therefore placed the birth of Christ in the conclusion of the first year of his era. When first about the time of Charlemagne, the beginning of the year was made to coincide with the 25th of December, the incarnation appears to have been taken as synonymous with the nativity. See Sanclementius, iv. c. 8. Ideler’s Chronologie, ii. 381, ff.

7 Ethelbert, king of Kent, dated first of all an original document anno ab incarnatione Christi DCV. cf. Codex diplomaticus acvi Saxonicci, opera J. M. Kemble. T. i. (Lond. 1839. 8.) p. 2. Afterward the venerable Bede used this era in his historical works.


9 Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 340, relates that some regarded the 25th of Pachon, (30th May), others the 24th or 25th Phieromuthi, (the 10th or 20th April), as the birth-day. After the 6th of January, solemnized as a day of baptism by the followers of Basilides, was kept by the Oriental Christians since the third century as the day of baptism and birth, people began to keep this day as the true day of birth, (Epiph. haer. ii. 21). After the 25th December was solemnized in the fourth century in the west, as the birth-festival, this day came soon to be looked upon as the day of birth, (Sulpici. Sever. hist. sacr. ii. 27).
continued one year, agreeably to Isaiah Ixi. 1, 2, comp. Luke iv. 19 (ἐνιαυτῷ κυρίον δεκτόν). On this was founded the hypothesis, which became almost traditional in the ancient church, that Jesus was crucified in his thirtieth year, in the consulship of Rubellius Geminus and Eufius Geminus (in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, 29th of the Dionysian era). But, according to the gospel of John ii. 13 (v. I), vi. 4, xi. 55, three, or perhaps four passovers occurred during the public ministry of Christ. It must, therefore, have continued more than three years, and may, perhaps, have extended over three. Thus, the year of his death falls between 31 and 33 aer. Dionys., making his age from thirty-four to thirty-eight years. Even if we could agree on the preliminary question whether the Friday on which Jesus died was the day before the passover, or the first day of the passover, yet, amid the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar of that time, an astronomical reckoning of the year of his death can scarcely be established.

10 So the Valentiniums, (Irenaeus, li. 38, 39), in opposition to whom Irenaeus puts forth the singular assertion that Jesus was baptized in his thirtieth year, but did not appear as a teacher till between his fortieth and fiftieth (John viii. 57), and then taught three years. One year, however, was adopted by Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 340. Origenes, hom. 32 in Lucam, and de principe iv. On the other hand, c. Cels. ii. p. 397, and Comment. in Matth. xxiv. 15, he says, that Judas was not three entire years with Jesus. Auct. Clementin. hom. 17 in fine. Julius Africanus (ap. Hieronym. in Dan. ix.). Philastrius haer. 106. Cyrill. Alex. in Esaiam. c. 32. Some moderns have attained to a similar result in another way. Priestley’s Harmony of the Evangelists in Greek, 1777. Haenelius progr. de temporis quo Jesus sum apostolus versatus est duratione. Edang. 1796. 4to.

11 Tertull. adv. Jud. 8 (but comp. adv. Marcion. i. 15). Lactant. institutit. iv. 10. August. de civ. Del. xviii. 54, de trinit. iv. 5 (according to Tertull. and August. ii. cc. and according to the old Acta Pilati in Epiphani. haer. i. 1, he was crucified the 8th of the Kalends of April, on the 25th of March the day of the vernal equinox, comp. Thilo cod. aenac. N. T. i. 496. Wieseler, S. 399). That Christ was thirty years old: Hippolytus Portensis in canone paschali. Chronicon anonyumi (in Canis. lect. antiqu. T. ii) c. 17 u. 18. Hieronym. epist. 22. ad Eustochium. Augustin. epist. 80 and 89. Comp. Petavii rationarium temporum (ed. Ludg. 1745). P. ii. p. 266, ss.

12 The first three evangelists designate the last supper as the passover (Matth. xxvi. 17, ss., Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7), and hence it has been usually assumed in the Western Church that Christ was crucified on the first day of the passover. On the contrary, the day of Christ’s death was according to John xiii. 1, 29, xviii. 28, xix. 14, 31, the day before the passover. The latter is followed by Tertullian, adv. Jud. c. 8, the Greeks, Scaliger, Cassanbon, Capellus, Luspe, Kuinoel, &c. It is strongly in favor of the latter hypothesis that the first day of the passover can never fall on a Friday, at least according to the present calendar of the Jews. See Ideer’s Chronologie, Bd. i. p. 519. Probably the account of the first three evangelists is to be explained by the circumstance, that they took the last supper of Jesus to be the Christian passover; see Theile in Winer’s Krit. Journ. der Theol. Literat. ii. 153, ff. v. 129, ff. Comp. Hase’s Leben Jesu, p. 167. [Bibliotheca Sacra, new series, 1845, an article by Robinson.]

13 Bynaeus de morte J. C. libb. 3. Amstel. 1691, 99. 3 voll. 4. Paulus über die Möglich-
§ 21.

HISTORY OF THE YOUTH OF JESUS.

The history of Jesus' life before his public appearance is very obscure,¹ and affords no disclosures in relation to the important question of the mode and progress of his spiritual development. Modern scholars have endeavored to supply this deficiency by conjectures, and have attributed a decided influence on his character, sometimes to the doctrines of the Essenes;² sometimes to those of the Sadducees;³ sometimes to a combination of Pharisaism and Sadduceism;⁴ sometimes to the Alexandrian-Jewish education.⁵ But such a spirit could not have received its direction from any school, and least of all from the schools of those times, which were better adapted to fetter the spirit, partly by their literal externality, partly by their fanatical idealism, than to prepare it for a clear and great self-development.⁶ On the contrary, the reading of the prophets of the Old Testament must have quickened in his kindred spirit a religious feeling as spiritual as that of the time was literal and carnal, and must have

keilt Jesu Todesjahr zu bestimmen, in his Comment. über das N. T. iii. 784. Wurm in Bengel's Archiv. ii. 361.


² So first the English Deists (see against them Prideaux's Connection). From them Voltaire borrowed this idea, as well as many others, (Philosophical Dictionary, under Essenes). Frederic the Great, Oeuvres ed. de Berlin, T. xi. p. 94. Staudlin Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, Th. 1. S. 570, ff. The same hypothesis has been enlarged in J. A. C. Richter das Christenthum und die ältesten Religionen des Orients. Leipzig. 1819. Christianity is supposed to be the public revelation of the Essene doctrines, and that these were connected with the ancient schools of the prophets, with Parsism, the Egyptian and Grecian mysteries, and through them with Brahmatism! According to Gbörer, (das Heiligtum u. die Wahrheit. Stuttgart. 1838, S. 382), Jesus was educated among the Essenes, and afterward followed his own course, but continued to hold what was sound in their doctrines and customs. On the other side see Bengel über d. Versuch Christenth. a.d. Essenus us abzuleiten, in Flatt's Magazine, vii. 148, ff. Heubner in the 5th appendix to his edition of Reinhard's Versuch über d. Plan Jesu. V. Wegner über das Verhältniss des Christenthums zum Essenus us, in Illgen's Zeitschrift für die histor. Theol. 1841, ii. 1.


⁴ Versuch den Ursprung der Sittenlehre Jesu historisch zu erklären (in Henke's Magazin. Bd. 5. S. 456.)

⁵ Bahrdt's Briefe über die Bibel im Volkstone. Berlin. 1784, ff.

⁶ So in John vii. 15, all higher cultivation in any school is denied to Jesus
given it a standard for estimating the condition of the Jewish nation at that period, and for judging of the means by which alone it could be elevated, very different from the usual view.

§ 22.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.


Before Jesus, appeared one of his relatives John, in the wilderness of Judea, with the solemn call, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” and dedicating his followers to this altered state of mind by a symbolical washing of the body. It is certain that John and Jesus had been earlier acquainted with one another; but it is improbable that there existed a close connection between them, or the concerting of a common plan. The peculiarities of John point to an earlier connection with the Essenes. The same character was possessed by his disciples, who, after Jesus’ appearance, continued apart from the disciples of the latter (John iii. 26; Luke v. 33; Matth. ix. 14; xi. 2, ff.), and of whom we meet with remains in Asia Minor, long.
after John himself had fallen a sacrifice to his intrepidity (Acts xviii. 25, xix. 1, ff.).

§ 23.

THE PUBLIC LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS.

Jesus also came out of Galilee to Jordan to be baptized by John, and was recognized in such a way by the latter that he considered it more befitting to receive baptism from Jesus than the contrary. The import of this is, that the Baptist looked upon the rite as a call to higher purity. This baptism was to Jesus the consecration to his Messianic activity. It is true that he began with the same call to his nation as John the Baptist (Matth. iv. 17); but he soon unfolded a far more comprehensive system in the discharge of his ministry, which, though it directly affected the Jewish people only, yet in its very nature belonged to all humanity. The Jewish people at that time

4 Cf. Recov. Clem. i. 54 and 60. In the middle of the 17th century, the existence of a sect was made known by Carmelite missionaries, whose head-quarters were Barrah and Saster, calling themselves Nazoreans (not to be confounded with the Mohammedan sect Nasireens), or Mendean, but by the Mohammedans they were named Sabians (Sabaei, probably the name was borrowed from the star-worshippers of the Koran). They got the name Christians of St. John from the missionaries. Cf. Ignatii a Jesu narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis. Rom. 1652. Svo. After one of their holy books was published entire (Codex Nasireanus, liber Adami appellatus, Syriac transcriptus latinæque redditus a Matth. Norberg. 3 Thle. Lond. 1815, 1816. 4to) fragments of two others (the Divan and the book of John) communicated to the world, and many accounts furnished by travelers, Gesenius gave a critical survey of their system in the Universal Encyclopaedia of Erach and Gruber (Leipzig. 1817), article Zabbar, from which it appears that the system is Ganostic-ascetic, nearly related to that of the Valentinians and Ophites, John appearing as an incarnate noon. The language of their sacred books is an Aramaean dialect, which occupies a middle position between the Syrian and Chaldee. They allege that they came from Jordan, from whence they were driven by the Mohammedans. Most scholars assume the descent of this sect from the disciples of John the Baptist. Les Nazoreens, thèse de Theologie historique par L. E. Burchhardt. Strasbourg. 1840. Svo. On the other side, see O. G. Tychsen in the Deutsches Museum, 1784, Th. 2. S. 414 (who, however, confounds the Nazoreans with another sect, Burchhardt, p. 11. 107). Baumgarten-Crusius bibl. Theol. S. 143.
presented an aspect the most deserving of compassion. In the
deepest external degradation, always cherishing the most ex-
travagant hopes in regard to the immediate future, they were
led by their very religious views in the road to their destruc-
tion. And yet this very religion, when judged, not by the par-
tial, priestly form which it had then received, but as drawn
from its original documents, and pervaded by the living pro-
phetic spirit which animated it as there described, must have
marvelously revealed itself to every human breast as directly
certain, as the only true source of human happiness. It was
the aim and object of Jesus to awaken, by his life and doctrine,
this prophetic element of the Mosaic religion, but in a purer
form and in greater development, among his countrymen; and
to bring it into the hearts of men as a spontaneous principle of
action. By such spiritual regeneration alone could the Jewish
people be delivered even from external corruption; and we
can not doubt that Jesus would gladly have effected this out-
ward deliverance also. But his plan extended far wider, al-
though the germs which lay in the compass of his ministry
proceeded forth and became visible, for the most part, only after
he had left our world. Jesus appeared first in Galilee, and re-
sided not at Nazareth (Luke iv. 24), but usually at Caper-
naum. From this place, however, he not only traversed Galil-
ee, but often abode for a long time in Judea in his journeys to
the festivals in Jerusalem. He was only in Samaria occasion-
ally as he went through it; and we find him but once beyond
the confines of Judea (Mark vii. 24, ff.). By degrees he drew
around him twelve young men, illiterate (Matth. xi. 25), and
from the lower orders of society, for the purpose of initiating
them into his spirit and plan, by their living with him and con-
tinually receiving his instructions. They accompanied him in
his smaller journeys on which he appeared, sometimes among
small domestic circles, sometimes in synagogues, sometimes
among great multitudes under the canopy of heaven; and
much as he attracted to himself universal attention by the ex-
traordinary works he wrought, he excited no less astonishment
and wonder by his doctrine, which directly convinced and car-
rried captive the hearer (Matth. vii. 28, 29; Luke iv. 32). At
first he avoided observation (Matth. ix. 30); he even forbade
his disciples to make him known as the Messiah (Matth. xvi.
20); but afterward he declared himself to be the promised Messiah, with a firmness that forbids the idea of mere accommodation (Matth. xxvi. 64). But the religious ideas of the Old Testament had obtained within him a new and higher life, reaching far beyond the local and temporal form handed down among the Jews by tradition. The Old Testament conception of a Theocracy was transformed in him into the high idea of the kingdom of God, in which men, animated by the Spirit of God, should be united with Deity and one another in moral unity. This kingdom of God he wished, as the Messiah, to establish on earth; on which account he required of his cotemporaries, sunk as they were in the external and the literal, first of all, change of heart, that they might be susceptible of the Spirit of God; next, faith in himself as the Christ, that by yielding itself up to the higher spirit, even the weaker mind might be elevated to free communion with God. It follows, of course, that nothing stood more in his way than that Pharisaic righteousness which rested on works. Hence he leveled his attacks chiefly against it. He did not indeed abolish the ceremonial law of Moses, constantly observing it himself; but he could not look upon it in any other light than as an expression of inward religious feeling; and all value attached to religious external observances, independently of true devotional feelings, was worthless in his eyes (Matth. xii. 1, ff.; xv. 1, ff.; v. 24; xii. 9). So far as he designated the free development of this internal religious feeling as the only genuine religious culture, it necessarily followed from his doctrine, and must have been sooner or later expressed publicly by his disciples, that no religious law for men can be in the form of a rule that requires something merely external. Thus the abolition of the ceremonial law necessarily followed his teachings. In like manner Jesus confined his immediate efforts to the Jews alone, and avoided coming in contact with those who were not Jews, out of regard to the very prejudices of his nation (Matth. x. 5; xv. 21–28). But still there lay always in his doctrine, which rejected all reliance on externalities, an adaptation for all mankind, as he himself often intimated with sufficient distinctness (Matth. viii. 11, 21, 43).

1 Chr. F. Böhme die Religion Jesu Christi aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt. Halle. 1825. 2te Aufl. 1827. 8.
While Jesus endeavored to guide his disciples to this purer religion and moral communion in the kingdom of God, he also drew them gradually away from the common notion of retribution which prevailed among the Jews (Luke xiii. 2, ff.; John ix. 2, 3), announced to them the forgiveness of sins in the way of repentance and faith, and then taught them, in this inward communion with God, to meet all external fortunes with submission and confidence, and the firmest trust in God (Matth. vi. 33; x. 28). The kingdom of God, as it was then begun, was only an inward thing (Luke xvii. 21), in continual conflict with the world and with evil; but Jesus promised that he should appear again, to judge the evil, and to place piety and happiness in their natural relation, in the kingdom of God (Matth. xxiv. 30; xxv. 31). The notion of such a triumphant kingdom of God had been already set forth, though in a sensuous form, in the description given of Messiah's reign; and since it could be spoken of generally only in figures, Jesus borrowed his figures from it, giving at the same time sufficient intimation of a more spiritual, universal, and purer view (Matth. xxii. 30). It could not be otherwise than that these figures should be more or less spiritually understood, according to the different degrees of religious culture: but the leading idea on which all depended, the idea of a future adjustment of the relation of happiness to piety in the kingdom of God triumphant, must have always been maintained. The disciples, accustomed to entertain the conception of an earthly Messianic kingdom, not only took all those images in a sensuous acceptation, but also introduced into them many more definite points. Thus, although Jesus had declared the point of time when he should come again to be a secret with God the Father (Matth. xxiv. 36), yet they annexed to the admonition to be always ready (Matth. xxiv. 43, 44), the expectation of the near approach of his coming (Matth. xvi. 27). These sensuous expectations could not at once be eradicated from their minds, without at the same time endangering their faith in Jesus; but they were gradually purified and spiritualized by a series of events. Probably the closing fortunes of Jesus' life, though even they did not destroy those sensuous hopes, were required to convince the disciples that God's ways are very different from man's expectations, and to confirm their faith in the Divine mission of
Jesus; while at the same time they furnished the highest example of a mind renouncing the earthly, entirely devoted to God, and of a self-sacrificing love.  

The Pharisees cotemporary with Jesus, affected and exasperated by the truth of his doctrine, did not rest till they had brought him to the death he had long foreseen (Matth. ix. 15; xvi. 21, et seq.). Delivered up to them by a disciple, after he instituted, shortly before, a covenant-supper, as a symbol of internal union with him, and of unity among his disciples themselves, he was accused by them of insurrection before Pontius Pilate, and condemned by him through unworthy views. The courage of the disciples, which had almost vanished away, returned after his resurrection with so much strength and purity, that an unshaken attachment to Jesus was now to be expected from them, even amid outward renunciations and self-denial. It was still reserved, however, for later occurrences to correct many remaining prejudices. Thus it was some time before they fully understood the last commission of Jesus to carry the glad news of the beginning of God’s kingdom on earth to all nations, to invite all into it, and to initiate them into it by baptism.

§ 24.

ALLEGED COTTEMPORARY NOTICES OF JESUS, NOT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The testimony concerning Christ in Josephus, Ant. xviii. 3, 3, is regarded with the greatest probability as genuine, but interpolated.  

1 On the contrary, the correspondence of Christ

2 Chr. F. Boehme de spe Messiana apostolica. Halae. 1626. 8.
with Abgarus, toparch of Edessa, and the apocryphal narratives of the birth, youth, and last days of Jesus, are un-

Lucas Osiander (in Epitome hist. eccles. Centur. i. lib. 2, cap. 7. Tubing. 1592). More searching investigations of various scholars, respecting the matter from 1646-1661, first occasioned by the Aldorf Professor Sebastian Suelliuss, who denied the authenticity, are collected in: Epistolae xxx. philol. et. hist. de Fl. Jos. testim., quod. J. C. tribuit, rec. Christoph. Arnold. Noriberg. 1661. 19 (also in Havercamp's edition of Josephus, tom. ii. Append. p. 533). Here the reasons against it are developed with superior skill, especially by Dav. Bhandel and Tanaquil Faber. Later defenders are: Carol. Daubuz pro testimonio Flavii Josephi de Jesu Christo, libb. ii. Londini. 1706. 8 (also in Havercamp's Josephus, tom. ii. Append. p. 187). Houteville erwiesene Währheit der christl. Religion durch ihre Geschichte. Frankfurt. 1745. 4. S. 273, ff. Oberthür in der Vorrede zum 1sten Theile der Uebersetzung des Josephus v. Frieses. Almena. 1805. C. G. Bretschneider σπερματομ σου ατη μηνο ή τινα της βασιλείας δυνα αισθήτων. Lips. 1812. 8. pag. 59. C. F. Böhmert über des Flav. Joseph. Zeugniss von Christo. Leipzig. 1823. 8 (comp. on the other side, the review in Winer's and Engelhardt's theolog. Journ. Bd. 2. S. 95, ff.). F. H. Schoedel Flav. Josephus de J. Chr. testatus. Vindiciae Flavianae. Lips. 1840. 8. Opponents of the genuineness are: (Abbé de Longuerue) sur le passage de Joseph en faveur de Jésus-Christ (against Daubuz) in Clericus biblioth. ancienne et moderne, t. vii. p. 237. God. Lessii dissert. ii. super Joseph de Christo testimonio. Goetting. 1781. 82. Eichstaedt Flavianae de J. C. testimoniis aedictia quo jure nuper defensa lib. quaest. vi. Janac. 1813-41. Arguments for the genuineness: 1. The agreement of all MSS. of the time of Eusebius. 2. The number of Christians was too great to allow Josephus to pass over their origin without mention. 3. Josephus mentions John the Baptist. Against the genuineness: 1. The silence of the fathers before Eusebius, while Josephus, in Orig. c. Celts. i. p. 33, is said to be οὗτος τὸν Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν. 2. The passage interrupts the connection. 3. The contents betray a Christian. 4. The other Jewish historian, Justus Tiberienis, has not mentioned Christ. Photii bibl. cod. 33. The assumption of interpolations which found their way into all the MSS. of Josephus out of the far more extensively circulated church history of Eusebius, is the most probable, since Josephus was read and copied only by Christians. Chrysostom appears, however, not to have been acquainted with these interpolations, since he mentions Josephus several times, and in hom. in Joann. 12, quotes his testim. de Joanne, but is silent in regard to this passage. Remarkable is the silence of Photius in his accounts regarding Jos., Archacol. (bibl. cod. 76 and 238), especially as he remarks respecting Justus, cod. 33, that he being a Jew, and encumbered with Jewish prejudices, does not mention Jesus and his miracles. The following writers have decided in favor of an interpolation formed by altering single expressions: Knittel (nova biblioth. phil. et crit. vol. i. i. 118. Goetting. 1782. 8), and Paulus (Heidelberg. Jahrb., August 1820, S. 734). In favor of an interpolation formed by inserted glosses are: Steph. le Moyen varia sacra, i. 331, l'Abbé de Fontaines in the Journ. des Savans, ann. 1723, Juill., p. 10, Paulus Comm. über die 3 ersten Evang. iii. 740, H. Olshausen hist. eccl. vet. monumenta practica, vol. 1. Berol. 1820. 8. p. 3. Heinichen Exorzus in his edition of Eusebius, tom. iii. p. 331. I have indicated above, by parenthetical marks, in what light I look upon the interpolation.

2 Euseb. Hist. eccl. i. 13, and Moses Chorenensis (about 440) Hist. Armen. ii. 29-31, found these letters in the Archives of Edessa, and gave them to the public in a Greek and Armenian translation. At the time of Abgarus, Abgarus Uchomo: about 170, there was a Christian Abgarus. These letters, therefore, may have been forged long before Eusebius. Cf. Assemani bibl. Orient. t. i. p. 554, t. iii. p. 2. p. 8. Bayer historia Orosiæ et Edessa. Petrop. 1734. 4. p. 104. Semler de Christi ad Abgarum epistola. Hal. 1768. 4. The genuineness of the letters is defended by W. F. Rineck, in Illyen's Zeitschrift f. d. histor. Theol. 1843. ii. 3.

3 Two classes of apocryphal gospels may be distinguished: I. The older, which contained much the same cycle of narrations as the canonical; for example, the gospels of the
questionably spurious. Still more modern are the pretend-
ed authentic likenesses of Jesus; and the epistle of Lentu-

Hebrews and the Egyptians, &c. II. The later, which refer to the youth, the parents, and the last fortunes of Christ. A. Respecting the history of Christ's youth, we find fabulous writings first of all among the Marcionians in the second century. (Irenaeus, i. c. 17.) The orthodox, at the same time, received a doctrinal interest in maintaining the miraculous stories of Jesus' youth in opposition to those Gnostics who asserted that the son was first united with the man at the baptism of the latter. (Epiphani. haer. li. c. 20.) Several of these traditions are found in the Koran (comp. Augusti christologiæ Cornicæae incantamina. Jen. 1799). Gospels of the infancy still extant are the gospel of Thomas, an Arabic gospel of the infancy, and a Latin history of the nativity of Mary and the infancy of the Saviour. At a later period the virgin Mary also began to invite men to similar fabrications. Compounds of the two are exemplified in the Protevangelion of James, the Arabic history of Joseph the carpenter, and the Latin gospel of the nativity of Mary. B. Respecting the last days of Jesus, Justin Martyr, Apol. i. c. 35 and 48, refers to the τὰ ἐν Ποτίῳ Πιλάτῳ γενέσεως ἀκτα; in the same way he himself alludes, c. 34, and also Chrysostom, hom. 31. de natali Christi, to the acts regarding the census of Quirinius, not that he had seen them himself, but because he pre-supposes their existence in the Roman archives. Hence arose Christian traditions in relation to the contents of these acts, out of which Tertullian, Apol. c. 5, 21, draws the fabulous. During the persecution of Maximin, the heathen, taking occasion from these traditions, produced wicked Acta Pilati (Suseb. H. E. ix. c. 5), to which the Christians of that day had none others to oppose. The latter, however, soon made their appearance afterward (Epiphani. haer. li. c. 3), and were fashioned and molded in various ways. One of these fabrications has received in later times the name, gospel of Nicodemus. Cf. Henke de Pilati actis probabiliis. Helvst. 1784 (opusc. academ. Lips. 1803. p. 199). W. L. Brunn de indoelæ, sextate, et usu libri apocr. vulgo inscripti Evangel. Nicodemi. Berol. 1794. 8. Editions are: J. A. Fabricii codex apocryphus N. T. partes iii. ed. 2. Hamb. 1719. 8. J. C. Thilo codex apocryphus N. T. t. i. Lips. 1832 [containing the apocryphal gospels]. [Jones on the canon of the New Testament. Lond. 3 vols. 8vo.] Die apokryph. Evangelien u. Apostelgeschichten, übers. mit Einleit. und Anmerk. v. Dr. K. F. Borberg. Stuttgart. 1841. Cf. C. J. Nitzsch de apocryphorum Evangeliorum in explicandis canonicis usu et abuso. Viteb. 1808. 4. F. J. Arens de Evangel. apocr. in canonicis usu historico, critico, exegetico. Goetting. 1835. 4.

The first traces of likenesses of Christ are to be found among the Carpocratians (Iren. i. 25), and in the lararium of Severus Alexander (Lamprid. c. 29). The persecuted church of the first centuries needed in Christ the pattern of a sufferer. Hence arose the general opinion that he was of unsightly form, according to Isaiah lxxii. 2, 3. (So Tertullian de carne Christi 8, adv. Jud. c. 14, and often. Clem. Alex. Paedog. iii. 1, Strom. ii. p. 308. Origens contra Cels. vi. p. 327, οὐδὲν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἄνθρωπος.) At the same time all representations were forbidden, according to Exodus xx. 4. As soon as art began to represent Jesus, it must also have sought to express his excellence even in external form. Hence, from the fourth century onward, Jesus was supposed to have had a body of external beauty, something divinely majestic in his exterior, according to Psalm xlv. 3. (Hieron. comm. in Matt. ix. 9.) Yet they confessed still that there was no authentic likeness of Jesus to be seen. (Augustin de trinitate, viii. 4. Nam et ipsius dominicae facies carnis innumeralbum cogitationum diversitate variatur et fingitur, quae tamen una est, quae cuncte crat, et c. 5, qua fuerit ille facies, nos penitus ignorantem.) Eusebius (H. E. vii. c. 18. Comp. the execrations in Heinichen's edition, tom. iii. p. 396, ss.) relates concerning a statue at Panias that it was there supposed to point to Jesus and the occurrence in Matt. ix. 20. All later writers repeat the story after him, and John Malula (600 A.D.), in his Chronog. p. 303, gave the name of the woman Beronice. This monument was destroyed by Julian (Sosom. v. 51. Philostorg. vii. 3), or according to Asterius, bishop of Amasia (about 400, in Photii bibl. cod. 271 in fine), by Maximin at a time when copies of it


to the Roman senate, containing a description of his person.


SECOND CHAPTER.

APOTOLIC AGE TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.


§ 25.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY TILL THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

The adherents of Jesus, more than 500 in number (1 Cor. xv. 6), and among them the twelve disciples, Sīmōn (Cephas, Peter), and Andōwe, sons of Jonas, Jāme and Jōn, sons of Zebedee (Boanerges, sons of thuder, Mark iii. 17), Philip,

1 For an account of the numerous Acts of the Apostles which are found in antiquity especially among single heretical parties, see the list in Fabrici cod. apocr. Nov. Test. tom. ii. p. 743, ss. Thus the Ebionites had the περιοδοι Πέτρου διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφέων (Epiph. hær. xxx. c. 15, comp. below, § 99), and πράξεις ἅλλαι Ἀποστόλων (L. c. c. 16). The Manichæans, the Actus Apostolorum or τῶν Ἀποστόλων περιοδοί, composed by one Léucias Chárismus (Augustin. de fide contra Manich. c. 38, and often. Plut. bibl. cod. 114), k. c. One of the most modern and copious productions of this kind is the Abdis (this Abdis, it is pretended, was a disciple of the Apostles, and first bishop of Babylon) historia certaminis apostolici (belonging to the eighth or ninth century), published in Latin in Fabrici cod. apocryph. New Test. t. ii. p. 388, ss. Respecting the apocryphal productions of this kind, printed and unprinted, see Thilo acta Thomae in the Notitia, p. iii. ss.


2 According to Wieseler (theol. Studien u. Krit. 1840, iii. 648), the sons of Zebedee were cousins of the Lord, their mother Salome the sister of Mary.
Thomas (called Didymus, John xx. 24), Bartholomew (Nathanael? John i. 46), Matthew (Matthew ix. 9; Levi, the son of Alphaeus, Mark ii. 14), James (the son of Alphaeus, Matthew x. 3, and of Mary, Matthew xxvii. 56, the wife of Cleopas, John xix. 25), Thaddæus (Lebbæus surnamed Thaddeus, Matth. x. 3, Jude the brother of James, Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13), Simon Zelotes (the Canaanite, Matth. x. 4), and Matthias, who was chosen in place of Judas Iscariot, to whom were now added the brethren of Jesus who had become believers, spent the first days after Christ's ascension in retirement in Jerusalem, till the Divine Spirit, who had been in the prophets and in Jesus, began to manifest his living power in them in an extraordinary manner on the day of Pentecost. Furnished with power and courage, the apostles now appeared more publicly, and the number of Christ's confessors increased every day. The community, however, did not renounce Judaism and the Jewish law, but rather considered themselves to be the society of genuine Israelites (μαθηταί, ἄνδελφοι, πιστεύοντες, σωζόμενοι, φοβούμενοι τῶν θεῶν, called in derision by the Jews Nazarenes and Galileans) who, having been saved from that untoward generation (Acts ii. 40), were preparing themselves for the unfolding of the Messiah's kingdom in its excellency. It must certainly be admitted, however, that sensuous expectations and erroneous opinions of the near approach of Christ's return (Acts i. 6, iii. 19–21), were mixed up with their better principles. The conditions of reception into this kingdom were repentance and faith in Christ, on which forgiveness of sin was promised in baptism, and the Holy Spirit imparted by the imposition of hands. Though they knew that the heathen also were admitted into the kingdom of God, still more that they should be invited, they yet believed that these Gentiles should first be incorporated among the Jewish people as proselytes of righteousness, and necessarily observe


3 Act. i. 14, comp. John vii. 5.

4 Chr. Fr. Boehme de spe Messiana apostolica. Halae. 1826. 8.
the entire Mosaic law. With this opinion they could not be in haste to invite the heathen also to embrace Christianity.

But although the community did not separate itself from the religion of the Jews, yet they were more closely connected together by the peculiar direction which their religious feelings naturally took, and by their peculiar hopes. Thus there arose by degrees a regularly constituted society among the brethren. For this the Jewish synagogue presented itself as the most natural model. At first, the apostles themselves performed the duties of the society, but by degrees special officers were appointed. The apostles caused seven *distributors of alms* to be chosen (Acts vi. 1–6), inasmuch as the brethren showed very great liberality toward their poor; and because the administration of these gifts threatened to be detrimental to the proper calling and ministry of the twelve. Soon after this, we find πρεσβυτέροι, elders (Acts xi. 30 = ἀρχον), chosen not so much for the purpose of teaching, as for the management of common concerns, and for maintaining the ordinances of the church. In all these appointments of the society, the apostles did not act despotically, but allowed the church to determine them (Acts vi. 2; xv. 22, 23).

The bold appearance of the apostles, and the enlargement of their party, soon excited attention. The *Sadducees* were now

---

5 The chief work is: Campegi. Vitringae de synagoga vetere, lib. iii., quibus tum de synagogis agitur, tum praecipue formam regininis et ministerii earum in ecclesiis christ. translatam esse demonstratur. Trinchevarum. 1696, and Leucointr. 1736. 4.

6 Luke calls them simply the seven *οἱ ἑπτά*, Acts xxi. 8. In later times they have for the most part been regarded as the first deacons. So Cyprian, as early as his time; Epist. 65, ad Rotgianum. They are, however, distinguished from the deacons by Chrysostom, Hom. 14 in Acta § 3 (ed. Montfaucon. ix. 115), and the council of Trulla, canon 16. Vitringae de syn. vet. lib. ii. p. ii. cap. 5, compares them with the διδόμενοι of the synagogue; and on the other hand, the ἄρχοντες of Paul with the διδόμενοι. Boëthius, diss. jur. eccl. aut. disq. v. p. 377, actually looked upon tigen as the first presbyters. See on the other side Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. p. 122. Without doubt the deacons arose from the seven, by an enlargement of the circle of duties required. See Mosheim, l. c. p. 120. Neander’s apost.Kirche, l. 142. R. Roethe’s Anfänge d. christl. Kirche, l. 162. Another opinion of Vitringae (l. c.), supported by Mosheim (l. c. p. 119), is, that those seven were appointed for the Hellenist poor. But the Grecian names do not necessarily indicate Hellenists; comp. the names of the apostles Andrew and Philip. Perhaps three were Hebrew, three Hellenistic Jews, and one a proselyte.

7 The opinion that the kingdom of Messiah would soon appear contributed, doubtless, very much to promote this liberality (comp. Matth. xxv. 34, ff.). It is not a community of goods that is taught in Acts ii. 44, 45; iv. 33–35; but a voluntary equalizing of property, according to the precept laid down in Luke xxi. 33. Cf. Mosheim de vera natura communiois honorum in eccl. Hierosol. in his dissertat. ad hist. eccles. pertinentium, ii. i. Ananias’s crime was a meanly calculating selfishness, assuming withal the appearance of enthusiastic brotherly love.
the bitterest enemies of those who confessed the name of one risen from the dead (Acts iv. 2; v. 17; xxiii. 6). On the other hand, *priests* (Acts vi. 7) and *Pharisees* (xv. 5) joined the Christians. After threatenings had been used with the apostles in vain (Acts iv.), the Sadducean party in the Sanhedrin wished to apply violent measures (v. 17, ff.), but were restrained by the prudent counsel of the Pharisee Gamaliel (v. 34, ff., comp. xxiii. 6). Some Hellenists, however, provoked by the zeal of Stephen, stirred up the popular fury, to which the Sanhedrin soon gave way. Stephen fell as the first martyr (vi. 8–vii. 60); but the very persecution that now set in was the first means of spreading Christianity still farther. The Christians, driven from Jerusalem, preached the gospel in Judea, Samaria (viii. 1–4), even as far as Damascus (ix. 10, 19), Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, but yet only to the Jews (xi. 19). In the mean time they had cast off the Pharisaic prejudice against the Samaritans; and in Samaria itself Philip gained many converts to Christianity. The same individual preached the gospel in the towns on the sea-coast of Palestine, and finally took up his abode in Caesarea, probably as the founder of a church there (viii. 40, comp. xxi. 8). The apostles, who had hitherto remained always in Jerusalem, now sent Peter and John to Samaria, in order to carry on the work there begun (viii. 14, ff.). Peter then went to the towns on the sea-coast, where he was commanded by Heaven to baptize a pious proselyte of the gate, the centurion Cornelius, in Caesarea (Acts x.). He quieted, indeed, the believers in Jerusalem who were not pleased with this transaction (xi. 1–18); but the greatest part of them did not proceed farther than to allow that the heathen should be baptized before being circumcised. In this sense alone the church at Jerusalem approved of the conduct of some Hellenistic Jews in Antioch who had converted Gentiles also to Christianity (xi. 20, comp. ver. 22). They still maintained the view, that the Mosaic law was absolutely binding on all nations, which was held particularly by some believing Pharisees (xv. 5), regarding the universal and strict observance of that law as an essential characteristic of the times of Messiah (according to Isaiah lii. 1, lxvi. 17, 20; Zech. viii. 21–23, xiv. 16, &c.).

---

§ 26.

PAUL.


In the mean time, however, that man had been previously converted to Christianity, to whom the mystery was to be announced that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs of the promises (Ephes. iii. 3–6). Saul, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, and a Roman citizen, but educated in Jerusalem under Gamaliel, a Pharisee, from being a dangerous enemy of Christianity suddenly became a zealous adherent to it (37–40 A.D.). After a three years’ abode in Damascus and Arabia he came to Jerusalem, where Barnabas introduced him to the apostles Peter and James (Gal. i. 17–19; Acts ix. 19–27). The very same person conducted him also to the great scene of his apostolic labors; for, having been sent by the apostles to Antioch in order to establish the infant church there, he recalled Paul from Tarsus, and took him as his assistant (Acts xi. 22–26). After this, when Herod Agrippa (41–44), for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the people, persecuted the church at Jerusalem, when James the elder was put to death, and Peter was saved from a like fate only by a miracle (Acts xii.), Jerusalem ceased to be the secure seat of the apostles; and James, the brother

1 On the rights of Roman citizenship, see Winer’s bibl. Realwörterbuch, i. 235.
3 With this agrees Apollinios (about 190), who (Fussch. H. E. v. 18) ὡς ἐκ παραβάσεως.
of the Lord, and a Nazarite, appeared at the head of the church with a reputation equal to that of an apostle. In the mean time, Barnabas and Saul at Antioch gathered from among Jews and Gentiles a church so numerous, even in wealthy members (κριστιανοί, Acts ii. 26), that they were able to bring contributions thence to the brethren at Jerusalem when a famine occurred (44 A.D., Acts xi. 27–30; xii. 25). After this, the two entered on the first large missionary journey through Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, during which the gospel was preached to Jews and Gentiles. After they had again abode for a long time in Antioch, Hebrew Christians came thither who excited divisions in the church, by the assertion, that the
newly converted Gentile Christians must also necessarily become Jewish *proselytes of righteousness*. Hence Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem, where they received from the collective apostles, and the assembled church, a decision to the effect that the Gentiles should only be required to accede to proselytism of the gate (*Acts xv.*). They were also, at the same time, recognized as *apostles of the Gentiles* by Peter, James, and John, who resolved to continue their labors among the Jews (*Gal. ii. 9, A.D. 52*). Soon after, Barnabas and Mark made a *second journey* to Cyprus, while Paul and Silas repaired to the churches of Asia Minor. In Lystra, Paul took Timothy with him, traveled through Phrygia and Galatia, passed over into *Macedonia*, where churches were founded at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Beroea, and came by Athens to *Corinth* (*Epistles to the Thessalonians*). After remaining there a year and a half, he returned by Ephesus, Caesarea, and Jerusalem, to An-
tioc (Acts xv. 36–xviii. 22). But he soon entered on the third great journey to Asia Minor, where he passed at Ephesus the first two years and three months. Here, and in the vicinity, he established Christianity more firmly (Epistle to the Galatians? First Epistle to the Corinthians?), and then traveled through Macedonia (Second Epistle to the Corinthians) to Corinth (Epistle to the Romans). After a three months' abode in this city, he returned to Jerusalem by Miletus (Acts xviii. 23, xxi. 17). Here, having been taken in the temple (55 A.D.), he was brought to Caesarea, and thence to Rome (60–61 A.D., Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon). The Acts of the Apostles closes with the second year of the Roman captivity (63 A.D.); but according to later, though ancient testimonies, he was again liberated from this bondage, made several other journeys (First Epistle to Timothy, Second Epistle to Titus), and then fell into a second captivity at Rome (Second Epistle to Timothy), which terminated in his death (67 A.D.). Among Paul's discipies the most distinguished were Silas, or Silvanus (Acts xv. 40, ss., as far as xviii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 19), who was afterward with Peter (1 Peter v. 12); Timothy, who, commissioned by Paul, abode for a long time at Ephesus, in

---

8 So according to Usener, Mill, Pearson, Jo Clerk, and Paley: Heydenreich die Pastoralbriefe Pauli. Bd. 1. (Haldarnew. 1826). S. 36, ff. G. Böhl über die Zeit der Abfassung u. d. Paulina. Charakter der Briefe an Timoth. u. Titus. Berlin. 1829. S. 294, ff. If the pastoral letters had been a forgery of the second century, as Baur thinks (die Sagen. Pastoralbriefe d. A. Paulus. Stutt. and Tübingen. 1835), it would be an inexplicable thing that the writer should lay at the basis of the history certain situations in which the apostle was placed, which can not be pointed out in the New Testament.

order to arrange the affairs of the church at that place; Titus, who had been left for the same purpose in Crete (both considered in later times as the first bishops of these churches, Euseb iii. 4); and Luke.

§ 27.

HISTORY OF THE OTHER APOSTLES AND THEIR DISCIPLES.

J. A. Fabricii salutaris lux evangeli toti orbi exoriens (Hamburg. 1731, 4to), page 95, ss.

The history of the other apostles, and their early pupils, is involved in great obscurity, and has frequently been much disfigured by mistakes and fabrications. Among these distortions may be reckoned principally, the traditions respecting the apostles determining by lots to what countries they should go from Jerusalem, the joint composition of the apostles' creed, and their unmarried state, as well as the tradition that they all suffered martyrdom except John. And when the apostles, who

3 Comp. against this 1 Cor. ix. 5. Hence also Ignatius ad Philadelphia, c. 4. mentions Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου—καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων τοὺς γάμους προσακληθήσωσιν. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. p. 448: Πέτρος καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαυδοτομησαντο· καὶ Παύλος ὁδεικνύει εν τοις ἐπιστολαῖς τὴν αὐτὸν προσαγορεύσεων σύζυγον, ἕναν ὑποπερικομένην διὰ τὸ τῆς ἐπερετισίας εὐσταλθᾶς. See J. A. Theiner and A. Theiner die Einführung der erzwungenen Eheelisheit bei den christl. Geistlichen und ihre Folgen (Altenburg. 1829. 2 Bde. 8). Bd. 1. S. 26. On the other hand, the Montanist Tertullianus de Monogam. c. 8: Petrum solum invenio maritum; cacteros cum maritio non invenio, aut spadones intelligam necesse est act continentis. Nec enim—Paulum sic interpretabimus, quasi demonstrat uxores apostolos habuisse. In later times, 1 Cor. ix. 5, was explained of female friends who served: Ambrosiaster ad h. 1. Hieronymus ad Matth. xxvii. 55. Theodore, ad 1 Cor. ix. 5, who adds, however, ἄλλας ὀβεραὶ ἀμφιβολίαν. (Cf. Saucorii thesaur. ecclesiasticus, ed. ii. Amstel. 1728. Τ. ι. p. 510, s. v. γυνή.) Even when it was conceded, as by Ambrosiaster ad 2 Cor. xi. 2: Omnes apostoli, excepts Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt: the view was usually held, Hieron. Epist. 30 (al. 50) ad Pammachium (ed. Martinae, t. iv. p. ii. p. 242): Apostoli vel virginiis, vel post nuptias continent. On the whole subject, see G. Calixtus de conjugio Clericorum (ed. ii. ed. H. Ph. C. Henke. Helmst. 1783). P. ii. p. 147, ss.
continued a long time in single churches, were considered as the first bishops of them; this is also liable to be misunderstood. Peter was still found in Jerusalem in the year 52 (Acts xv.), then in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), also in Babylon (1 Peter v. 13), and, according to other ancient testimonies, he suffered martyrdom in Rome (67 A.D.)

Since the end of the 4th century, the fabrication of the Clementines, that Peter was first bishop of Antioch, and then of Rome, obtained more general

---

4 Clemens, Rom. Epist. i. c. 5, testifies merely to his martyrdom; Ignatius, Ep. ad Rom. cap. 4, alludes to it. The Praedictatio Petri (which was known even to Heracleon, and consequently belongs to the beginning of the second century; see the Clementines by A. Schleierm. Hamb. 1844, P. 233), comp. Lib. de non iterando bapt. appended to Cypriani opp. ed. Rigalt. p. 139: Liber, qui inscriberit Pauli praedictatio, in quod libro—iunvent, post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, post conlationem evangeli in Hierusalem et mutum alterationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem, postremo in urbe, quasi tune primum, invicem sibi esse cognitos. (The Praedictatio Pauli seems to have formed the last part of the Praed. Petri. Credner's Beiträge zur Einleit. in die bibl. Schriften, i. 360.) Dionysius Corinth. (about 170) Ep. ad Romanos (in Euseb. ii. 25): Αρμών (Πέτρου και Πάβλου) καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμέτεραν Κόρασιν φιλέσπασες ἡμᾶς, ὅμως ἐλθόντας Ἰάοιος δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ιωάννην ἄμοες διδασάντες, ἑλαστάρσαντας κατὰ τὸν αὐτόν καρόν. Ignatius adv. Hær. (written 176 or 177) iii. 1: 'Ο μὲν δὴ Ματθαίου ἐν τούτῳ ἔμαθεν τὸν Ἑλικιόνα τῇ δικῇ διαλείτην αὐτῶν καὶ γραφήν ἐξέμνυκεν εὐαγγελίαν, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ρώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων, καὶ θεμαλοῦντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὸν τούτων ἔξων Μάρκος κ. τ. λ. Tertullianus de Praescr. laicetorium, c. 36: Felix ecclesia (Romana), cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum saucúne suo profuderunt; ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adequadatur, ubi Paulus Iohannis (baptizatae) exitu coronatur. Cajus Romanus (about 200) in Euseb. ii. 25: 'Εγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἔχω δείξαι· ἐκακὶ γὰρ θλήσεις ἀπελεύθην ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικάνον, ὡς ἔπει τὴν ἄλλο τὴν Ὀσιαν, εὐφράσει τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταχύτατον ἑδυσμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. In the middle ages the Waldenses denied (Moneta adv. Catharos et Waldenses. Romec. 1743, fol. p. 411) Marsilius Patavinus, Michael Caecus, &c. (cf. Spanheim de fucta protectione Petri Ap. in urbe Romam, Opp. ii. 337) that Peter had ever been at Rome. In this they were followed by Matth. Flacius, Claud. Salmiatus, and Fred. Spanheim (i. e.), all openly entangled by party feeling. Several moderns, resting on a scientific basis, have made the same assertion, particularly Eichhorn (Einl. in d. N. T. i. 504), Baur (Tübingen theolog. Zeitschr. 1831. iv. 136. 1836. iii. 163) and Mayerhoff (Einl. in die Petrin. Schriften, Hamburg. 1835. S. 73). Neander (apost. Kirche, ii. 458) and Winer (bibl. Reallwörterbuch, ii. 291) waiver. On the contrary, the old tradition is defended by Credner (Einleit. in d. N. T. i. ii. 628. Hall. A. L. Z. 1836, July, S. 370), Bleek (theol. Studien und Kritik. 1838. iv. 1061) and Olschann (Einleit. zum Römernbriefe, and theol. Stud. und Kritik. 1838, iv. 916). There is a new rejoinder by Baur (über den Ursprung des Episcopates, s. 43). A violent catholic defense is presented in Frdl. Windischmanni vindiciae Petriniae. Ratlab. 1836. If, according to Baur, this tradition proceeded from Judaizing Christians at Rome for the purpose of exalting Peter above Paul, we can not understand how the fabrication did not forthwith meet with a decided contradiction from the adherents of Paul at Rome, nor how Caes, a disciple of Paul, is a leading witness for its truth. Comp. Drey, Herbst, and Hirscher theolog. Quartalschrift. Tübingen 1830. iv. 567. Mynster's Kleine theolog. Schriften. Köpenhag. 1825, s. 141. On the manner of Peter's death Tertullian speaks (i. c.): Petrus passioni dominicae adequadatur. On the other hand, Origen (in Euseb. H. E. iii. c. 1): Πέτρος—ἀνεκολοπηθείκας κατὰ κεφαλήν, ὁδὸν ἄξιον παιδίν, according to Rufinus' version: eremitae est deorsum capitio demense, quod ipsa ilia fori deprecatas est, ne exaequari domino videretur.
currency. Philip spent the last years of his life in Hierapolis in Phrygia (Polyerates, about 190, ap. Euseb. H. E. iii. 31, and v. 24). John also went to Asia Minor, and a great part of his life belongs to the following period. The traditions are ancient respecting Thomas preaching the gospel in Parthia, Andrew in Scythia (Origines ap. Euseb. iii. 1), Bartholomew in India (Euseb. v. 10), and it is reported that John Mark, first the companion of Paul and Barnabas, then of Peter, was the founder of the church in Alexandria (Euseb. ii. 16). The later traditions respecting the apostles, and apostolic men, which have been partly indebted for their origin to the wish of many nations to trace their Christianity up to the apostolic age, are, to say the least, uncertain, and in part so marvelously forged, that they sufficiently betray their own falseness.


* Later accounts make Thomas go to India. So first Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xxv. ad Arian. p. 438, ed. Paris. Ambrosius in Psalm xlv. 10. Hieronymus. Epist. 148, and so the Syrian Christians in India (Thomas-Christians) consider him to be the founder of their church (Assemani bibl. orient. iii. ii. 435), comp. Acta Thomas apostoli ed. J. C. Thilo. Lips. 1823, p. 97, 121. These Manichaeans Acta Thomas render it probable that the tradition is of Manichaeus origin. On this account Theodoret Haer. fab. i. c. 26, declares that the Thomas sent to the Indians was a disciple of Manes.

* Probably Yemen. Rufinus H. E. x. 9: Thomaes Parthia, et Matthaeo Aethiopia, eique adhærcus exterior India Bartholomaeo dicitur sorte decreta. Inter quern Parthianique Media, sed longo interius tracta India ulterior jacet. So also Philostorgius H. E. ii. 6, calls the Sabaeans, or Homerites, τοὺς ένδοτας. "Inboco.

* Thus the Spaniards pretend that James the elder was seen in their country (his body is said to be in Compostella, since A.D. 816); the French claim Demusins the Areopagite, Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, and others; the English, Simon Zelotes, and especially Joseph of Arimathea; the Germans, Matermns, Eucherius, and Valerius, as legates of Peter; the Russians, Andrew, &c. The real but later founders of churches have been frequently transferred to the times of the apostles by tradition.
§ 28.

RECEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG JEWS AND GENTILES.

(Comp. § 19.)

Neander's Kirchengesch.  2te. Auflage i. i. 117, ff.

With the Jews, their earthly expectations of the Messiah always presented a special obstacle to Christianity. When the Christians not only took into their society the Samaritans, but when Paul admitted the very heathen into it, without requiring of them circumcision, the fact appeared to the Jews to afford sufficient proof that the confessors of Christ could not be followers of a true Messiah; and Christianity now appeared to them only a form of Judaism profaned by a mutilated impartation of it to the heathen, as is expressed even in the appellation of the Christians, Ἰουδαίοι, which originated, perhaps, somewhat later. On this account Paul and his disciples were most violently hated by the Palestinian Jews (Gal. v. 11, Rom. xv. 31), who could even spread the report concerning him, that he had introduced heathen into the temple, the uproar arising from which caused his imprisonment (Acts xxi. 27, ff.). Among the Hellenistic Jews Paul found once and again much susceptibility of mind in relation to Christianity, as in Berea (Acts xvii. 11, 12), Ephesus (xviii. 19, 20), and Rome (xxviii. 17). In other places these very Jews were his most dangerous enemies, as in Thessalonica (xvii. 5, ff.), and Corinth (xviii. 12, ff.), partly from the usual national prejudice, and partly, also, perhaps, from fear lest the publication of their Messianic hopes might injure them in the eyes of the Romans (Acts xvii. 6–8).

In addition to the inward power of Christian truth on the human spirit, the miraculous origin of Christianity and the prevailing inclination to foreign superstitions, influenced the heathen in its favor. On the contrary, with the higher classes, and especially the philosophers (1 Cor. i. 18, ff.), its Jewish origin, the simple form in which it appeared (Acts xvii. 18, ff.), and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body (1. c. 32) hindered its reception. Christianity was looked upon at this time by the
heathen only as a Jewish sect,¹ an opinion which from many indeed may have drawn upon it contempt, but which secured for it, notwithstanding, the protection of the civil government (Acts xviii. 12, ff.); for now, the Christian societies, like the Jewish, passed for Sodalitiae licita (comp. § 12). The circumstance that even some heathens were drawn away from their own religion by means of these communities, served, indeed, to raise complaints against them (Acts xvi. 20, ff.; xvii. 18); these, however, were generally overlooked by the Roman magistrates, just as the circumstance of many heathens becoming proselytes of the gate had been formerly passed over, since, amid the general inclination to foreign superstitions,² the old religious laws were not strictly enforced. When Claudius, on account of a dispute between the believing and unbelieving Jews at Rome, expelled both parties from the city, this act can not naturally be reckoned a persecution of the Christians.³ As little were the Christians persecuted on account of their religion by Nero, when, to turn from himself the suspicion of setting fire to the city, he gave up the despised sectaries to all kinds of torture (64).⁴ Probably the Neronian persecution was confined to Rome,⁵ though it appears to have continued with some inter-

² When Tertullian relates that Tiberius wished Christ to be admitted among the Roman deities (Apologeticon, c. 5: Deullet ad Senatum cum praecogitativa suffragi sui. Senatorius, qui non ipse probaverat, respuit. Caesar in sententia manuit committas periculum auctoritatis Christianorum, this is in contradiction to the Roman spirit, the character of Tiberius (Sueton. Tiber. c. 36: Externas ceremonias, Aegyptios Judaicarum ritus compescuit. C. 69: Curae deoae religiosis negligieron: quique adduxit mathematicam, plenitudine persuasionis, cuncta fato agi), and the historical relations; while the silence of the Roman historians in regard to it would be inexplicable. The less credit is to be given to Tertullian’s single testimony, inasmuch as he falsely ascribes to his cotemporary Marcus Aurelius, partiality for the Christians, in a passage subsequent to the one in which he speaks of Tiberius. Yet the account is defended by J. W. T. Braun de Tiberii Christum in Deorum numerum referendi consilio comm. Bonnse. 1834. 8.
⁴ Tacit. Ann. x. 44. Sueton. Nero, c. 16.
⁵ First extended to the provinces also by Orosius, vii. 7, whose opinion gained the assent of many till H. Dodwell in dissert. Cryptanicarum (Oxon. 1684. 8.), dissert. xi. de paucitate martyrum, § 13, proved the opposite. Yet Theod. Rainert in praefat. ad acta
ruptions till the death of the tyrant (Peter and Paul suffered under him). 6

§ 29.

INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.

The assembly of the apostles and church at Jerusalem had allowed the Gentile Christians to neglect the Mosaic law, but in so doing they had tacitly recognized its binding force on the posterity of Abraham. Since, therefore, on this account the Jewish Christians must have avoided intimate intercourse with the Gentile Christians, for the sake of Levitical purity; and since the one party looked upon James, the Lord's brother, and on Peter, as their leaders, while the other took Paul for their head (Gal. ii. 9), a certain wall of partition necessarily stood between them, and perfect incorporation into one brotherhood was impossible. This must have been felt in many churches gathered from among Jews and Gentiles by Paul out of Palestine (Gal. ii. 11, ff.). The very circumstance, however, contrib-

Martyr. sincera, § 3, still defended the opinion of Orosius. The inscription pretending to have been found in Spain or Portugal: Neroni ob provinciam latronibus et hic qui novum generi humano superstitionem incolubant, purgatum (Jan. Gruteri inscr. t. i. p. 238, a. 9), is spurious, and was forged perhaps by Cyriacus of Ancona. See Ferreras histoire d'Espagne, i. 192. Defended by J. E. J. Walsh persecutionis Christianorum Neronianae in Hispania ex ant. monumentis probandas ulteriori explanatio. Jenae. 1753. 4. But compare especially the epistola Hagenbachii, p. 51-69, there given.

6 Since the Christians constantly expected Antichrist, as the forerunner of Christ, to be near at hand, it is not to be wondered at that Nero, during his persecution, should appear to them as Antichrist, and that they entertained the opinion after his death that he had not actually died, but should soon return again to undertake a final persecution. Hence the Apocalypse (written about 69) xiii. 3; xvii. 10, 11, and the Sybiline oracles, iv. 116 (which verses, according to Bleek in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's, and Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift, i. 244, were composed about the year 80 A.D.) That the like report among the heathen originated in that sentiment of the Christians, is at once apparent from the form of it, comp. Sueton. Nero, c. 40: Praedictum a mathematicis Neroni olim erat, foro ut quandoque destinaretur. Soponderant tamen quidam de bello Orientis dominationem, nonnulli nominantur regnum Hierosolymorum. Hence the Pseudoceremonen. Sueton. I. c. c. 57. Tacit. Hist. ii. 8. Dio Cassius, lxiv. 10. Among the Christians that expectation survived for several centuries. Laetani de Morti persecut. c. 2. Sulpic. Savor. Hist. sacr. ii. 28, § 1, 29, § 6, dial. ii. c. 14. Hieronym. in Daniel xi. 28, in Essai xvi. 13, ad Alcgasiam, qu. xi., and it was believed that Paul referred to Nero in 2 Thess. ii. 7. Chrysostom., Theodoret., Theophyl., and Oecumen. on this passage. Augstini de civ. Dei, xx. c. 19. Compare Cocroft's krit. Gesch. d. Christiustum, ii. 309. Lücke's Einl. in d. Offenb. Johannis, S. 248. Credner's Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 704.
uted in no small degree, to lead that apostle to a more spiritual
development of Christianity and one freer from the national
ward perception of the truth, that spiritual communion with
God by faith in Christ alone constitutes the essence of Chris-
tianity. In this conviction, he was not afraid to overstep those
rules of the council at Jerusalem in a twofold manner, both by
declaring the obligation of the Jews to observe the Mosaic law
invalid (Romans vii. 1, ff.; 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21; Gal. ii. 15, ff.),
since he regarded that law merely as preparatory to Christ
(Gal. iii. 24); and also by denying the absolute binding force
of the laws regarding food given to the Gentile Christians
(1 Cor. viii. 10, 23, ff.), while with reference to all such ex-
ternal institutes he merely required some regard for the con-
sciences of weaker brethren, and practiced himself such forbear-
ance (1 Cor. viii. 9, ff.; x. 32; Acts xxi. 26). The other
national prejudice of the Jewish Christians, viz. carnal millen-
narianism, likewise disappeared from his mind along with an
overweening estimate of the Mosaic law. He thought, indeed,
of the return of Jesus as near at hand (Phil. iv. 5), but he ex-
pected the triumph of God’s kingdom in a state above the
earthly (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 2 Cor. v. 1, 2). Christ himself
was conceived of by Paul, who had seen him in the clouds of
heaven, more in his spiritual and divine aspect; while the Jew-
ish apostles, in consequence of the personal intercourse with him
which they had enjoyed, dwelt more on his human appearance.
The Palestinian Christians might have overlooked the new
development of doctrine, inasmuch as they had been accustomed
to much more important doctrinal differences springing up in
Judaism, without forfeiting the privileges of ecclesiastical fellow-
ship. On the other hand, they attributed to Paul’s loose view
of the law, by which he drew away so many Jews from the ob-
servance of its precepts, in the Gentile-Christian churches, so
much the greater mischief, because the other apostles conformed
to the stricter view (Acts xxi. 20, ff.). Nor, on the other side,
could the Palestinian appear to the Pauline Christians in any
other light than as obtuse persons, who had not at all penetrated into the essence of Christianity (Heb. v. 11, 12).

The difference between these two parties is still more strongly manifested in the aberrations into which individuals fell from the respective positions of the parties. Among the Jewish Christians, a party always continued, who asserted the absolutely-binding nature of the Mosaic law in relation to the Gentiles. By this means many belonging to Gentile-Christian churches were led astray, so that Paul felt the necessity of combating the error (Ep. to the Galatians; Phil. iii. 2). And when persecutions befell the Christians in Palestine, shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, many of them were on the point of falling away entirely from Christianity (Hebrews vi. 4, ff.; x. 25, ff.), having been rendered impatient, partly by the long-continued disappointment of their millenarian expectations, partly because they could not decide upon a complete separation from Judaism, such as now appeared necessary.

Among the Gentile Christians, on the contrary, philosophy early began to mingle itself with Christianity. As far as we know, Apollon, a cultivated Alexandrian Jew, was the first who looked at Christianity from a more speculative point of view, and first preached it in this form with great eloquence at Corinth. Little as he desired to appear in an antagonist position to Paul, the latter declined in reputation, notwithstanding, among many of the Corinthians, and divisions arose in the church (1 Cor. i.–iv.). Paul wishes to leave it to time to disclose the value of such a philosophical system erected on the foundation of Christian faith (1 Cor. iii. 11, ff.); but he blames the divisions occasioned by it, agreeably to his manner of inculcating toleration even in regard to errors, provided they be not practically scandalous or claim for themselves exclusive adoption (Rom. xiv. 1, ff.). Afterward, however, there appeared among

---

3 Brief a. d. Hebræer erläutert v. F. Bleek, i. 60, ff.
4 Bleek, l. c. p. 423, ff.
the Gentile Christians actual errors, and those, too, of an important moral bearing, which Paul was obliged to combat with all his might.

The Christians considered themselves, in opposition to the rest of the world (ὁ κόσμος, ὁ ἀλών ὑτος, under the κοσμοκράτωρ, Eph. vi. 12, the θεός τοῦ ἀλώνος τοῦτον, 2 Cor. iv. 4) hastening in their perversity to destruction, a chosen people dedicated to God, ἄγιος, ἕκκλειτο, οἰκτος. In these appellations there was no claim to moral perfection, but a remembrance of their high calling in Christ. Though it is certain that Christianity in its first beginning imparted spiritual enlightenment to many of its adherents, and transformed them in a moral view, yet it could so much the less purify them all from the imperfections of the education belonging to their nation and time, because it is certain that many of them had been led to embrace it by superstitious or other interesting motives. This explains the reason why Paul found that he had continually to contend with even gross vices among the Gentile Christians, particularly at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 6), and ἐν Crete (Titus i. 10, 11); why James saw himself obliged to condemn the moral abuse of the Pauline doctrine relative to the power of faith, as that alone which brings salvation (Ep. of James); and why the Apocalypse (written 69 A.D.) denounces seducers in Pergamus (the Nicolaitanes), six who

---

6 As the later Jews בּוֹשֵׁךְ־בּú דan. viii. 24, cf. vii. 18, ss.
8 ἀποκ. ii. 6, 14, 15. Those who κρατοῦντες τὴν διδαχὴν Βαλαίμ (cf. Numb, xxxi. 16, and those who κρατοῦντες τὴν διδαχὴν τῶν Νικολαίτων are the same. בּוֹשֵׁךְ is derived from בּוֹשַׁה יִזְרֵל, even among the Rabbins. Buxtorf. Lex. talmud. p. 314, to which corresponds נִכְרָפָן τוֹנָא. So first Chr. A. Heumann in Actis erudit. an. 1713, p. 179. Ewald. Poscile, ii. 392. Münchener in Gabler's Journal für theolog. Liter. v. 17. Eichborn and Ewald in their commentaries on ἀποκ. ii. 6. Hence the appellation Nicolaitanes was not the common name for a sect, but one invented by the Apocalypse writer. As the names of sects were usually formed after the name of the founder, the fathers thought of Nicolaites, Acts vi. 5, who, according to Ireneaus, i. 26, iii. 11, and Tertullian de Præscr. herer. c. 46, is said to have been the founder of the party; but according to Clemens Alex. Strom. ii. p. 490, iii. p. 522, he was merely the unconscious cause of the appellation on
paid no regard to the regulations respecting food enjoined on the Gentile Christians, nor even to the prohibition of lewdness (Acts xv. 29). But after a philosophical treatment of Christianity had procured friends in many churches of the Gentile Christians, the superstitious philosophy of the times also speedily crept in among the Christians, first of all, as it would appear, in Asia Minor, and threatened morality with still greater danger by recommending chimerical, mysterious doctrines, and an arbitrary asceticism, as the true mode of purifying the soul. Against such errorists as united a Jewish-heathen asceticism with a peculiar philosophy, Paul had first to warn the Colossians (Col. ii. 8, 16, ff.). The same tendency spread itself as far as Ephesus, where it manifested itself in high-flying speculations, in prohibitions of marriage and meats (1 Tim. i. 5–7; iv. 3, 7; vi. 20), and manifestly contributed to the immorality of that place (2 Tim. iii. 6). The attempt, also, of Hymenaeus and Philetus to explain spiritually (2 Tim. ii. 18) the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, so offensive to the heathen (1 Thessal. iv. 13, ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 35, ff.), an attempt that proceeded from the same tendency, was not destitute of a moral influence at this time, when the doctrine was most intimately connected with that of retribution. That Paul did not reject philosophy as such, he has proved in his conduct toward Apollos; the philosophy against which he warns his readers (Col. ii. 8) is that science, falsely so called (1 Tim. vi. 20) which, as Paul had been

account of his words which were misunderstood by others, ὅτι παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ. (παραχρήσασθαι is, 1. to abuse, used particularly, according to Buidas de concubitu immodico; 2. equiv. to διαχρήσασθαι, to put to death, as Justin. Apol. maj. c. 49.)


10 That consciousness and feeling could not be conceived of apart from bodies, was a very common notion of antiquity. Comp. the Epicurean Velleius in Cíc. de Nat. deor. ii. c. 12; Quod (Plato) sine corpore ullo Deum vult esse—id quale esse possit, intelligi non potest. Careat enim sensu necessa est, careat etiam prudentia, careat voluptate. The heathen Caecilius in Minucius Felix, c. 11, says: Velleum tamen secelicet, utramque sine corpore an cum corporibus, et corporibus quibus, ipsiusque animas, resurgatur? Sine corpore? hoc, quod sicam, neque mens, neque anima est, nec vita est. Ipsa corpore? sed jam ante dilapsum est. Allo corpore? ergo homo novus nascitur, non prior ille reparator. Justini dial. c. Tryph. c. 1: ἀπαθεῖς γὰρ τὸ λαύθηκαν. Tertulliani Apologeticon, c. 48: Ideo repressentlytubenter et corpora, quia neque pati quicquam potest anima sola sine stabili materia, i.e., carne caed.
fore anticipated, was only the first beginning of still greater errors, of the later gnostic reveries (2 Tim. iii. 1, ff.).

In strong relief to these defects of the time, the brotherly love, the benevolence (2 Cor. viii. 1, ff.; Heb. vi. 10; xiii. 1, ff.), the patient endurance of the hostility of the unbelieving (Phil. i. 29; 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4, ff.; Heb. x. 32, ff.), and the holy zeal for Christianity, form the bright part of the picture presented by the first Christians. The church at Philippi, in its tender attachment to the apostle Paul, appears to us particularly attractive. (Comp. the Ep. to the Philippians.)

§ 30.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.


The new churches out of Palestine formed themselves after the pattern of the mother church in Jerusalem. Their presidents were the elders (πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι), officially of equal

1 The traces of Gnosis in the N.T. are exaggerated, particularly by Haur. Hammond. de Antichristo (in his diss. iv. quibus episcopatus iura adstruuntur. Lond. 1651), and in his Amnot. ad N. T. (lat. per J. Clericam. Anst. 1698, fol.) But, on the other side, C.Chr. Titmamn (tract. de vestigii Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quaest. Lips. 1773. 8), goes too far. Comp. Joh. Horn über die bibliische Gnosis. Hannover. 1803. 8.

1 That both appellations are the same follows from Acts xx. 17, 38; Tit. i. 5, 7; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8. Acknowledged by Hieronymus Epist. 82, (al. 82) ad Oceanum: Apud veteres idem episcopi et presbyteri, quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc actatis. Epist. 191, ad Evangelum see below, § 34, note 2.—Iadem ad Tit. i. 7: Idem est ergo presbyter, qui episcopus: at antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fient, et diocretur in populis: ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego antem Cephae, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernantur. Postquam vero unusquisque cos, quos baptizaverat, suos putat esse, non Christi: in toto orbe decurionem est, ut unus de presbyteris electus superponereetur castoris, ad quem omnis ecclesiae cura pertinet, et schismatis semina tolleretur. Putat aliquis non scripturarum, sed nostram esse sententiam, episcopum et presbyterum unum esse, at alid actatis, alid esse nomem officii: relegat apostoli ad Philippienses verba, diocretis. Hoc follow the above cited passages; then: Haec propterca, ut ostenderemus apud veteres cosdem hisse presbyteros, eos et episcopos: paulatim vero et dissensionum plantarum ovellentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatum. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciant, se ex ecclesiae consuetudine ei, qui sibi praepositus fuerit, esse subjectos: ita episcopi nonerint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicae veritate, presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere. Augustinii Epist. 62, ad Hieron. c. 33: Quamquam secundum honorum vocabula, quae jam ecclesiae usu obtinuit, episcopus presbyterio major sit: tamen in multis rebus Augustinum Hieronymo minor est. Cfr. Chrysostomi Hom. in Ep. ad Philipp. Theodorot. comm. in Philipp. i. 1. It is remarkable how long afterward persons maintained this view of the original identity of bishops and presbyters. Isidorus Hispal. Etymol. vii. c. 12, transcribes that passage from Hieron. Epist. ad Oceanum. Bernaldus Constantiensis (about 1088) the most zealous defender of
rank, although, in many churches, individuals among them had a personal authority over the others.2 Under the superintend-
ence of these elders were the deacons and deaconesses (Rom. xvi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 9, 10). All these officers received their support, in so far as they needed, as well as the poor, from the free-will contributions of the church (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 13). The duty of teaching as an office was by no means incumbent on the elders, although the apostle wishes that they should be διδάσκαλοι, *apt to teach* (1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24). The capacity for instructing and edifying in the assemblies was rather considered as a free gift of the Spirit (χάρισμα πνευματικόν), which manifested itself in many Christians, although in different modes (προφήτης—διδάσκαλος—γλώσσα λαλόν, 1 Cor. xii. 28–31, c. xiv.). Still less was a distinct priestly order known at this time; for the whole society of Christians formed a royal priesthood (βασιλείων εὐαγγελισμόν, 1 Peter ii. 9), God’s peculiar people (κληρον, ημών, 1 Peter v. 3; cf. Deut. iv. 20; ix. 29). The Christians met in private houses; in many cities the churches were divided into several smaller communities meeting in different places.

(Col. i. 7, iv. 19); then Archippus, supported by the reputation of his father Philemon (Col. iv. 17; Phil. i. 2); Comp. the εὐφύς γενέσθαι, Phil. iv. 3.

2 Respecting Deaconesses see Rothe, i. 243.

4 Against the division into presbyteros docentes and regentes (first made by Calvin. Inst. c. ii. § 8; verbi ministros s. episcopos et gubernatores s. seniores ex plebe defectos—afterward made a part of the constitution of the Presbyterian church) see Vitringa de Synag. vetere, lib. ii. c. 2. Neander apost. Kirche, i. 186. Rothe, i. 221.

5 Tertullianus de Exhort. castit. c. 7: Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas. Ambrosiaster (Hilarus Diaconus), about 380, in comment. ad Ephes. iv. 11: Primum omnes docebant et omnes baptizabant, quibusque diebus vel temporibus fuisse occasio; nec enim Phillipus tempus quasvis aut diem, quo esset baptismatum neque jejunium interposuerat.—Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et scripturas in ecclesia explanare. At ubi omnia loca complexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et caetera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clericis [perhaps ceteris] auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, praesumere officium quod secret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Et coeperit alio ordine et providentia gubernari ecclesia, quia si omnes eadem possent, irrationalis esset, et vulgaris res et vilissima videretur. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconis in populo praedicant, neque clericis vel laici baptizant, neque quocunque die credentes tinguntur, nisi aegri. Ideo non per omnium conveniens scripta apostoli ordinationi, quae nunc in ecclesia est, quia haec inter primordia sunt scripta.

6 ἐκκλησίας κατ’ ὅλον, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Philem. ver. 2; Col. iv. 15. N. Chr. Kist über den Ursprung der bischöflich. Gewalt, (aus d. Archief voor Kerkenlijcke Geschiedenis, Deel. 2, translated into German in Illgen’s Zeitschrift für die hist. Theol. ii. 2, 54), thinks that these churches in houses, belonging to one town, were established by different teachers, and without a common government. Baur (Pastoralbriefe, S. 78, 6) infers from Titus i. 5, that every church had but one elder, and that where several elders are represented as being in one city each governed independently a particular church. The analogy of the synagogue, however is in favor of the plurality of elders in a church; for the connection of the elders of one city into a college, and, consequently, of the churches in houses into one
In their assemblies, there was an interchange of reading out of the Old Testament, explanation of what was read, free discourse, singing, and prayer (Col. iii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 13). The letters of Paul also were read, and sent from one church to another (Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27). The covenant-supper of Jesus was solemnized in an actual evening meal (ἀγάπη, 1 Cor. xvi. 20). The kiss of charity was customary—the token of brotherly love in the assemblies (φιλήμα ἀγάπης; φιλήμα ἄγιον, Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Pet. v. 14). The other regulations of the churches were left free to each society, innocent national customs being observed (1 Cor. xi. 4); and therefore they differed in separate communities. While the Jewish Christians of Palestine retained the entire Mosaic law, and consequently the Jewish festivals, the Gentile Christians observed also the Sabbath and the passover (1 Cor. v. 6–8), with reference to the last scenes of Jesus’ life, but without Jewish superstition (Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16). In addition to these, Sunday, as the day of Christ’s resurrection (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Apoc. i. 10, η κυριακή ἡμέρα), was devoted to religious services. All bodily asceticism was valued only as a means of virtue, and left to the free discretion of individuals. Thus, fasting was looked upon as a suitable preparation for prayer (Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23); celibacy was regarded by Paul desirable on account of the distressing times impending (1 Cor. vii. 26); but this very apostle requires that all these abstinences should be left to the free choice of every one (Romans xiv. 17; 1 Cor. viii. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 3). Immoral members were excluded from the church (1 Cor. v. 12–13), repentance and improvement forming the conditions of restoration (2 Cor. ii. 5–8).

church, (even if every house-church, as every synagogue, had its particular elders), those passages speak in which the collected elders of one city appear and act as a united whole. Comp. Acts xv. 4, xx. 7; Phil. i. 1; James v. 14. Comp. Rothe, i. 180, ff. 7 On the nature of the singing see Isidor. Hispal. de eccles. orlo. i. 5: Primitiva ecclesia ita psallebat, ut modico flexa vocis faceret psallentem resonare, ita ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam cantenti (out of Augustini Confess. X. xxxiii. 2: [Alexandrinus episcopus Athanasius] tam modico flexa vocis faciebat sonare lectorum psalmi, ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam cantenti).


9 These passages furnish valid proof, when taken in connection with the fact, that the observance of Sunday is presupposed as an established custom, in Epist. Barnab. c. 15: ἐλεγε τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἕξις εἰς εὐφόρον, ἐν ἀν καὶ ὁ Ἴησοῦς ἑνήσεται ἐν νεκρών καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἕναθε εἰς τοὺς φόροις. Cf. C. Chr. L. Franke de diei dominici apud veteres Christianos celebratione comm. Halae. 1836. 8. Neander apost. K. i. 198.
The idea set forth by Christ of the union of his people with himself, and with one another in one joint body (John x. 16; xv. 1, ff.), was kept alive by the apostles (σώμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Romans xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17; xii. 13; Ephes. ii. 16; iv. 4; xii.; xvi.; Col. iii. 15: ἐκκλησία, Acts ix. 31; xx. 28; 1 Cor. x. 32; xii. 28; Ephes. iii. 10).¹⁰ This unity did not, indeed, obtain, for a long time, the corresponding external form; but it had an external opposition in the unbelieving, and an external center-point in the apostles,¹¹ who exercised a general survey over all the churches (2 Cor. xi. 28), and were co-overseers in every single church (συμπρεσβύτεροι, 1 Peter v. 1). As they had themselves divided the large sphere of their activity by the separation into apostles of the Jews and of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 7–9); so, again, did each one find in the churches he had himself founded, his narrower field of labor (Romans xv. 20), without, however, being prevented by this circumstance from being zealous for Christianity in other churches also. The first arrangement in the newly planted churches, even the appointment of elders in them, was made by the apostles themselves (Acts xiv. 23). Afterward, the officers belonging to societies of Christians were appointed by elders with the consent of the churches.¹² In the newly established churches, Paul was accustomed to transfer the first arrangement and superintendence to one of his assistants (Acts xvii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 3, ff.; Titus i. 5, ff.), who then had a routine of duties similar to those of the later bishops, though not bound to any particular church.¹³ They belonged rather to the class of teachers who, without being confined in one place, preached the gospel as opportunity offered (ἐναγελισταί, 2 Tim. iv. 5). James, the Lord's brother, occupied a peculiar position. He stood in Jerusalem, where he continued to reside, at the head of the church, in equal esteem with the apostles, and with extensive influence and reputation, quite in the relation of a later bishop, but without the appellation.¹⁴

¹⁰ Rothe, i. 282.
¹¹ Rothe, i. 302.
¹² Clement of Rome, Epist. i. 44, says, that the presbyters were at first appointed (κατασταθήσεται) by the apostles, afterward ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐλλογίσων ἀνθρώπων, συνεδρικάς τῆς ἐκκλησίας πίστος, as according to Cyprian, Epist. 52, the bishop was chosen de clericorum testimonio, de plebis suffragio.
¹³ Rothe, i. 303.
¹⁴ Gal. i. 19, H. 12; Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18. (Comp. § 25, note 2. § 86, 6, note 4.) Rothe, S. 294
§ 31. 

TIME OF THE JEWISH DISTURBANCES.

The Jewish expectations of the Messiah had constantly been most lively under the oppression of foreign rulers, and had expressed themselves among the Palestinian Jews in an Apocalyptic literature, shaped after the old Hebrew prophecies, but far surpassing these in definiteness and richness in imagery, viz.: the book of Daniel¹ (under Antiochus Epiphanes); the book of Enoch² (under Herod the Great). The times of oppression, in like manner, before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, furnished new nourishment to such expectations (4th book of Ezra).³


² Preserved in an Ethiopic version first translated into English by R. Laurence. Oxford, 3d edition, 1838. A. G. Hoffmann's Bach Henoch in vollständiger (translated from the English as far as the 55th chapter, the remainder from the Ethiopic) Uebersetzung, mit Commentar, Einleitung und Exercisen. 2 Abth. Jena. 1833, 38. Svo. According to Laurence, Hoffmann, i. 23, Gribner (Jahnhundert des Heils, i. 96) and Wieseler (die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Proph. Daniel. Göttingen. 1839, S. 163), it belongs to the first year of the reign of Herod the Great; according to Hoffmann's later opinion (ii. Ver. S. 11), to the conclusion of the Maccabean period. Lücke (Einl. in die Offenbar. Johannes, S. 60) places it in the time of the Jewish war, probably after the destruction of Jerusalem. So, in like manner, Credner (Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 719), in the time about which the Apocalypse was written. Unquestionably, Christian elements have been pointed out by Lücke (S. 75) in the book, which, however, came into it by means of a later revision. [Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, book of Enoch.]

³ The Greek original is lost. There are preserved an old Latin translation (in J. A. Fabricii codex pseudopigraphus V. T. i. 173), an Ethiopic (Primi Ezrae libri, qui apud Vulgatum appellatur quartus, versio ethiopica, nunc primo in medium prolata, et Latina angliceque reddita a R. Laurence. Oxon. 1820, 8), and a paraphrasing Arabic one (translated from English in Whiston's Primitive Christianity, iv.; its variations are also found in Fabrius, i. c. On the book comp. Corolid. Krit. Gesch. des Chiliasmus, i. 179; Lücke a. a. O. S. 72; Griefo a. a. O. i. 69; Wieseler a. a. O. S. 206. Ch. J. van der Vlis disp. crit. de Ezrae libro apocrypho, volgo quarto dicto. Amsterdam. 1829, 8. Laurence fixes the time of its writing between 28 and 25 B.C. Mick. Merkel (Vernisschte Anmerkungen aus d. Philologie, Kritik, und Theologie, Erste Samml. Leipz. 1772, S. 75, ff.) places it in the time of Vespasian. On the other hand, Corolid. Lücke, Griefo, and Wieseler, in the end of the first century. It was written by a Jew, but interpolated by a Christian hand. From the latter proceed cap. i. ii. xv. and xvi. entirely.
on the other hand, made use of the widely spread form of the
sybilline oracles, in order to oppose idolatry, and to procure re-
spect among the heathen for their people and their destiny.
The more the Christians were inclined to see the beginning of
the end in the oppressions of that time, the easier access to them
did such writings obtain, and the more readily were they imita-
ted (first Christian sybillines.).

When Jewish fanaticism pressed severely on the Christians
of Jerusalem immediately before its destruction, and even James,
the Lord's brother (69 a.d.), fell a sacrifice to it, the most of

4 After the genuine sybillines had been burnt along with the capitol, 74 n.c., and persons began to collect new sybillines, they sprang up in so great numbers that the loss in the capitol was not only replaced very soon, but Augustus could even cause such writings to be deposited in the temple of Apollo on the Palatine (Sueton. Aug. c.
31). Although at that time the possession of all soothsaying books was forbidden, yet numerous sybilline predictions were constantly circulated among the people (Tacit. Ann. vi. 19). The first certain trace of Jewish sybillines is to be found in Joseph. Ant. i. 4. 3 (cf. orac. Sybill. iii. 35). The sybillines now extant (Sybillinorum oraculorum lib. viii. ed. Jo. Opposon. Paris. 1589, ed. 3, 1607, gr. 8vo. Servatius Gallaeus. Amst. 1689. 4.
Gallandius in his Bibl. pp. i. 133: to these have been lately added, lib. xi.-xiv. in Ang
Majus scriptorum vett. nova collectio, t. iii. p. 3. Romae. 1828. 4) were usually before this time assigned to the second century, and to the Montanists; by many (Cassabon, Scaliger, Blondel) to Montanus himself. Hist conjectured their authors to be the Gnostics; Cave, Alexandrian Christians; Semler, Tertullian. Grofius regarded them as Jewish productions, after ward interpolated by Christians. G. J. Vossius, however, perceived that they proceeded from several authors at different times. Birger Thoraciinus (libri Sybillistarum veteris ecclesiae crisi, quatenus monuments christianae sunt, subjecti, Hamm. 1815, 8, and Conspectus doctr. christ. quals in Sybillistarum libris continuator, 1816, also in F. Münter Miscellanea Hafniensia i. i. 113) assumed that they had been for the greater part composed between 100 and 170 a.d., in Paphleg—some of them, too, by
Or. in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's u. Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift, i. 120, and ii. 172) the oldest of them are Jewish oracles belonging to the second century before Christ; the youngest, Christian oracles of the fifth century after Christ. The greatest part of the third book, and several sections in the fifth (i. c. i. 198, ii. 189, 194), proceed from Alexandrian Jews. Gröger (Philo. ii. 121) agrees with him in this opinion, and points out Jewish-Alexandrian dogmas in these sections.

5 According to Bleek (l. c. i. 240, ii. 232), the fourth book was composed by a Christian, about 80 a.d., probably in Asia Minor.

6 Josephus Antiq. xx. 9, 1 (also in Euseb. ii. 33), relates: “The high-priest Annas, a Sadducee, a severe and cruel man, made use of the time in which, after the death of Festus, the procurator, his successor Albinus had not yet entered on office (63 a.d.): καθεξεν συνήθους κρατοῦν· καὶ παραγαγόν εἰς αὐτόν [τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγέμενον Ἰωσὴφ, Ἰάκωβον ἄνω τινὶ, καὶ] τινὰς [ἐτέρας, ἣς παραπωμοῦσαν κατάγομαι παράκλησιν, παράκλησιν λευσθῆναι]. Many pious and zealous Jews were much dis-
pleased with this proceeding, and accused Annas before King Agrippa and Albinus. Agrippa, therefore, deposed him from the office of high-priest.” Le Clerc, however, Art. crit. ii. 223, Lardner Suppl. vol. iii. cap. 16, sect. 5, and Credner (Einl. u. d. N. T. i. ii. 581) regard, on important grounds, the bracketed words as spurious. On the other hand, Hegesippus, in Euseb. ii. 33, according to the passage given in a preceding note (4, § 96), narrates the death of James in this manner: “By his preaching he had gained over many
the members of the church fled to Pella. John repaired to Asia Minor, and there, full of the impressions which he had taken along with him from Palestine, and perceiving in these oppressions the beginning of the last events, wrote the Apocalypse (69 A.D.). This was the commencing point of a rich apocalyptic literature among the Christians.

of the people to Christ, and stood generally in the highest repute as the righteous one. Hence the scribes and Pharisees demanded of him a solemn denial of Christ: ἔστησαν οὖν τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ναὸς, καὶ ἔκραξαν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπον· δίκαιος, καὶ πάντες πείθεσθαι ὡφελομένειν, ἐπεὶ ὁ λαὸς πλανᾶται ὑπόσω Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος, ἀπάγγειλον ἡμῖν, τῇ ἡ θύρᾳ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος. (θύρα as in Rabbinc "θύρα" estimate, value. See Credner in the new Jena A. L. Z. August, 1843, S. 795. "What is the disclosure, the truth of Christ?"") Καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο φωνῇ μεγάλῃ: τί με ἐπιστράτευμεν περί Ἰσραήλ τοῦ ναὸς τοῦ αὐτοῦ; καὶ αὐτός καθῆται ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ κοιτήσεως τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἐρχεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Since now many agreed with him, the scribes and Pharisees resolved to put him to death. Ἀναβάντων οὖν κατέβαλλον τὸν Ἰάκωβον—καὶ δράσαντο λιθάζειν αὐτὸν. He was not, however, killed instantaneously, but still prayed for his murderers: Ἐαρ ἤμεν τινις ἡ αὐτὸς εἰς τῶν κυνάδων τὸ ἔξολον, ἢ ὢν ἄπειτο τὰ ἱμάτια, ἔγκεικα κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ὀικούμενος· καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ θάνατο εἰς τὸν ναὸν, καὶ ἦν αὐτὸς ἡ στήλη μένει πάντων τῶν ναῶν. And εἶναι Θεοπατοῦντος πολύωρει αὐτοῖς. In opposition to Josephus, who places the death of James in the year 63, there agree with the designation of time by Hegesippus, agreeably to which the siege of Jerusalem took place immediately after James's death, Eusebius, iii. 11 (Symeon was chosen successor to James, after Ἰακώβος martirιαν καὶ τὴν αὐτίκα γενομένην ἀλώσιον τῆς Ἰεροσολύμης), although in his chronicle he places the death of James and the inauguration of Symeon, after Josephus, in the seventh of Nero; the Clementines (so far the Ep. Clem. Rom. ad Jacob, α.1, in Catolicii Patres ap. i. 611, and Clementina Epitome de gestis S. Petri, c. 147, l. c. p. 798, announce that Peter died before James), and the Paschal Chronicle, which (ed. Bonn. i. 460) places the death of James in the first year of Vespasian's reign. Comp. Credner Einleitung in d. N. T. i. ii. 589. Rothe Anfänge d. christl. Kirche, i. 275.

7 Eusob. H. E. iii. 5. Epiphanius Haer. xxix. 7. de mensuris et ponderibus, c. 15.
8 This time is specified by Ewald Comm. in Apoc. p. 48, and Lücke Einleitung in d. Offenbar. Joh. S. 244. I can not, however, bring myself to refuse to the apostle John the authorship of the book. The author designates himself as the apostle; the oldest witnesses declare him to be so. Had the book been forged in his name thirty years before his death, he would certainly have contradicted it, and this contradiction would have reached us through Irenæus from the school of John's disciples. On the contrary, the later contradictions of the apostolic origin proceed from doctrinal prepossession alone. The internal difference in language and mode of thought between the Apocalypse, which John, whose education was essentially Hebrew, and his Christianity Jewish-Christian of the Palestinian character, wrote, and the gospel and epistles which he had composed after an abode of from twenty to thirty years among the Greeks, is a necessary consequence of the different relations in which the writer was placed, so that the opposite would excite suspicion. There is much at the same time that is cognate, proving continuous-ness of cultivation in the same author. Comp. E. Lücke Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, und in die gesamte apokalyptische Literatur. Bonn. 1832. 8vo.
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THIRD CHAPTER.

AGE OF JOHN: FROM 70-117.

§ 32.

FATE OF THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS IN PALESTINE.

Although a Jewish Christian church soon formed itself among the ruins of Jerusalem, and again selected a relative of Jesus, Symeon, to be its head, yet, after the judgment which had befallen Judaism, this church could no longer continue to be a model mother-church, and the center of Christendom. We have a proof that these Christians were continually hated by the Jews, in the composition of the work called יישוע גברון, and in the crucifixion of Symeon at the age of 120 (107). After the

1 Epiphanius de mensuris et ponderibus, c. 15. According to c. 14, the small Christian church on Mount Zion was among the few buildings that were spared.
2 Euseb. iii. 11. See § 31, note 6. Hecesippus apud Euseb. iv. 22: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον—πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θείου αὐτοῦ Συμεών ὁ τοῦ Κλοπᾶ καθισταται ἐπίσκοπος· ἵνα προσθέτων πάντες, ὅταν ἀνεψι τοῦ Κυρίου, δεύτερον. Clopas, the father of Symeon, was, according to Hecesippus in Euseb. iii. 11, a brother of Joseph. (Sophron. in app. ad Hieronymi Catal. § 6, represents this Symeon as Judas, the brother of James, and moreover the apostle Simon Zelotes. In opposition to this, see San. Bassigne Annales politico-ecclesiastici ad ann. 31, no. 72.) These Jewish Christians generally preferred to choose relatives of our Lord as presidents of their churches. So Hecesippus relates (in Euseb. iii. 30) that the grandchildren of Judas, a brother of Christ, after they had been set free by Domitian, ἤγγισαν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὡς ἐν ὧν μάρτυρος ἤνωκα καὶ ἀπὸ γένους ὠντος τοῦ Κυρίου.
3 The feeling of this is plainly expressed in the writings of this period. Barnabae Epist. c. 9: ἤ πεποίηθη, ἢπτ᾽ ἤ πεποίησαν, κατηγρηταὶ even for the Jews. The law of Moses had only a typical meaning, particularly the laws regarding meats (c. 19); the Jews are not heirs of the promises, but the Christians (c. 13, 14); the Jewish Sabbaths are not agreeable to the Lord, but Sundays are (c. 15); in place of the destroyed Jewish temple appears a spiritual temple (c. 16).
4 Samuel, the Little, is said to have composed it at the instigation of R. Gamaliel in Jafne, where the Sabaedrim met after the destruction of Jerusalem (Talmud. Hierosol. et Babylon. in tract. Berachoth). Hence this Gamaliel can not be the elder Gamaliel, but his grandson. Cf. Vitringa de Synagog. vet. p. 1047. Respecting the name דניאל, see Fuller Miscell. theolog. lib. ii. c. 3. G. E. Edzardus in ad Avoda Sara, p. 253, ss. Hieronym. Ep. 89, ad Augustin.: Usque hodie per totas Orientis synagogas inter Judaeos haeresis est, quae dicitur Mescerum et a Pharisieis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaraeos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium Dei, natum de virgine Maria, et eum dicent esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est et resurrexit: in quem et nos credimus, sed dum volent et Judaei esso et Christiani, nec Judaei sunt nec Christiani.
5 Hecesippus in Eusebii H. E. iii. 32: Ἀπὸ τοῦτων τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν καθηγοροῦσι τινὲς
death of this man, there also arose an internal division among them. An opposition in the church, which had existed since the apostolic council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), but had been hitherto restrained, now broke out openly (Thebethis);* and from the Nazaræans,† who remained steadfast in the apostolic faith, a party separated which held the Mosaic law to be binding in all cases, and Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary. To them the name Ebionites was afterward for the most part applied—an appellation originally given by the Jews, in derision, to the Christians generally.‡ A new party also arose among the Jew-


---

* Hegesippus, in Eusebii, iii. 33, says that the church enjoyed a profound peace from the death of Symeon, till the time of Trajan, and that continued to be parthenos kathara kai idiomorphos. When he designates Thebethis as the person who corrupted it (Euseb. iv. 22), the connexion does not render it necessary to understand the death of James as the point of time at which Thebethis appeared; and we must therefore refer to the point of time which was before announced in obvious terms. Least of all can the opinion of Schleemann (Clementinum, S. 460) be justified, according to which, iv. 22 should be understood of the first beginnings of heretical views immediately after the death of James; iii. 32 of the open breaking out of these heresies in the second century. The influence of a Thebethis, because he was not a bishop, can only have been an open opposition. The first beginnings of heretical views among the Jewish Christians are to be found long before the death of James in the opponents of Paul. It is still more remarkable that Schleemann, p. 488, f. did not further consider this point of time given by Hegesippus as that in which the sects arose, but places the separation of the Ebionites from the Nazaræans in the year 136. Comp. my treatise on the Nazaræans and Ebionites in Städilin’s and Tschachir’s Archiv. iv. ii. 320. Θεσσαλική, according to Codrus (Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 619), is not a person, but a collective idea, Chalad. Ναβιτον Ναβιτον opposition, reluctance, especially abhorrence of the stomach, nauseae, hence vomitus, and then generally filthy, dirt, much the same as σπλαθής. Jude 12; σπλαθή και μόχοι, 1 Peter ii. 13.

† Comp. Epiphanius Haer. 29. According to c. 7, they lived at the time of Ephiphanus, toward the end of the fourth century, in Beroea, in Syria, in Coele-Syria, in Decapolis about Pella, and in Cœrae in Basanitis (not a village, Cœrae, between Damascus and Nebias, nearer the latter. See Burchhardt’s Travels, German edition, edited by Gesenius, p. 591).

‡ Origenes c. Cels. ii. init.: 'Εξιωνιαιου χρηματίζοναι αλήθεια της Ιησου ή Χριστου παραδεξάμενοι. V. 61: Οι δυτικοι 'Εξιωνιαιοι, ήταν εκ παρθένου δημογονούς δαιμόνιον της Παρθένου, ὅπερ ουκ ευγενεθήσα, κατα των λοιπων άνθρώπων. C. 65: 'Εξιωνιαιοι ομοφόρους. These two classes can not, as Schleemann supposes, be the
ish Christians about the time of Trajan, in the countries lying eastward of the Dead Sea, by means of the diffusion of Essenism, which united with the asceticism of the Essenes the peculiar opinion that the Spirit of God associated himself differently with man, that, as the true prophet (Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Jesus), he might announce the same truth, and restore it when obscured. This party became

Gnostic and the common Ebionites. He has himself shown, p. 297, that the former could not think of a birth of Christ by a virgin: Origen also calls them Ebionites; see below, note 10. They are the Nazaraeans and Ebionites whom even Eusebius, H. E. iii. 27, groups together under the common appellation Ebionites, and at the same time obviously draws a distinction between them. The Ebionites, in a stricter sense, arose, according to Epiphanius Haer. xxx. 2, at Cocaba, and lived in his day (i. e. c. 18), in Nabathaean, Panaea, Moabitis, and Cocab. Respecting their adorants in Asia Minor, Rome, and Cyprus, of which he also speaks, see below, note 10. The derivation of the name from one Ebion, occurs first in Tertullian de Praescrpt. heret. c. 33. In the Talmud, Hierosolymit. tract. Joma, fol. 4, col. 3, appears no עבון, as Lightfoot Parergon de excid. urbis, Opp. t. ii. p. 148, asserts, but a וּבָן. Comp. my treatise, p. 297, ff. 306, ff.

9 Comp. Credner "On the Essenes and Ebionites, and a partial connection between them," in Winer's Zeitschrift f. wissensch. Theol. i. 211, 277. A. Schliemann's die Clementinen nebst den Verwandten Schriften, und der Ebionitisnum. Hamburg, 1844. According to Epiphanius, the 'Ἐσσυρχον (Haer. x.) lived in Samaria; on the other hand, the 'Ἐσσυρχον (Haer. xix.) in Nabathaean, Iturea, Moabitis, and Arethia. Hence he takes the former as a Samaritan, the latter as a Jewish sect. Doubtless the names were different merely by provincial pronunciation. The Essenes had withdrawn into these districts during the Jewish wars, in order to avoid the importunity of the Jews insisting on their carrying arms along with them. To the Essenes, i. e. the Essenes living to the east of the Dead Sea, 'Ἠλξαί, Ἡλξαίος attached himself in the reign of Trajan (Epiph. Haer. xix. 1); and remains of the party which he modified were still existing in the time of Epiphanius as a Christian sect, under the name of Συμμαχαί, living in Nabathaean and Moabitis (i. e. c. 2), also in Iturea. They were also called 'Ἐλκάεοι (Haer. liii. 1); and by Origen (in Euseb. H. E. vi. 38) 'Ἐλκάεοι. That Elxai also attached himself to the Ebionites, and a part of them followed him (Epiph. Haer. xxx. 3). Epiphanius professes even to have read the prophetic book left by Elxai (Haer. xix. 1, 3); and he had heard besides of another writing, belonging to a brother of Elxai (Haer. liii. 3) called 'Ιεσός (Haer. xix. 1). The name 'Ἡλξαί signified, according to his followers, δόμως κυαλεμένη, from ידוע and ידוע (Haer. xix. 2). Modern writers have conjectured that this name first originated from the name of the party, and have declared the name Eloeasaei equivalent to יושב לעמ (from יתנ, to deny), apostate. Baumgarten's Geschichte der Religionsparteien, pag. 371; from יתנ ינ, Nitzsch de Testamentis xii. patriarcharum, p. 5. But according to Scaliger, 'Ἐλξαί νον ἵνα Ῥοῦ καὶ Ἐσκαλος (Petavii comm. ad Epiph. Haer. xix.) According to Delitzsch (in Rudehbach's and Guericke's Zeitschrift, 1841, i. 43), the Eloeasaeus derived their name from the town Elosi, in Galilee. I believe that ידוע is an appellation of the Spirit of God which made the true prophet, and which is also called in the Clementines, Hom. xvii. 16, δύναμις ἀπάφικος. The Eloeasaeus praised this secret power as their teacher; hence arose the error of Epiphanius. If the title of the work which he possessed was ידוע ידוע, and he heard of another ידוע ידוע, the latter treating of the concealed deity as the former did of his concealed power, he may have made out of this two brothers. That this development proceeded from a confounding of the Essenes with Jewish Christians is shown by Credner, i. c. p. 312. When Schliemann denies this, because the similarity of
known beyond their own country by means of the Clementines, toward the end of the second century; and they were called sometimes Elcesaites or Sampsaeans, sometimes Ebionites; which latter was the general appellation of heretical Jewish Christians.

§ 33.

EXTERNAL FORTUNES OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE OTHER PROVINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, the heathen Christians were every where so numerous that it was no longer possible to mistake the distinction between Christianity and Judaism. Still, however, the Christians were looked upon as a Jewish sect. All the prejudices entertained against the Jews, and the hatred of the heathen, which had been strengthened against them since their rebellion, were transferred in like manner to the

the Essene creed to the Elcesaites can not be demonstrated, he forgets that the former is completely unknown to us, since it was guarded as a mysterious doctrine under the sanction of an oath, a thing which the Elcesaites had also to do (Credner's Beiträge zur Einl. in d. bibl. Schriften, i. 369). When Schleiermacher, on the other hand, designates this tendency as Gnostic Ebionitism, no objection can be made to the assertion, if Gnosis be taken as synonymous with theosophy generally. In this sense the Essenes, too, were Gnostics. But that theosophy which is in historical possession of the name Gnosis was opposed by the Elcesaites, as Schleiermacher, p. 539, himself shows. When, moreover, this same writer refers to the incorporation of the old oriental elements into Judaism, in order to explain Gnostic Ebionitism, and quotes Neander, he lays claim to the same source for it as that from which Neander derives Essaenism (see above § 15, note 9). Regarding the name of the party, I do not believe with Credner (Beiträge, S. 367) that Ossenes, Sampsaeans, and Elcesaites were the names of the three highest classes of the Essenes. The Ossenes were the Essenes east of the Dead Sea, who by degrees became Christians. These Essene Christians were styled Elcesaites from the ὙΠΕΑΤΕΩΝ, which they confessed; Sampsaeans (Epiphan. Haer. liii. 2: Ἡλεαατον ἡμενενατα Ηλιακοι from ὙΠΕΑΤΕΩΝ), probably because they turned while praying toward the rising sun, as did the Essenes. The name Ebionites which was given to them, if we may rely on the authority of Epiphanias, is with him the general appellation for all heretical Jewish Christians, and is therefore least of all adapted for a strict description.

See below § 58. From this time onward the party appears to have obtained adherents in Asia Minor, Rome, and Cyprus. Hence Origen, in Euseb. H. E. vi. 38, distinguishes the ἀναπρος τῶν Ἑλεαατῶν οἐς νεωτι ἐπανεταγένησ. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether the doctrine of this party be represented in its pure unadulterated form in the Clementines.

1 Hence in Tacitus (Hist. v. 5), while describing the Jews, traits appear which are manifestly borrowed from the Christians: Animas profici aut supplicis peremptorum asternas putant. Hinc generandi amor et moriendi contemptus.
Christians. At the same time Christianity appeared far more dangerous than Judaism, inasmuch as it was not confined, like it, to one people, but propagated itself everywhere with immense rapidity. Yet the persecutions which the Christians had to suffer from individual emperors were only partial. Vespasian (70–79) did not at all persecute the Christians as such, although they may have been harassed under his reign and that of Titus his successor (79–81) by the demand of the tax imposed on every Jew. This was still more the case under Domitian (81–96), who caused some Christians to be put to death even in Rome, and search to be made in Palestine for the posteriority of David. Under Nerva (96–98), all these provocations ceased. At the time of Trajan (98–117), appear the first traces of that popular rage against them to which, in succeeding times, so many must frequently have fallen sacrifices (Eusebius iii. 32). Pliny the younger, governor of Bithynia, where the

2 Notions of this time concerning the Christians: Tacit. Annal. xv. 44: Quos per flagitiam invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperante, per procuratorem Pontium Filatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in praesens exstitis superstitio rursus erumpent non modo per Judaeas originem ejus maii, sed per Urbem etiam, quo cursum undique statuta aut pudenda confestit celebranturque. Ouido humani generis conscius sint. Sueto. in Nerone, c. 10: Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae.


5 As Vespasian had already done (Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. iii. 12), Hegesippus, in Euseb. iii. 29, relates how the grandchildren of Judas, the brother of Christ, were brought before Domitian.

number of Christians had unusually increased, applied against them the general laws, which had been lately revised by Trajan, against forbidden societies (hetaeriae) which were really dangerous (cf. Plin. Epist. x. 42, 43; 110 or 111 A.D.). He adopted that course because no special laws had been enacted with regard to them. His account of the Christians, addressed to Trajan, which is of the highest importance toward understanding their condition at that period, led to the first legal enactment relative to the course which should be adopted, to
which, among others, Ignatius also, bishop of Antioch (116), fell a sacrifice.²

§ 34.

REGULATIONS OF THE CHURCH.


¹ Euseb. H. E. iii. 36. Trajan’s conduct toward Ignatius is not inexcusable, as Baur (Ursprung des Episcopats, S. 149) supposes, but was well considered. He sent him to be executed at Rome, partly for the sake of not provoking the fanaticism of the Christians at Antioch, by looking upon his martyrdom; partly because he thought that the tedious hardships endured on the way to the place of execution might effect a change of mind, for the apostacy of this head of the Christians must have been of the greatest consequence; partly for the purpose of terrifying the Christians on the way when they saw the sufferer. Among the various texts of the Acta martyrii Ign., that of the old Latin version is the most ancient (Cotelerii Patr. apost. ii. 171); the Greek is (l. c. p. 161) a revision, which first proceeded, perhaps, from Simeon Metaphrastes. Both may also be found in Rainart Acta mart. selecta.

² John’s exile to Patmos, an inference from Apoc. i. 9. Clemens Alex. quis dives salvetur, c. 43. Cf. Tertull. de Praesert. haer. 36: Apostolus Johannes posteaquam in quem ignem demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. That he drank off a poison-cup without injury [as Justus Barsohraz after Papas ap. Euseb. iii. 39, comp. Mark xvi. 18] is first related by Augustin in Soliloquias. Cf. Fabricii Cod. apocr. N. T. ii. 576. Thilo acta Thomae, in the notitia uber, p. 73. Tradition gave rise to the fabrication of the story concerning the cup and the baptism, that Matth. xx. 23 might be fulfilled. His death was under Trajan (Iren. ii. 29, iii. 3), according to Euseb. Chron. and Hieron. Catal. c. 9, in the third year of Trajan, 100 A.D. Traditions growing out of John xxi. 22: the one that John placed himself alive in the grave, and is only sleeping in it, Fabric. l. c. p. 588, Thilo, l. c. lxiv.; the other, that he was translated like Enoch and Elias, Pseudo-Hippolytus de consummat. mundi (in Hippol. opp. ed. Fabricius, append. p. 14) and Ephremomius Antioch. about 526 (in Photii bibliod. cod. 929, ed. Rothmagn. p. 798, ss.)—Surames: νερό, παρθένος (so ran at first the subscription to the first and second epistles of John: ἐπιστ. Ἰωάνν. τοῦ παρθένου. The Latins, afterward misunderstanding it, made out of it Epistolam ad Parthos), after the council of Nice especially ἔξωκος.—Credner’s Einl. in d. N. T. i. l. 217.
Ephesus. While the latter superintended the churches of Asia Minor, and laid the foundation of a peculiar discipline of doctrine, by instructing able disciples and by his writings, the churches of other countries lost that superintendence which they had hitherto enjoyed, by the death of the apostles and their immediate disciples. The need of unity required something to compensate for this loss; it was presented in the episcopate, 2

2 Comp. § 30, not. 1. Hilarius Diaconus (usually called Ambrosiaster), about 389, in comment. ad 1 Tim. iii. 10: Episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est. Quod enim sacerdos est; sed episcopus primus est; ut omnis episcopus presbyter sit, non tamen omnis presbyter episcopus: hic enim episcopus est, qui inter presbyteros primus est. The traces of this relation were longest preserved in Alexandria. Hieronym. Epist. 101 (al. 85) ad Evaevum (in the old editions falsely styled ad Evagrium, also in Gatarensis dist. xcii. c. 24): Apostulus perspicue docet eosdem esse presbyteros, quos episcopos.—Quaec. auctoritate? Audi testimoniun. Then Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 28, &c., are cited. Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui caeteris praeponetur, in solennitate medium factum est, ne ait quisque ad se trabens Christi ecclesiam rumperet. Non et Alexandriæ a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos (about 240 A.D.) presbyteri semper unum ex se selectum, in excelsior gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant. Quomodo si exercitus imperatorum faciat, aut diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noveint, et archiepiscopum vocent (comp. on this letter Chr. Wacechtler, acts eruditorum ann. 1717, p. 484. ss. 824, &c. With a Catholic bias P. Molkenbuhr, and after him Binterum Denkwiirdig. d. christkath. Kirche. ii. i. 72, &c. have pronounced the letter spurious). Hilarius Dinc. comm. ad Ephes. iv. 11: Primum presbyteri episcopi appellabantur, ut uno recessente sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit episcopus. Sed quia coeperunt sequentes presbyteri indigni inueniri ad primatum tenendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente concilio, ut non ordo, sed meritis crearet episcopum, multorum sacerdotum judicium constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparit, et esset multis scandalam.—Pseudo-Augustini (probably also Hilarii Diaconii) Quaestiones vet. et nov. testamenti (in the appendix tom. iii. p. ii. of the Benedictine edition), quasst. 101: Presbyterum unum intelligi episcopum probat apostolus Paulus, quando Timotheum, quem ordinavit presbyterum, inuitut, qualem debent creare episcopum (1 Tim. iii. 1). Quod est enim episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est summus sacerdos? Nam in Alexandriæ et per totam Aegyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat [Ms. Coll. consignat] presbyter. In like manner, Eustathius (Saïd Ibn Bâtrîk about 930) patriarcha Alex. in Ecclesiae suae orig. (ed. Joh. Selden p. 29): Constituit Marcus evangelista xii. presbyteros, qui nempe munerent cum patriarcha, adeo ut cum vacaret patriarchatus, eligerent unum e xii. presbyteris, iussi capiti reliqui xi. manus imposerent, eique benedicerent, et patriarcham eum crearent (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 14).—Neque desit Alexandriæ institutum hoc de presbyteris, ut scilicet patriarchus crearent ex presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri patriarchae Alexandriæ, qui fuit ex numero illo ccxxviii. Is autem vetuit, ne deinceps patriarcham presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit, ut mortuo patriarca conveniret episcopi, qui patriarcham ordinarent. In this account the part, at least, which contradicts the later discipline has certainly not been interpolated in later times (but still Gulielmus Antissiodeorenis, about 1206, Comm. ad sent. l. iv. qu. 1, de sacram. ord. sub finem, says: Quod si non essent in mundo nisi trea simplicis sacerdotes, oporteret quod ad liquis illorum consecraret alium in episcopum et alium in archiepiscopum), and so far it has a historical value. Attempts to remove from the passage what is offensive to preconceived opinions have been made by Morin, Pearson, Le Quien, Renaudot, Petavius, especially by Abrah. Ecclerosia Eutychius patriarcha Alex. vindicatus et suis restitutiones orientalibus, a responsio ad Jo. Seldeni origines, &c. Rome. 1601. 4. Manachii Orig. et antiquit. Christian. tom. iv. p. 503, ss. See on the contrary sides, J. F. Rohkopf: Vitaæ
which had been adumbrated for a considerable time in the mother-church of Jerusalem, by the position of James and his successors.\(^3\) This example was imitated especially in the neighboring churches, at Antioch in particular.\(^4\) It is true, that in the more remote churches the chief presbyters, as presidents of the college of presbyters, occupied a similar position; but they had not been as yet elevated above the other presbyters by independent privileges peculiar to themselves.\(^5\) Ignatius, through

domestic accounts of Jerome and Hilary rests the usual Protestant view of the origin of episcopacy, which is developed among the moderns (for the older literature see § 30, note 1), with different modifications by Zoiger Gesch. d. Kirchl. Verfassungsformen, p. 7. Gabler de Episcopis primae eccl. Christ. curauque origine dixit. Jenae. 1805. 4to. Neander K. G. i. i. 394. Episcopacy is said to have been established as a point of union between the ἕκκλησια καὶ ὀλίκον, which may have stood independently of each other in towns (see § 30, note 6), by J. F. Gruner de Origine episcoporum exere. Halae. 1764. 4to. Münchener Dogmengeschichte, ii. 376, and especially by N. Chr. Kist. über den Ursprung der hisch. Gewalt (in Illgen's Zeitchrift für d. hist. Theol. ii. i. 47). See on the other side Rothe die Anfänge d. christl. Kirche und ihrer Verfassung, i. 194. According to Rothe (p. 399) episcopacy was introduced as an instrument of Christian unity by the still remaining apostles at the council of Jerusalem, at which they chose Symeon bishop of Jerusalem (Euseb. ii. 11). But when the memory of this synod is preserved how can its most important transaction be forgotten? According to Baur (über d. Ursprung des Episkopats. Tübingen. 1838. 8), the heresies which first appeared in full force under the Antinoites, which brought the idea of the Catholic church into a clear point of view, gave rise to the outward manifestation of this idea by establishing the episcopate, which was looked upon as a matter of pressing necessity. The Petrine and Pauline parties were united on this point; and in the endeavor to realize the measure, the influence of the Clementines, which proceeded from the Petrine party, as well as the Acts of the Apostles, the pastoral epistles, and the later Ignatian letters, which now proceeded from the Pauline party, were working in the one direction.

\(^3\) See above, § 36, note 4. \(^4\) § 92, note 2.

\(^4\) Comp. the epistles of Ignatius, Rothe Anfänge d. christl. Kirche, i. 407. It is worthy of notice, that the bishop is always here represented as Christ's representative; the presbyters as the representatives of the apostles (ad Trallianos c. 2: Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.—ὑποτάσσεσθαι καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτερῳ, ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, cf. c. 3, ad Magnes. c. 6, ad Smyrn. c. 8); whereas, according to the view which soon after prevailed in the church, the bishops are the successors and representatives of the apostles. The Ignatian apprehension of this relation appears to have had its origin in Jerusalem, where James, the brother of Jesus, might be reckoned the representative of the latter; and in like manner, the other relatives of Jesus who were subsequently chosen presidents by the churches in Palestine, see § 92, note 2.

\(^5\) Clemens Rom. in Epist. i. ad Corinthi, c. 49, names only ἐπίσκοπον καὶ διάκονον, and finds these two classes of the clergy prophetically announced as early as Isaiah lx. 17. Hermiae Pastor, i. vis. ii. 4: Seniores, qui praesunt ecclesiae. Vis. iii. 5: Apostoli, et episcopi, et doctores, et ministri. Here the bishops are the seniors, the doctors, the teaching presbyters and evangelists, and not as Rothe, p. 408, supposes, the presbyters merely. Polycarp. ad Philipp. c. 5, admonishes, ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς πρεσβύτεροις καὶ διάκονοις, ὡς τῷ θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ. Polycarp designates himself as president among the presbyters in the beginning of the epistle: Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ παροικοῦσῃ Φιλιππαῖς κ. τ. λ.
the instrumentality of his epistles, recommended episcopacy universally, as a condition of unity, and that, too, in the most urgent terms; and thus the first presbyters soon generally moved up to the higher step as ἐπίσκοποι, although they retained besides, for a long time, the title πρεσβύτεροι. When the attempt was made, at a later period, to carry up the series of bishops, as the successors of the apostles, to the apostles themselves, the most distinguished presbyters of the earlier times were reckoned as the first bishops. In this way we explain the different accounts of the order of the first Romish bishops. The universal right to teach in the public assemblies having occasioned improprieties very early (James iii. 1), it seems to have been already in this period so limited by custom, that usually

6 Ignatius recommends submission to the episcopal authority, as something new, or at least not yet sufficiently settled, see Kist in Illgen’s Zeitschrift, ii. ii. 68. In his Epist. ad Polycarpum he addresses the latter as ἐπίσκοπον different from the πρεσβύτερος (c. 6), and exhorts him to the exercise of his episcopal rights and duties; although Polycarp himself, in his epistle written not long afterward, designates himself merely as the principal presbyter (see note 5). Thus Ignatius represents the first presbyters of the churches as bishops, and wishes to induce them to appropriate the idea of the episcopate. Thus he addresses Onesimus as bishop of Ephesus (Ep. ad Ephes. c. 1), Polycillus as bishop of Tralles (ad Trall. c. 12), Dumas as bishop of Magnesia (ad Magnes. c. 2), and an unknown person as bishop of Philadelphia (ad Philadelph. c. 1).

7 The προστάτως, who, in Justini Apol. maj. c. 65, is supposed to be in all churches, is doubtless the bishop.

8 Because they always possessed as yet the character of the presiding presbyter. Thus the bishops are included among the πρεσβύτεροι in Irenaeus, iii. 2, 2 (successiones presbyterorum; on the other hand, iii. 3, 1 and 2, successiones episcoporum). In Irenaeus Epist. ad Victor. ap. Euseb. v. 24, the earlier bishops are called ὁ πρεσβύτερος, ὁ προστάτης τῆς εἰκλησίας. Tertullianus in Apostol. c. 39, calls bishops and presbyters together, seniores.


10 Comp. § 27, note 6. First of all, Irenaeus adv. Haer. iii. 3, followed by Eusebius, iii. 2, 13, 14, 31, gives it thus: Linus (2 Tim. iv. 21 ?) + 80, Anencletus, Anecletus or Cletus + 99, Clemens (Philipp. iv. ?) + 102, Evarestus + 110. According to the Clementines, on the contrary, Clement, the constant attendant of Peter, was consecrated by that apostle bishop of Rome. This opinion is followed by Tertullian de Praescr. c. 32. Accordingly, the Apostol. constitut. vii. 46, give the following order: Linus nominated by Paul, Clement by Peter, &c. In like manner, Optatus Milev. de schism. Donatist. ii. 2. Augustini Ep. 53, ad Generosum. On the other hand, Epiphanius, xxvii. 6, represents Clement as ordained bishop by Peter, but not as having entered on his office till after the death of Linus and Anecletus. Rufinus præf. in Recognit. says that Linus and Cletus were bishops in the lifetime of Peter; and that after the death of the latter, Peter appointed Clement, shortly before his own death. According to Jerome (Catal. c. 15), most of the Latins looked upon Clement as the immediate successor of Peter. The modern Romish church assumes the following order: Peter, Linus, Clemens, Cletus, Anecletus, Evarestus. Comp. Jo. Pearson et Her. Dodwell Diss. de successione primorum Roman episcoporum, in Pearsonii opp. posth. Lond. 1688. 4. J. Ph. Baratarii Disquisitio chronol. de successione antiquissima episcoporum Rom. Ultraj. 1749. 4.
only the officers of the congregation spoke in public, although it was not formally abolished.  

§ 35.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.


Apostolic fathers is a title given to those who were the immediate and genuine disciples of the apostles, and in a stricter sense, to such of them as have left works behind. To the school of Paul belong Barnabas (comp. § 26) 1 Clement of Rome (comp.  


1 The epistle of Barnabas, which was regarded even by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome, as genuine, remained entirely unknown till, after Ussher's edition had been burned in the printing-office at Oxford, 1643, it was first published by Hugo Menardus, Paris, 1645, 4to, and with a corrected text by Iss. Vossius appended to the epistles of Ignatius. Amstel. 1646. 4to. For a long time the predominant opinion was against its authenticity, see especially Tontzel ad Hieron. Catal. cap. 6, in Fabricii Bibl. eccles. p. 38, ss. Yet Issac Vossius, Cave, Grynaeus, Gallandus, declared it genuine. Since J. E. Chr. Schmidt K. G. 437, Münchener Dögengesch. i. 111, Rosenmüller Hist. interpret. libb. sacr. i. 42, decided in its favor, this became almost the prevailing opinion, and has been defended with ingenuity, particularly by D. E. Henke de epistolae quae Barnabas tribuitur authentia, Jenae. 1827. 8vo; Bleek Brief a. d. Hebräer, i. 416; and J. Chr. Rödum Comm. de authentica epist. Barnabae. Partic. I. Hafni. 1828. 8vo. Gu. H. Haverkorn von Ryaswky Diss. de Barnaba, Arnhemiae. 1835. 8vo, has also declared in favor of the genuineness. Recently, however, certain important voices have been raised again in opposition to the epistle, as Neander (K. G. ii. 1132), Twesting (Dogmatik, i. 104), Ulmann (theol. Studien u. Kritiken, i. ii. 382), and Hag (Zeitschrift für d. Geistlichkeit d. Erzdiöse Friesburg, ii. 132, ff.; iii. 208, ff.). Dan. Schenkel (über d. Brief d. Barn. in d. theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1837, iii. 659) believes that § 1–6, 13, 14, 17, constitute the genuine original letter, and that § 7–12, 15, 16, were afterward inserted by a therapeutical Jewish Christian. On the other hand, C. J. Hefele, in the Tübing. theol. Quartalschr. 1839, i. 50, affirms the integrity of the epistle, but denies the authenticity of it in the work entitled, "das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas aufs neue untersucht, übersetzt und erklart, Tübingen. 1840. 8."—The chief ground urged against the genuineness, that the absurd mystical mode of interpretation could not have proceeded from a companion of the apostle Paul, seems to me untenable. That Barnabas was not a man of spiritual consequence, is clear even from the Acts of the Apostles. There he is at first the more prominent by virtue of his apostolic commission, in company with Paul (Acts xi. 22; xii. 5, Barnabas and Saul), but he soon falls entirely into the background behind Paul, after a freer sphere of
§ 34, note 10), to whom, in later times, many writings were falsely ascribed, and Hermas, whose work (ὁ πομήριον) inculcates moral precepts in visions and parables, in order to promote the

activity has commenced (xiii. 13, 43, Paul and Barnabas). The epistle was written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, according to chapters iv. and xvi.; and the ancient testimony of Clement, that Barnabas was the author, can not be derived from a partiality of the Alexandrian in favor of a production of kindred spirit, because the millenarianism of the letter (c. 15) could not have pleased the Alexandrian, and besides, all the interpretations do not agree with Clement, who in his Paedagog. ii. p. 221 refutes one of them, and in his Stromata, ii. p. 464 prefers another view of Psalm i. 1 to that given in the epistle before us.

2 His epistle to the Corinthians, which was usually read in the religious assemblies at Corinth, as early as the second century (Dionys. Corinhi. in Euseb. H. E. iv. 23, 6. Iren. iii. 3), is called in question without reason by Schmoller (istor. Euleit. zu Baumgarten's Unters. theol. Streitigkeiten. Bd. 2. S. 16) and Ammon (Leben Jesu, i. 335), but it has been looked upon as interpolated, by H. Bignorn, Ed. Bernard, H. Burton, Jo. Clericius (see Patrum apost. Coterellii ed. Clericii, ii. p. 133, 478, 483, and in the notes to the letter), Ksig. Mosheim, and Neander. It seems to belong to the end of the first century. In opposition to Schinkel (theol. Studien und Krit. 1841, i. 65), who places it between 64 and 70, see Schillermann's Clementinum, p. 409. The so-called second epistle, a mere fragment, is spurious (Euseb. iii. 38). These two letters, preserved only in the Cod. Alexandr., were first published by Patricius Junius, Oxon. 1633. 4to, and his incorrect text has been revised in most editions. After a careful comparison of the MS., a more correct text was given first of all by Henr. Wotton, Cautabr. 1718.

3 Namely, 1. Two letters in the Syriac language, see below § 73, note 5. 2. Constitutions and Canones apostolorum, see § 67, note 3. 3. Recognitiones Clementis et Clementina, see § 58.

4 Partly an imitation of the 4th book of Ezra (see § 31, note 3, comp. Jachmann, p. 63), it professes to be a writing of the Hermas mentioned in Romans xvi. 14 (lib. i. vi. ii. c. 4), and is quoted as scripture even by Irenaeus, iv. 3. When the opposition to Montanism began in the west toward the close of the second century (see below § 59), it lost its reputation there with those who were inclined to Montanist views, because it allowed a repentance once after baptism, and with the opponents of Montanism it fell into disrepute, on account of its apocalyptic form (Tertull. de Pudic. c. 10: Cederem tibi, si scriptura pastoris, quae solo mочекo amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidit, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum, etiam vestrum, inter apocrypha et falsa judicaretur. C. 2: Ille apocryphas pastor moechorum, and now it is declared by the Fragmentum de canone in Muratorian antiquit. Ital. iii. 892: Pastorom vero supererit temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscipit, sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo, fratre ejus. This assumption, which Irenaeus can not have known, became afterwards the usual one in the west. On the contrary, the work remained in repute among the Alexandrians, and is cited by Clement of Alex. and Origen frequently, by Athanasius several times as an authority (see Jachmann, p. 37). Origines in Ep. ad Rom. comm. lib. x. c. 31: Puto tamen, quod Hermas, ivae (Rom. xvi. 15) sit scriptor libelli iustius, qui Pastor appellatur, quae scriptura valde mibi utilis videtur, et, ut puto, divinitus inspirata. But when in later times the Ariums appealed to it (Athanasii Epist. ad Achos in opp. i. ii. 893) its reputation sank in the Greek church also. Hieronymus in Catal. c. 10: Herman, cujus apostolus Paulus ad Romanos scribens meminit—asserunt auctorum esse libri, qui appellatur Pastor, et apud quasdam Graeciae ecclesiae etiam publico legitur. Revera utilis liber, multque de eo scriptorum veterem usuapavere testimonia, sed apud Latinos paene ignotus est. Lücke Einl. in die Offenbarung Joh. p. 141, places it in the middle of the second century, Jachmann der Hirte des Hermas, Königsbü. 1835, in the beginning of it, and regards the Hermas of Paul as the author.
completeness of the church. The disciples of John are Ignatius, bishop of Antioch (see § 83, note 8), Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna († 167),6 and Papias, bishop of Hierapolis,7 of whose writings

6 Seven epistles ad Smyrneos, ad Polycarpum, ad Ephesios, ad Magnesios, ad Philadelphienses, ad Trallianos, ad Romanos (Polycarp Ep. c. 13, mentions the epistles of Ignatius in general. Iren. v. 28 cites that to the Romans, Origines prol. in Cant. Cant. and Hom. vi. in Lucam those to the Romans and Ephesians; Eusebias, iii. 36 mentions all the seven) are extant in a longer and in a shorter recension. (The latter was first published by Is. Vossius, at Amstel. 1649. 4to.) The controversy concerning their genuineness was interwoven with that respecting the origin of Episcopacy. In the older literature, which is rich in notices of the epistles, the chief work in favor of the authenticity is: Jo. Pearson. Vindicacae epistol. S. Ignatii. Cantabri. 1672. 4. The leading work against the authenticity is: Jo. Dallaeus de scriptis, quae sub Dionysi Arcop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur. Genev. 1666. 4. Recently Rothe (Anfänge p. 715) defended the authenticity. But in opposition to him, Baur (über die Ursprung des Episkopats, S. 148, ff.) asserted that those letters were composed at Rome in the second half of the second century, on the side of the pure Pauline Christianity against the Petrine Judaizing tendency which had found expression in the Clementines. Dr. J. E. Huther again defended the authenticity with reference to these doubts (Ilgen's Zeitschrift für die histor. Theol. 1841, iv. 1). As regards the two recensions, W. Whiston (Primitive Christianity revived. Lond. 1711) is the only person who has declared the longer to be the original one; while Dr. F. K. Maier (theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1836, ii. 340) is of opinion that it comes much nearer the original text. Against the latter see Rothe, I. c. p. 739, and Arndt (theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1839. i. 136). J. E. Chr. Schmidt (in Henke's Magazin. iii. 91) thought that both recensions arose from a thorough revision of the genuine text, but yet he admitted (in his Biblioth. für Kritik. u. Exegese d. N. T. ii. 29) that the shorter comes nearest to the genuine text. Nettz (theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1835. iv. 881) has repeated the same opinion. Against him see Arndt (theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1839. i. 742). The latest investigations have all turned out in favor of the shorter recension (see Rothe, Arndt, Huther, II. cc. F. A. Chr. Düsterdieck, quae de Ignatianorum epistolarum authentia, duorumque textuum ratione et dignitate hucusque prolatae sunt sententiae enarrantur et dijudicantur. Gottingae. 1843. 4. Worthy of attention are the remarks of Arndt, S. 139, respecting the necessity of revising the shorter recension after the best MSS. and other existing critical helps. Eight other pretended letters of Ignatius are certainly spurious. [See particularly “The ancient Syriac version of the epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans; together with extracts from his epistles collected from the writings of Severus of Antioch, Timotheus of Alexandria, and others. Edited with an English translation and notes. Also the Greek text of these three epistles, corrected according to the authority of the Syriac version. By William Careton, M.A., London. 1845. 8vo.”]

7 Ιωάννου μὲν ἄνωστῆς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταίρους γεγονός. Iren. v. 33, is said to have suffered martyrdom in 163, in Pergamus (Chronicon. pasch. ed. Bonn. i. 491), wrote λογίαν νυμφαίων ἔξηγης; fragments in Grabe, ii. p. 26. Houth, i. p. 1. In Euseb. H. E. iii. 36, he is called: ἀνήρ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ μάλιστα λογισταῖ ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς εἴδημον (respecting the omission of these words in some MSS. after Rufus's example, see Kimmel de Raffino, p. 236). But because he expressed very gross millenarianism in his writings (although that doctrine was older), Eusebius passes a very severe judgment upon him, H. E. iii. 39: Χιλιάδα τινά φάσον ἑτῶν ἐσθάθη μετὰ τῆς ἑκ νεκροῦ ἀνάστασιν, σωματικὸς τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείας εἴπε ταυτάτη τῆς γῆς ὑποστηρικτὴν—σώδρα γάρ τοι σμικρός ὃν τῶν
nothing but fragments are extant. The compositions attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts xvii. 34) are spurious.

§ 36.

DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE IN THIS PERIOD.

While the stricter party of Jewish Christians maintained the Jewish particularism, and therefore constantly endeavored to impose on the Gentile Christians the observance of the Mosaic law, that speculation which strove to comprehend Christianity in its peculiar nature was always becoming more powerful in other quarters. Inasmuch as a speculative basis was not yet firmly established, great freedom was allowed for it; but as soon as it trenched upon the moral and religious interests of Christianity, it was resisted, and not till then. It was principally with the wonderful person of Christ, which it endeavored to understand, that speculation occupied itself. Even here the most different tendencies were indulged in, as long as they left unimpaired the divine and human in Christ, by the union of which the atoning and model character of the life of Jesus was necessarily constituted. Hence, the Shepherd of Hermas, with its peculiar Christology, gave no offense. On the contrary, the doctrine of

---

8 Respecting them see below § 110, note 4.
1 Against this party is directed Epist. Barnabae, c. 1–16.
2 Thus an error which threatened to turn Christian liberty into licence is combated in the Epistle of Jude, which was written after the destruction of Jerusalem (Credner's Einl. in d. N. T. i. ii. 611), and in the 2d Epistle of Peter, which is an imitation of that of Jude (Credner, i. ii. 630). The false teachers mentioned in the latter epistle denied the return of Christ and the judgment (2 Peter iii. 3, 8).
3 Hermas Pastor, iii. 5, 5: Filius Spiritus sanctus est. iii. 9, 1: Spiritus filius Dei est. iii. 9, 12: Filius Dei omni creatura antiquior est, uta ut in consilio patri suo aducerit ad condendam creaturam. C. 14: Nomen illi Dei magnum et immensum est, et totus ab eo sustentatur orbis. This spirit dwells in men, i. 5, 1: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον κατοικοῦν ἐν σοί. i. 5, 6: Accipiet mercedem omne corpus purum ac sine macula repertum, in quo habitandi gratia constitutus fuerit Spiritus sanctus. The Holy Spirit is the essence of all virtues, which, iii. 9, 13, are designated under the title of virgins, and even called Spiritus sancti: non alter homo potest in regnum Dei intrare, nisi haec (virgines) induerat eum.
the Docetae was rejected, which represented Christ's humanity as a mere appearance, in the way that the Jews conceived of the manifestations of angels (δακτυλαι).

In the mean time, however, speculation relative to the higher nature of Christ and the essence of Christianity, attached itself to the more general questions respecting the creation of the world and the origin of evil. Here the Alexandrine Jewish philosophy presented itself as a pattern. The idea of the λόγος in particular was borrowed from it for the purpose of explaining the higher nature of Christ. John followed this speculation in his gospel, in order to divert it from the region of a fruitless hyper-naturalism into a consideration of the moral efficacy of the Logos. It went astray, how-

veste sua. Quinunque nomen filii Dei portat, horum quoque nomina portare debebunt: nam et Filiae nominis portat carum. Respecting the person of Christ, iii. 5, 2: A master in- trusts a faithful servant with the care of a vineyard, praecipiens, ut viribus jungeret palus. The servant does for him still more than he had been ordered. The master consults about rewarding him adhibita filio, quem carum et haereditatem habebat, et amicis, quasi in consilio advocatbat, et concludes: vos eum filio meo facere cohaeredem. The explanation, c. 5: The master is God, Filii est autem Spiritus sanctus est: servus vero, illis Filii est Dei est. Vincit autem populus est, quem servat ipse. Pali vero Nunciis (angels) sunt, qui a Domino praepositis sunt ad continentium populum ejus. C. 6: Quare autem Dominus in consilio adhibebat Filium de haereditate et bonos Angelos? Quin Nuncius (Christ) audit illum Spiritum sanctum, qui infusus est omnium primus, in corpore, in quo habitaret Deum. Cum igitur corpus illud parvis est omnis tempore Spiritui sancto: placuit Deo—ut et huic corpori—locus alicuius consistendi daretur, ne videretur mercedem servitutis suis perdiderat. A useful application, c. 7: Corpus hoc tuum custodi mundum atque purum; ut Spiritus illius qui inhabitat in eo, testimonium referat illi, et tecum fullass judicetur. The eternal Son of God is here the Holy Spirit, and there is no account of a personal union of him with the man Jesus. Against Jachmann, Hrste des Hermes, S. 79, and Schleiermacher Clementina, S. 423, who wish to defend the orthodoxy of Hermes, see Baurd Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit, i. 134.

* Later names: Phantasias, Phantasiodocetas. Opinionari. Perhaps even 1 Joh. iv. 2; 2 Joh. 7 (see Lucke's Comm. zu Johannes, 2te Aufl. i. 66). Distinctly and often in Ignatius ad Ephes. vii. 18, ad Trallianos ix. 10, ad Smyrn. 1-8: Ἰησοῦν τὸ δοκεῖν (δακτυλεῖ) φαντασίας, and in the Evang. Petri (Serapion apud Euseb. vi. 12).


* So also in the κινημα Πέτρου. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 427, Cremer's Beiträge zur Einl. in die bibl. Schriften, i. 354.

ever, even at that time, falling into that false *Gnosis* which denies the fundamental principles of Christianity, and which the apostle Paul had already predicted in its germs. The first Christian-Gnostic system was that of Cerinthus, in which, however, the Gnosis did not yet attain a consistent development, but was obliged to accommodate itself to many Jewish opinions.7

7 According to him, the God of the Jews (δημιουργός) is separated from the highest God by a series of Aemons, and the highest God was first revealed by the Aeon Christ. The Mosaic law, however, must be observed, a resurrection and thousand years' reign be expected. J. E. Ch. Schmidt Cerinth ein judaisierender Christ, in his Bibliothek fur Kritik u. Exegese des N. T. i. 181. H. E. G. Paulus historia Cerinthe in his Introdac
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INTRODUCTION.

§ 37.

STATE OF PAGANISM.


Although the emperors of this time preserved to the Roman empire external security, maintained internal order and justice, and favored the sciences, yet the old Roman morality and religious sobriety could not be restored among the degenerate people. The propensity to theosophic mysteries, consecrations, and purifications (§ 14), produced new institutions which ministered to superstition. They were no longer satisfied with the wandering priests of Isis and Cybele, the Chaldeans and Magic. In the second century, many secret rites or mysteries were spread abroad over the Roman empire in addition to the former (those of the Dea Syra, of Isis, of Mithras). Besides these, the old Eleusinian and Dionysian mysteries also came again into greater repute, though it would appear that they were variously accommodated to the spirit of the time. Abstinence from sensual pleasures was a universal condition of initiation, by which it was supposed that the people obtained a nearer communion with the deities as they passed through the different gradations of the mysteries. This period was conscious of its godless condition, but mistaking the religious moral way, it sought to obtain

purity by magic, with the aid of all kinds of external observances. We have a proof, in the horrible Taurobolium and Kriobolium which now appeared, of the extreme ingenuity of superstition. The prevailing philosophy continued to be that Platonic eclecticism which adopted and defended all superstitions, although by it a certain monotheism was elevated above polytheism, even in the view of the people generally. Among the Platonics of this time, the most distinguished are Plutarch of Chaeronea [† 120], Apuleius of Madaura [about 170] and Maximus of Tyre [about 190]. In opposition to this dogmatic philosophy, skepticism, too, was always rising to a higher degree of strength. Sextus Empiricus.

§ 38.

FATE OF THE JEWS.


The hatred of the Jews against the Romans was still more increased by the destruction of Jerusalem, and the great oppression that followed, and soon began to manifest itself in new acts of rebellion. An insurrection first broke out in Cyrenaica (115), which spread over Egypt also, and raged longest in Cyprus. Another was kindled simultaneously in Mesopotamia. Even Hadrian found relapses of these rebellions, which required

2 Numenius (about 130) peri tlagathou lib. i. (apud Eusebii Praep. evang. ix. 7): Eις δὲ των δεξιων επτάντα, καὶ σημαριέμενον ταῖς μαρτυριαι τοῦ Πλάτωνος, ἀναγινώ-

3 Maximus Tyrinus Diss. xvii. (al. i.) ex rec. J. Davissii. Lond. 1740. 4. p. 193, with reference to the different opinions of men respecting divine things: Ἐν τοσούτῳ δὴ πολλῷ, καὶ στὰς, καὶ διαφορικά, ἕνα ἑδός ἵν ἐν πάσῃ ὑμ. ὁμορρώφων νόμων καὶ λόγων, ὅτι Θεὸς εἰς πάντων βασιλεὺς, καὶ πατὴρ, καὶ θεὸς πάλαι, Θεὸς πάιδες, συνφύγης,

To this also the figurae pantheae, frequently found on gems, point.
to be combated, and appears to have been led by them to enter-
tain the idea of doing away the dangerous and exclusive nation-
ality of this people, by prohibiting circumcision.\footnote{1} As he resolved,
at the same time, to restore Jerusalem by means of a Roman
colony, a pretended Messiah soon made his appearance, who, under
the title of Bar Cochab (Numb. xxiv. 17),\footnote{2} obtained many adhe-
rents, especially by the recognition of Rabbi Akiba, elevated
the fortress Bether to be the seat of his kingdom, and endeavored
from it to drive the Romans out of the land (132). His con-
quests had already extended beyond Syria, when \textit{Julius Severus}
appeared, and, after a bloody war, put an end to the insurrection
by taking possession of Bether (135). Palestine became a com-
plete wilderness. The colony of \textit{Aelia Capitolina} rose on the
ruins of Jerusalem, but access to it was prohibited to the Jews
on pain of death. Hadrian’s prohibition of circumcision was
first abolished by \textit{Antoninus Pius}.\footnote{3}

\footnote{1} \textit{Spartiannus in Hadriano}, c. 14. \textit{Moverunt ea tempestas et Judaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia.}

\footnote{2} Called after his want of success, \textit{אֶבְרִי} \textit{רַבְּה} filius mendacii.

\footnote{3} \textit{Modestinus Justinus (about 244)} in Dig. lib. xlviii. tit. 8. l. 11: \textit{Circumcidere Judaeis filios suos tantum rescripto Divi Pii permittitur: in non ejusdem religionis qui hoc facerit, castantis poena irrogatur. Ulpianus in Dig. lib. l. tit. 2. 1. 3. § 3: Eius, qui Judaeos superstitionem sequantur, D. Severus et Antoninus honores (namely, decurionum) adipisci permiserat: sed et necessitates (the quern functiones et munera incumbent on the decu-
  riones) eis imposuerant, quae superstitionem eorum non laederent. Julius Paulus (about 232) in his sententis receptis (in Schultingii Jurisprudentia vetus antojustiniana et Hugo Jus civile antejustinianum. tom. i.) lib. v. tit. 22 de seditione 3: Civis Romanus, qui se Judaeo ritu vel servos suos circumcidit patientur, bonus ademptis in insulam perpetuo
  relegatur. Medici capitum puniantur. 4. \textit{Judaei si alienae nationis comparatos servos circumcident, aut deportantur aut capitum mentiont. Even the Samaritans were not allowed to practice circumcision, Origenes \textit{in Celsum}, ii. c. 13. p. 68. ed. Spencer.}
FIRST CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 39.

ITS DIFFUSION.

Although the Christian writers of this time manifestly speak in exaggerated terms of the spread of Christianity, yet the extraordinary progress it made can not be mistaken. In the west, it extended from Rome to western Africa, where Carthage was its chief seat. In Gaul, we find churches at Lyons and Vienne, immediately after the middle of the second century (Euseb. V. c. 1). From this country Christianity may have spread into Ger-


2 Fr. Mæsteri Primordia ecc. Africaneae. Hafn. 1829. 4. p. 6, ss. The numbers of the Christians here, even so early as the end of the second century, may be inferred from Tertullian Apoget. c. 37: Hosterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus, urbem, insulas, castella, municipia etc., and adv. Scapal. c. 5, when it is said that, in case of a persecution of the Christians, Carthage would have to be decimated. About 200 A.D. a synod was held under Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage (Cyprian. Epist. 71 and 73), which, according to Augustine de Baptism. ii. c. 13, consisted of seventy African and Numidian bishops.
many (Cisrhenana) and Britain, but only by the efforts of individuals. In the east, we find it firmly established in Edessa, so early as the middle of the second century; and from this city it had also extended itself, as it seems, into the countries lying eastward. In northern Arabia, there must likewise have been Christians so early as this period. About 180, Pantaenus went from Alexandria to India, to preach the gospel in that region (Euseb. H. E. v. 10).

§ 40

OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY BY WRITERS.

Tzschirner's der Fall des Heidenthums. Bd. 1. S. 313, ff.

The principal opponent of Christianity at this period was the Epicurean Celsus (about 150), who, in a work styled "ἀληθής λόγος," and perhaps in others now lost, collected all that could be said against it with any appearance of probability. The


4 The Christian scholar Bardaneses, about 160–170, was highly esteemed by the prince of Edessa, Abgar Bar Mann. According to the Chronicon of Edessa in Assemann Bibl. orient. i. 321, the church of the Christians in Edessa was destroyed by an inundation as early as 202 A.D. Comp. Bayer Historia Osroenae et Edess., Petrop., 1734, 4. p. 170.


6 Arabia Petreae, since the time of Trajan a Roman province under the name Arabia, its chief city being Bostra, or Nova Colonia Trajana. So early as the middle of the third century there were many bishops here, Euseb. vi. 33, 37.

7 Probably Yemen, see § 27, note 28. Comp. Redepenning's Origenes, i. 66.

1 Celsus and his work are known only by the refutation of Origen (contra Celsum libri. viii. ed. G. Spencer. Cantabrig. 1677, 4to, translated by Mosheim, Hamburg. 1745. 4to, cf. C. R. Jachmann de Cels. philosoph. diss. et fragmenta libri, quem contra Christianos edidit, collig. a Koenigsberg Ester-program. 1836. 4). Origen calls him an Epicurean (i. p. 5, εὑρίσκεται ἐπικορείως τοὺς άλλους συγγραμμάτων, ἐπικορείως τοὺς άλλους συγγραμμάτων), who, merely kept back his Epicureanism in his work (iv. p. 163, μὴ πάντων ἐμφανίσαι οὖν τοῦ συγγράμματος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ συγγραμματέον, ἀλλὰ προστασίαν νῦν πρὸς τὸν πανομοσύνης φιλοσοφόν εἰπέναι), and assumed the term of a Platonic philosopher (iv. p. 219, ἐν πάλιν πλατησίως πανομοσύνης). Doubtless because he was able to influence the religious heathen only in this way. In opposition to the opinion that Celsus was really a Platonic philosopher, which has become common on Mosheim's authority (preface to his version of Origen, p. 29, ff.), his Epicureanism is asserted by J. F. Fenger de Celse, Christianorum adversario, Epicureo-comm. Havn. 1823. 8. Tzschirner's der Fall des Heiden-
Cynic philosopher Crescens, and the rhetorician M. Cornelius Fronto (about 150), are known as the enemies of Christianity only by detached passages. Lucian of Samosata (about 180) also considered Christianity in no other light than as one of the many follies of the time, which deserved the satirical lash.

§ 41.

DISPOSITION OF THE PEOPLE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE TOWARD CHRISTIANITY.


In proportion as the peculiar nature of Christianity, as a different system from Judaism, became better known, so much the

thunus, i. 325. According to F. A. Philippi de Celsi, adversarii Christianorum, philosophandi genere. Berol. 1836. 8, he was an eclectic with a special leaning to Epicurus. According to C. W. J. Bindemann (über Celsus u. seine Schrift gegen die Christen, in Ilgen’s Zeitschr. für d. hist. Theol. 1842, ii. 58), he was a Platonist philosopher of a more liberal tendency, who agreed with Epicurus in many points. According to Origen, i. p. 28, Celsus lived κατα Αδριανον καὶ κατωτέρω. It is certain that he wrote in the second half of the second century, for he recognizes the whole of the Gnostic sects, and even the Marcionites (v. p. 272), as parties completely formed. Probably he is the same Celsus to whom Lucian dedicates his Alexander, as is assumed by the ancient scholar (see Luciani Alexander ed. C. G. Jacob, Colon. 1838, p. 8. Fenger p. 40, ss. Bindemann, l. c. 99). Origen does not know (l. p. 33, iv. p. 186) whether he is the same Celsus who wrote several books against magic, and two other books against the Christians.

2 Respecting Crescens comp. Euseb. iv. 16, where also the passages Justin. Apol. ii. c. 3. Tatian, Orat. c. 19, are quoted. Respecting Fronto see Minucius Felix. E. 9 and c. 31.

more must it have appeared, when viewed from the position of a heathen citizen, as a hostile threatening power, whose rapid diffusion was highly suspicious. The Christians saw only evil demons in the gods of the heathen; and since the worship of the gods had pervaded all forms of life, they were compelled entirely to withdraw themselves from the public and the domestic life of the heathen, from their amusements, and their works of art. Hence Christianity appeared to the heathen in the light of a misanthropic superstition. But the Christians refused even to the emperors the usual marks of divine honor paid them. They cherished among them the expectation that a near destruction was impending over all the kingdoms of the earth; and many would not assume the civil and military offices to which they were called. It was natural, therefore, that they should be looked upon as bad citizens; and however solemn was their asseveration that Christianity demanded still greater obedience.

1 Hence from the games (cf. Tertullian, de Spectaculis liber), festivities, and banquets (even the wearing of garlands was not permitted. Tertull., de Corona militis. Clemens Alex. in Paedagog. ii. c. 8), from certain professions, &c., cf. Tertull., de Idololatria liber. Neander's Antignosticus. Berlin. 1825, S. 22, ff. The same author's Kirchengesch. i. i. 450, ff. Fr. Münster's die Christinn im heidnischen Hause vor den Zeiten Constantins d. G. Kopenh. 1828, 8.

2 Minucii Felicis Octavius, c. 12, the heathen Caecilius says: Voc vero suspensi interim atque solliciti honestis voluptatibus abstinentis: non spectacula visitis, non pompis interestis; convivia publica absque voibus; sacra certamina, praecerptos cibos et delubros altari bus potus abhorretis. Sic reformidatis deos, quos negatis. Non floribus caput necitis, non corpus odoribus honestatis; reservatis usqueventa funeribus, coronas etiam sepulcri dene gatis, palliis, trepidis, misericordia digni et nostrorum deorum. C. 8: Latrocinia et lucifugna natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula.

3 Theophyl. ad Autolycum. i. 11: 'Ερείς μοι: διά τι οὖ προσκυνεῖς τῷ βασιλεία; Tertullianus ad Nationes. i. 17: Prima obstinatio est, quae secunda ab eis religio constituitur Caesarianae majestatis, quod irreligiosi dicamur en Caesares: neque imagine eorum reprobantur, neque genios de Juventae populi nuncupamus. Tertull. de Idololatria. c. 12–15, is zealous even against the illumination and decoration of the doors in honor of the emperors, cf. c. 15: Igitur quod attinget ad honores regnum vel imperatorum, satia prae scriptum habemus, in omni obsequio esse nos opertere, secundum Apostoli praeceptum, sicut et magistri et principii et potestatibus: sed intra limites disciplinae, quosque ab idololatria separuman.—Accedunt itigur quotidie lucerns, quibus lux nulla est, adfingat postibus lauros postmodum asuras, quibus ignes imminent: illis competunt et testimonia tenebrarum, et auspica poenarum. Tu lumen es mundi, et arbor virens semper. Si templis remuntiasti, ne feceris templum januanum tua.

4 How this was expressed in a manner exasperating to the heathen, especially by the Montanists, see below § 48, note 5. On this account, it appeared to the heathen politically dangerous. Justini Apol. i. 11: Καὶ ἤτοι ἀνισοκάτιστος βασιλεύς προσδοκώντων ἡμᾶς, ἀκρίτως ἀνθρώπων λέγεις ἡμᾶς ἐπελθάτε, ἡμῶν τὴν μετὰ θεὸν λέγουσιν. Espec. Tertull. de Idol. c. 17, 18. Idem de Cor. militis. c. 11. Origen. c. Celsum. viii. p. 427: Still, however, there were many Christian soldiers at this time. Neander's K. G. i. l. 404.
to the powers under which they lived, it appeared, notwithstanding, in the eyes of the heathen, accustomed as they were to a religion subordinate to political objects, a circumstance so much the more suspicious, that the Christians were constantly obliged to annex a condition, viz., that the commands of the magistrate should not contradict the Divine law. The moral impression which the doctrine and customs of the Christians must have made on the unbiased, was weakened by prejudices. The Jews, in whom an accurate knowledge of Christianity was presupposed, contributed to increase the disposition which was adverse to it. Many of the heathen recognized in the Christian doctrine much that was true, but believed that they possessed it still purer in their philosophy, and took offense at its positive doctrines. Credulous persons allowed themselves to be deceived by ridiculous fabrications respecting the objects which the Christians wor-

---


8 Justinus M. Dial. c. Tryph. 17 and 108, speaks of Jewish emissaries, who had gone out from Jerusalem into all the world, in order to calumniate Christ and the Christians. Accordingly, the Jews were particularly active about the execution of Polycarp. Epist. eccl. Smyrn. ap. Euseb. iv. 15, 11: Malestta Iouanwn proboitas, o de tho autous, elc toue tov progoventa. Respecting the curings of the Christians in the synagogues, see Justinus Dial. c. Tryph. c. xvi. 47, 96, 108, 117, 137. Hieronymus in Eus. v. 18; xlix. 7, lii. 5, in Amos. i. 11. Semisch Justia d. Martyrer, i. 28.


shiped; 11 the superstitious inferred from their oppressed condition the impotence of their God; 12 and, finally, the foreign origin of Christianity, 13 as well as the humble lot of most of its votaries, 14 were as offensive to all as the idea of an universal religion was absurd. 15 The external morality of the Christians could not fail to be perceived by the heathen; 16 and the brotherly love prevailing among them had unquestionably attracted many a feeling heart to Christianity, although it sometimes also allured low selfishness; 17 but the secret meetings of both sexes 18 gave occasion to hatred, and furnished a ground for mis-

11 Tertulliani Apologet. c. 16: Somnium quaesumus esse Deum nostrum,—crucis nos religiosis.—Alii plane humanissimae et verissimae sollemne credant deum nostrum.—Sed nova jam Dei nostri in ista civitate proximo editio publicata est, namely, pictura cum ejusmodii inscriptione: Deus Christianorum Onychochites (according to E. A. Schulzii Exercit. philolog. fasc. i. p. 30: Onychochites; according to Havercamp and Münter Primord. ecc. Afr. p. 167: Onochoitis). Is est auribus omnibus, altor pede unguilatus, liburn gestans, et toga (see Münter's Christian im heidn. Hauste, S. 18), Minucius Felix, c. 9, below note 19. Comp. above § 16, note 6.—Other fictions respecting the person of Jesus are referred to by Celsus, Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 22, ss.

12 The heathen Cacchilius says, apud Minuc. Felix. c. 12: Ecce pars vestrum et major et melior, ut dicitus, egetis, algetis, ope, re, fame laboratis: et Deus patitur, dissimulat, non vult aut non potest opitulari suis, ita aut invalidas, aut iniquas est. Nonni Romanii sine vestro Deo imperant, regnant, frumenti erbe toto, vestrique dominatur?

13 Celsus, therefore, calls it βασιλεία βασιλέων, Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 5.

14 Cacchilius apud Minuc. Felix, c. 5: Indignandum omnibus, indolescendumque est, audere quosdam, et hoc studiorum rudes, litterarum profanos, experimenta artium etiam nisi sordidavam, certum aliquid de summa rerum ac majestate decernere, de qua tot omnibus saecus sectarum plurimarum usque adhuc ipsa philosophia deliberat. Cap. 12: Proinde si quid sapientiae vobis aut verecundiae est, desinit coeli plagas, et mundi fata et secreta rimari: satis est pro pedibus adeptas, maxime iadocis, impotens, rubius, argestibus: quibus non est datum intelligere civilia, multo magis negentum est disserere divina. How the Christians drew over to themselves ignorant, humble, and immoral men, is described by Celsus with hostile exaggragation, apud Origines adv. Cels. iii. p. 144, ss.

15 Celsus (Orig. c. Cels. viii. p. 423): Εἰ γάρ δὴ οἶνος εἰς ἑνα συμφορέυμα νόμον τοὺς τῆς Ἀθήνης, καὶ Εὐρώπης, καὶ Λατίνων, Ἐλλήνως τε καὶ βαρβάρως, ἀκρι περάτων νευεμένοις!—ο ὁ τοῦτο οἴμονος οἴδαν οἴδαν.

16 The famous physician Claudius Galen (about 160) said in one of his last works (the passage is cited in a Syriac translation in Bar-Hebraei Chron. Syr. ed. Brunns et Kirsch, p. 55, from Gal. comm. in Phaedonem Platonis; more copiously in Arabic in Abu Fidae Historia antiecalina, ed Fleischer, p. 109, from Gal. de Sententia politiae Platonicae): Hominum pleisque orationem demonstratam continuam mente assequi necqueunt, quae indigent, ut instituantur parabolae. Veluti nostro tempore videmus, homines illos, qui Christiani vocantur, fidem suam e parabolis petisse. Hi tamen interdum talia faciunt, qualia qui vere philosophantur. Nam quot mortem contemnant, id quidem omnes ante oculos habemus; item quod verecundia quadam duci ab usu rerum venerarum abhorrent. Sunt enim inter eos et seminae et viri, qui per totam vitam a concubitu abstinentur; sunt etiam, qui in animis regendis coëcendisque et in acerrimo honestatis studio eo progressi sint, ut nihil cedant vero philosophantibus.

17 Lucianus de morte Peregrinii, c. 11-16.

18 Particularly nightly meetings, which were strictly forbidden by the law (see § 12, note 6), and constantly awakened suspicion.
interpreting that love, by representing it as being of an impure character, and several Christian practices as crimes, just as they had appeared in their own mysteries, and other secret societies. The steadfastness of the martyrs must, indeed, have invited every unbiased mind to a nearer acquaintance with the source of this lofty spirit; but yet an unfavorable opinion was


20 So among the Bacchanals in Rome, A.D. 185. Comp. the expressions of Livy xxxix. 13: Ex quo in promissa sacra siat, et permixti viri feminis, et nocta licentia accessorit, nili ibi facinis, nihil flagittii praetermissum, plura virorum inter seco, quem feminarum esse supræ. Si qui minus patientes dedecoris siat, et pigiores ad facinas, pro victimis immolat. &c. Catiline employed human blood as pignus conjunctionis (Sallust. Catil. 29), qui inter so did magis forent, alius ali quia factiuroris conscrib. Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 30, relates of the same person: Πάσα τενα καταθήκης, και επ' των σπαλάγχων αυτού τὰ ὁμοία ποιήσας, έπετα επισφάλεις δελτία μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων.

21 Justinus M. Apol. ii. c. 12, speaks of the impression which they had made upon him. Tertull. Apologeticus, c. 59: Nec quicquam tamen proficis exquisitor quaque crudelitates vestra, illecebra est magis sectar; plures efficuius, quoties metimus a vehis; semem est sanguis Christianorum.—Illux ipsa obstinatio, quam exprobatis, magistra est. Quis enim non contemplatione eos concutitur ad reiurandum, quid intus in re sit? Quis non, ubi requisivit, accedit? ubi accessit, pati exhertat?
entertained regarding that, too, even by the cultivated, agreeably to preconceived notions. The Jews were still protected by their peculiar national character. But the Christians were looked upon merely as ignorant and wild fanatics, who wished to destroy all established order. The cultivated laughed contemptuously at them on account of the confidence and obstinacy of their religious faith; the goelae (impostors) were inimical to them as opponents of their interest; the people hated them as despisers of their gods (άθεω, ἀσβεστίς), and in the public misfortunes saw nothing but admonitions from heaven to exterminate them.

22 Tertull. Apolog. c. 27: Quidam dementiam existimatum, quod cum possimus et sacrificare in praesentia, et illas abire, manente apud minimum proposito, obstinationem saluti praebereamus. C. 30: Propterea desperati et perditi existimamus. Autiam Comm. de Epistel disputationibus, i. c. 7: Eita ὅποιοι μνεια μὴ δύναται τις ὤν τι διατελήσῃ πρὸς τοῦτο (θῶμαν κ. τ. λ.) καὶ ὑπὸ θεον ὡς οἱ Γαλαταιοι, ὑπὸ λόγων ὡς καὶ ἀποδείξεως ἐνεχθῆ ὑπαται; Schweghäuser in his edition, Th. 2. S. 915, looks upon the words ὡς οἱ Γαλ. as a gloss. Marc. Aurel. Elc. ταυτών, xi. c. 3: Οὐκάνειν ὡς τοὺς ἤτοις, οὐδὲν ήτοι ἀποδείξειν ήρημός τινα σῶματος, καὶ ήτοι σεβασθήναι σκελεσθήναι, ἡ συμμείωσις; τὸ δὲ ἐτοιου ταῦτα, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἀνδρικῆς κρίσεως ἐρρίθηται, μὴ κατὰ ψυχήν παραταξάτω, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ, ἀλλὰ λεγομενοὶ, καὶ σεβούσι, καὶ ἔστε ἄλλον πέτας, ἀπαγωγός. Eichstätt (Exercit. Antoninius, iii.) conjectures that the words ὡς οἱ Χρ. were a later interpolation in this place.


24 How the Jews and Christians had become a proverb on this account, see Galenus de Pulsuum differentiis, lib. ii. (ed. Kühn, viii. 579) Ἐπίλαβον αὐτούς ἄνεμον κατὰ χρυσόμοντα, ὡς εἰς Μάσσον καὶ Χρυσόν διατρίβην ἄφεγμος, νόμον ἀναποδείκτων ἐκοῦσι. Lib. iii. (p. 637) Θέτων γὰρ ἀν τοὺς ἄνεμον καὶ Χρυσόν μεταδίδεις, ἡ τοῖς ταῖς αἱρείσθης προστηθήκης λατρεύοις τε καὶ φιλοκτῆσις.

25 Thus spoke the false prophet Alexander of Lobosccchios (Lucianus Alex. c. 23) to the inhabitants of Pontus, ἄθεων ἐκπεπλήθησα καὶ Χριστιανοῦ τῶν Πνεύμων, ἀεὶ ἐκλείπον ἐλθέων ἐλεύθερον. Elyce ἐθέλειν ἔλεος ἔρχετο τῶν θεῶν. And he began his consecrations with the formula (c. 37): Εἰ τῇ ἔθεσι οἱ Χριστιανοὶ ἡ Εὐποίοβερος ἦκε τάκτικος τῶν ὸργών, μεγάτω.

PERSECUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The laws against *religiones peregrinae* and *collegia illicita* still remained in force, even in reference to the Christians; but they were by no means universally and uniformly enforced. The persecutions of this period were rather the effects of the people's hatred, to which the magistrates gave way, and also of personal malevolence in those possessing official power. Hence all the persecutions of the period were confined merely to single cities or provinces. Under Hadrian (117-138) the people first began to clamor for the execution of some Christians at the public festivals. But at the representation of Serenius Granianus, proconsul of Asia Minor, Hadrian issued a rescript to the successor of the proconsul, interdicting such tumultuous proceedings. The tradition regarding this emperor, that he caused temples to be dedicated to Christ, is the more improbable, because he entertained very erroneous and unfavorable notions of the Christians. Under Antoninus Pius, the Christians were

---

1 Hence Caecilius apud Minuc. Fel. c. 8, calls them *homines deploratae, illicitae et desperatae factionis.* Tertullian Apologetic. c. 38: *Inter licitas factiones sectam istam deputari oportebat, a qua nihil tale committitur, quae de illicitis factionibus timeri solebat, etc.*


3 Lampridius in vita Sev. Alexandri. c. 43: *Christo templum facere voluit, eunuche inter decos reciperere. Quod et Adrianus cogitasse fuit, qui templam in omnibus civitatis sine simulacris jussaret fieri, quae ille ad hoc parasse dicebat.* On the other hand, Spartianus in vita Hadriani, c. 22: *Sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit.* Flav. Vopiscus in vita Saturnini, c. 8, from a work of Philogon, a freedman of Hadrian: *Hadrianus Augustus Serviano Ca. S. Aegypti, quem mihi laudebas, Serv*
disturbed afresh once and again (138–161). But the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180) was still more unfavorable to them, for in it the frequent misfortunes that befell the empire caused many outbursts of the popular fury against them; while the emperor himself endeavored right earnestly to maintain the ancient reputation of the state religion. Hence the Christians in Asia Minor suffered persecutions, to which even Polycarp...
(167) fell a sacrifice, while Justin (166) became a martyr at Rome. But the recently formed churches at Lyons and Vienne (177) suffered most. The supposed miracle of the legio Melitina (κερανθοβόλος, fulminatrix) (174) could have had less the influence on the emperor in favor of the Christians, since so many parties ascribed the merit of it to themselves. Under the barbarous Commodus (180–192), the Christians lived in peace.

---

7 Ecclesiæ Sacyrensis de martyrio Polycarpi epistola encyclios ap. Euseb. iv. c. 15, first published by Ussher, 1647, in a form somewhat longer, then printed in Cotelerii Patr. epist. and in Ruinart. On the relation of the two recensions, see Dunz de Eusebio, p. 130, ss.


9 Ecclesiarii Vienenses et Lugdunensis epistola ad ecclesias Asiae Phrygicae de passione martyrum suorum ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 1–3. To what a height the rage of the heathen proceeded, is proved, c. i. § 6, by the violation of the ancient law, de servo in dominum quaeri non licere, Cic. pro Deiot. c. 1. Tacit. Annal. ii. 30. Digest. lib. xlviii. Tit. 18, de quaestionibus.

10 The heathen writers ascribe the phenomenon partly to the conjunctions of the Egyptian Amnephis (Die Cassius in exerpt. Xiphilini, lxxvi. 8. Suidas s. v. Ἰουλιανός), partly to the prayer of Marcus (Capitolinus in vita Marc. Aureli. c. 84. Themistius in Orat. xv. p. 191, ed. Harduin). The emperor himself expresses his opinion on a coin on which Jupiter is represented hurling his lightning against the barbarians lying on the ground (Echkul Numism. llii. 61). Cf. Claudianus de sexto consulatu Honorii, v. 342. Similar occurrences are related of Alexander, Curt. iv. 7, 13; of Marius, Orissi Hist. v. 15; and Hosidius, Dio Cass. ix. § 9. The Christians, in like manner, ascribed the merit to themselves, cf. Claudius Apollinaris ap. Euseb. v. 5. Tertullian ad Scap. c. 4, and especially Apologet. c. 5: At nos e contrario edimus protectorem, sibi litteras M. Aurelii—requirantur, quibus illam Germaniam situm, Christianorum forte militum praecationibus impretrato imbru, discussam contestatur. Qui sicut non palam ab ejsmodi hominibus poenam dimovit, ita ilio modo palam disperit, affecta etiam accusatibus damnatione, et quidem tere tis. This writing, falsely ascribed to M. Aurelius, was afterward annexed to Justin Martyr’s Apology. i. In it all accusation of the Christians is forbidden under punishment of death by fire. The same thing is found in Edictum ad commune Asiae, note 4.

11 Marcia, coniubiae of Commodus, was favorable to the Christians (Die Cassius, lxxvii. 4). On the martyrdom of Apollonius, see Euseb. H. E. v. 21; Hieron. Catal. c. 42. According to Jerome, he was betrayed by a slave Severus; according to Eusebius, his accuser was immediately put to death, ὅτι μὴ ἐξελείν ἢν κατὰ βασιλέως δρον τοὺς τῶν τοιῶν μνημῶν. M. de Mandajors (Histoire de l’acad. des inscript. tom. 18, p. 235) thinks that the slave was put to death as the betrayer of his master, according to an old law renewed by Trajan; but that the occurrence had been misunderstood by the Christians, and had given rise to the tradition which is found in Tertullian and in the Edictum ad comm. Asiae (see above note 10), that an emperor at this period had decreed the punishment of death for denouncing a Christian. So also Neander K. G. i. i. 291. Certainly such a law against the denunciation of masters by slaves was passed under Nero (Die Cassius, lxviii. 769). Cf. Capitolinus in vita Pertinac. c. 9. Digest. lib. xlix. tit. 14, l. 2, § 6; on the contrary, it was also a law (Julius Paulus Sentent. receptt. tit. 16, § 4); servus, qui ultra aliquid de domino confiteatur, fides non accommodatur (cf. Digest. lib. xlviii. tit. 18, l. 1, § 5 u. § 16, l. 9, § 1); and though the case of high treason (c ausa Majestatis) was
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§ 43.

JEWISH CHRISTIANS.

(Comp. § 32.)


The Jewish Christians in Palestine were severely persecuted by Bar Cochab (§ 38), because they would not attach themselves to him;¹ and they must afterward also undergo the same oppression as the Jews generally, from whom they were not externally distinguished. These circumstances caused many of them, now that a church of heathen converts had been collected in Jerusalem, where they were forbidden to remain, to separate themselves entirely from Judaism, and to join the Christian community.² Still, however, the different parties of Jewish Christians³ continued down to the fourth century, and even later. In what way the Nazarenes and the Gentile Christians still looked upon one another as orthodox, is evident from the expla-

excepted, yet then the punishment of the slaves also was remitted, if they had made a well-grounded accusation (Cod. Justinian. lib. ix. tit. 2, l. 20). Comp. on all these laws, Gothofredus in comm. ad Cod. Theodos. lib. x. tit. 10, c. 17. J. A. Bachil D. Trajanus, sive de legibus Traiani Imp. Lips. 1747. 8. p. 73, ss. According to these principles of law, therefore, either Apollonius only, or his slave only, could have been put to death, but in no case both. Jerome does not say either that Severus was the slave of Apollonius, or that he was executed; and since Eusebius grounds this execution expressly on a supposititious law, it may have belonged only to the oriental tradition, which may have added this instance in support of the alleged law.

² Euseb. iv. 5, enumerates down to this time fifteen bishops of Jerusalem belonging to the circumcision. Probably during the dispersion of the church several of them were contemporary. Ibid. c. 6. Cf. Sulpie. Sever. Hist. sacr. ii. 31. Militum cohortem (Hadrianus) custodias in perpetuum agitare jussit, quae Judacos omnes Hierosolymae aditum accurat. Quod quidem christianae fidei proficiscerat, quia tum paene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credabant. Nimium id Domino ordinante dispositione, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiæ tolleretur. Ita tum primum Marcus ex gentilibus apud Hierosolymam episcopos fuit.
³ See respecting them above, § 32.
nations of Hegesippus on his journey to Rome, whether he arrived under bishop Anicetus (157–161). But since the Gentile Christians looked upon the Nazarenes as weak Christians, on account of their adherence to the Mosaic law, the connection between them became less and less intimate, the knowledge of their creed more indistinct; but at the same time, since they did not keep pace with the progressive development of doctrine in the catholic church, the actual difference between the two parties was greater, until at length Epiphanius (about 400) went so far as to include the Nazarenes in his list of heretics (Haer. xxix.).

\[\text{\S} \ 44.\]

\section*{Gnostics.}


The tendency of theological speculation, which was before apparent in Cerinthus (§ 36), appeared, at the commencement of this period, completely developed in the different Syrian and Egyptian systems.\footnote{Eusebius iv. 23. Hegesippus had conferred with many bishops, particularly with Primus in Corinth and Anicetus at Rome and testifies on this point: εν ἐκάστῃ δὲ διάδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῳ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει, ὡς ὁ νόμος κυρίττει καὶ αἱ προφήται καὶ ὁ Κύριος. The Nazarenes might find the life of the Gentile Christians conformed to the law, because the latter observed the precepts of Noah, see § 17, note 7, § 36, note 6. An Ebionite would have required the observance of the Mosaic law. Against Baur (Tübingen Zeitschr. 1831, iv. 171) and Schwager (Montanismus, S. 276), who thinks that he was an Ebionite, see Schliemann's \textit{Clementinen}, S. 428.}

\footnote{Justin. \textit{Dial. cum Tryphone}, c. 47.}

\footnote{Sources of \textit{Gnosis}, Lewald, i. c. p. 98, ss. The church fathers derived it from the heav.}

\footnote{Sources of \textit{Gnosis}, Lewald, i. c. p. 98, ss. The church fathers derived it from the heav.}

\footnote{Sources of \textit{Gnosis}, Lewald, i. c. p. 98, ss. The church fathers derived it from the heav.}
was the old question, πόθεν τὸ κακόν. In proportion as the idea of the highest divinity had developed itself, the less did philosophy believe itself right in venturing to consider him as a world-creator (δημιουργός), and the more strongly was it disposed to derive the imperfect good in the world from lower beings, but

then philosophy, especially from Platonism (Tert. adv. Hermog. c. 8: haereticorum patriarchae philosophi. De anima, c. 33: Plato omnium haereticorum confinentarius), and class the theosophic fancies with the heathen myths. Down to Mosheim, most writers were in favor of the Platonic origin of Gnosis. So also Tiedemann Geist der speculativen Philosophie, iii. 96. Derivation from the Jewish Cabbala, Jo. Crotch conjecturae in quaedam loca Origenes, Irenaei, &c., appended to Grabe's Irenaeus. F. Buddel diss. de haeresi Valentiniiana, annexed to the Introduct. ad histor. philos. Hebræorum, ed. 2. Halae. 1730. 8. p. 619, ss. Jacc. Basnage Histoire des Juifs, liv. iii. p. 718, ss. From an oriental philosophy (= x), especially Mosheim: comp. F. Lücke in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's, u. Lücke's theol. Zeitschr. ii. 138. From the Zend-system, Löwald, l. c. p. 196, ss. Comp. on the other side, A. L. Z. April, 1823, S. 628. The writings of Zoroaster, to which some Gnostics appeal (Porphyryus in vita Plotini, p. 10. Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 304), are unquestionably of Greek origin. From the Buddhist doctrines, by J. J. Schmidt über die Verwandtschaft der gnostisch-theosoph. Lehren mit d. Religionssystemen des Orients, vorzüglich des Buddhaismus. Leipzig. 1828. 4to. Comp. his treatises on Buddhism in the Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de S. Petersbourg vi. Série. Sciences polit. Histoire, Philologie, T. i. livr. ii. (1830), p. 89; livr. iii. p. 292, T. ii. livr. i. (1839) p. 1, 41. (See theol. Studien u. Krit. Jahrb. 1830, ii. 374.) According to Möhler (Vers. über d. Ursprung d. Gnosticismus, in his Schriften u. Aufsätzezen, i. 403), Gnosis proceeded directly and entirely from Christianity, and from a practical motive, viz. from an evangelized contempt of the world, which afterward endeavored to lay a speculative foundation for itself, and for this purpose applied all that was useful in the older systems of philosophy, theosophy, and mythology. According to Baur (Gnosis, S. 36), Gnosis, has borrowed its material substance from the religions which were given historically, its chief object being to inquire into and define the relation in which those historical elements stood to one another. Its first elements were formed among the Alexandrian Jews. Persian dualism, platonism, and Alexandrian philosophy of religion, have had their influence in originating the Christian Gnosis. It is an attempt to conceive the entire course of the world as a series of elements in which the absolute spirit becomes objective to himself, and is reconciled with himself, and has therefore nothing more similar than the Hegelian philosophy of religion. (Comp. this author's Krit. Studien über d. Begriff d. Gnosis, in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1837, iii. 511.) [An Inquiry into the Heresies of the apostolic age. By E. Burton, D.D. Oxford. 1829. 8vo.]

the evil from an evil principle. Among the speculating Christians, these ideas obtained some hold from the Christian view taken of Christianity, Judaism, and heathenism, as the complete, the incomplete, and the evil. These three religions appeared as revelations of three corresponding principles, which were first conceived in their true light from the position of Christianity. Matter (ἐλέη) was the evil principle, which had revealed itself in heathenism, and was there conceived as having sometimes an undeveloped, sometimes a developed consciousness. The creation of the world belonged, according to Gen. i., to the God of the Jews, who, commonly regarded as the first of the seven planet-princes, proceeded from the highest God only at an infinite distance, and was as incapable of willing the perfect as of restraining the opposition of matter. On the other hand, Christ revealed the high-

3 Plutarchus de Isido et Osiride, c. 45: Οὗτος γὰρ ἐν ἀγνώσει σώμασι τῶν τοῦ παντὸς ἀρχῶν θετῶν, ὡς Δημόκριτος καὶ Ἑπίκουρος, οὐκ ἀπόδειξις ἰδιοσκυρίαν ἔχει ἕνα λόγον καὶ μίαν πράξειν, ὡς οἱ Σωκράτης, περιγνωμονεύουσιν ἀπάντων καὶ κριτῶν. ἐδιδάσκαλος γὰρ ὁ φυλάκην ἄτιμον, ὲπὸ πάντων, ὡς κριτῶν, ὡς ἱστοινός ὁ θεος αὐτος ἐγκαθεσθάτης. Hence the ancient opinion of the wise men is this: ἁπ’ ὅντων ἀνενιατών ἄρχων, καὶ ἀνενιατῶν δυνάμεων—οἱ, τε βίος μετόπος, οἱ, τε κόσμος—ἀγνώσεως καὶ κοινός γέγονε καὶ μεταφθάσαι σάπας δεχόμεθα. C. 40: Καὶ δικαιοῦ τούτῳ τοῖς πλαστοῖς καὶ σώφρονες. Ἡμι-

4 οὖσαι γὰρ οἱ μὲν θεοῖς εἰσίν δόκει, καθάπερ αὐττεγχνος, τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἱερομονότος, τὸν δὲ φαίλλον δημιουργόν. οἱ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἁμείρων θεόν, τὸν δὲ ἔτερον Δαίμονα καλοῦσαν. Zosamostar calls the former Ormud, the latter Aliriman, μέσον δὲ ἁμφότερον τὸν Μιθρηνον εἰσίν—διὸ καὶ Μιθρην Πρῶτος τοῦ ἄνευν οὐκοίθεν—ἐδώδεξαι μὲν τὸ εὐκοῖτα θείων καὶ χαριτωμάς, τὸ δὲ ἀπο-

5 τρόπια καὶ σκιάπησα. Κ. 48: Χαλκάνδων δὲ τοῖς πλανοτοῖς τοῖς θεοῖς γενέσθαι, οὐς κα-

6 λοῦσαν, οἱ μὲν ἀγαθογραφοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κακοποιοῖς, μείζων δὲ τοῖς τρεις ὑποφανέναι καὶ κατοφηθοῖς. This dualism is found also among the philosophers, even in Plato, who speaks in the clearest manner concerning it, ἐν τοῖς νόμισεις (Lec. ν. τ. 609, and Tim. p. 538) ὅτι μὴ ψυχή κινεῖται τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλὰ πλασίον ἑαυτοῦ, δοῦν τὸ πάντως τοῖς ἐκλαττοῦσι: οὔκ ἔχει τὸν μὲν ἄγαθογράφον ἀφίκεται, τὸ δὲ ἐναντίων τὰτηρεῖ, καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίων δημιουργοῖς ἀπολύεται, διὸ καὶ πέτυχον τοῖς μεταξὺ φαιον, οὐς ἄφαρον, οὐδὲ ἔκλεισεν, οὐδὲ ἔδηχεν έξ αὑτῶν—ἈΛΛ’ ἀναιελημένον ἀφίκειται κατάφων, ἐφεμένην δὲ τὸν ἁμείρων άλλως τούθαναι, καὶ διακόσιαν. Similar to it is the Egyptian doctrine, in which Osiris is the good, Typhon the evil principle, and Isis that third nature. Numenius πρὸς τόνδα (in Euseb. Praep. evang. x. 18) shows that the Demominus must be distinguished from the highest God, who, as he thinks, resembles the Logos of Philo: Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον θεοῦ ἀρχῶν εἰναι, ἔργων ἐμπαντῶν καὶ βασιλείας, τὸν δημιουργοῦν τὸ δεν ἑγουμενεῖ, δ’ οὐρανοῦ λῶτα. διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ δ’ οὐλίκος ἐγέρεται, κάτω τὸν νόμον εἰκόνων ἐν ἑξακόσιον ταῖς τοῖς κοινωνεῖσθαι συντηθημένοις. And in a proceeding passage: Καὶ γὰρ οὔτε δημιουργεῖν ἡτό χρῶν τοῦ πρῶτον, καὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦντος δεν θεοὶ χρή εἰσίν καὶ νομίζεται πατέρα τοῦ πρῶτον θεοῦ.

7 Analogous to the Jewish-Christian view, according to which the heathen gods were evil angels. Keilii Opusc. ii. 584, 601.

8 The Jewish-Christian opinion of the division of the world among angels corresponded to this. Keil. i. c. p. 480.
est divinity, which, elevated above all being, had produced out of himself only the world of light, a world of blessed spirits. Human spirits, πνεύματα, are rays of light proceeding from this blessed spirit, whose object is consequently free themselves from the fetters of the Demiurgus and matter, in order that they may return into the world of light. To effect this was the object of Christ, who was thought by most Gnostics to be one of the highest spirits of light. As the means of doing so, he left behind to his genuine disciples, the γνώσης. These general ideas were carried out in special ways in the separate schools, on which account they received different forms and modifications. Among the Alexandrian Gnostics, traces of the Platonic philosophic ideas are most obvious; among the Syrian, the influence of Parseism was superadded. Among the former, the emanation doctrine was pre-eminent; among the latter, dualism. In all the schools, however, there remained a wide field for the play of fancy in making vivid to the perception the internal relations of the world of light, the origin of the Demiurgus from it, and the creation of the world. For this purpose the Alexandrian Gnostics employed, but only as an insecure guide, a representation which was borrowed from the Platonic doctrine of ideas, that the visible world, with its germs of life, is only an image and impression of the world of light. With this view the allegorical

aιτία εἶναι τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, ὃς Ἰουδαῖος λατρεύων, ἐφήθη σαὶ ἐξ ἀτελείας καὶ οὐκ ἀγάθου τυχόντος τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, τῶν συνήθετα ἐπιδεικνύεται τεθειότερον καταγέλαστα λόγον θεοῦ, ὃς φασὶ μὴ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τυχόντας, διαφόρως περὶ τούτων κινούμενος, καὶ ἄπαξ ἀπόστατες τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀγάνοτος μόνος θεός, ἀναπλασίας λατούς ἐπιδεικνύει, μεθυσκότως ἐκεῖνος ὑπουργεῖς, καὶ ὡς οὖν γεγονότα ταῦτα μὴ βλαπτόμενα, καὶ ἐτερὰ τινα μὴ βλεπόμενα, ὡς ἢ φυσικὴ αὐτοῖς ἀναδισκόμενην. New Testament passages also may have been cited by the Gnostics in favor of the distinction, ex. gr. Joh. xii. 31, xiv. 30; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. iii. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7; Eph. iii. 9, ff.

9 Plotin. cont. Gnost. e. 6: Ὁμοιοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶς τα μὲν παρά τοῦ Πλάτωνος εἰληφθεῖν τα δὲ, ὁσα κανενομοσύνην, ἑνα ἴδιαν φιλοσοφίαν θαυμάζει, ταῦτα ἑξω τῆς ἀληθείας εἴρηται.

10 Neander divides the Gnostics into those who adhered to Judaism, and anti-Jewish: see the Hall. A. L. Z. April, 1833, S. 831, and Baum's Gnosis, S. 97, ff. The latter assumes three classes: 1. Those who brought Christianity into closer connection with Judaism and heathenism; 2. Those who made a strict separation of Christianity and Judaism from heathenism; 3. Those who identified Christianity and Judaism, and opposed both to heathenism in the form of Gnosis (the pseudo-Clement. system).

interpretation of holy scripture already current could be readily united, and employed in an arbitrary manner. Moreover, all the Gnostics appealed particularly to a secret doctrine handed down to them from the apostles. The principle of the gnostic morality, *freedom from the fetters of the Demiurgus, and of matter*, led to rigid abstinence, and a contemplative life. But when the pride of dogmatism among the later Gnostics had stifled the moral sense, a part of them fell upon the expedient of giving out the moral law to be only a work of the Demiurgus, for the sake of indulgence in sensual excesses.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\)Clement Alex. Strom. iii. p. 529: Αἱρέσεις—ἡ—διαφόροις ἐξιν διδάσκοντα, ἢ τὸ ὑπότροπον ἄγουσα, ἔγκρατειν διὰ ἀσυχίας καὶ φιλανθρωπισμόν καταγγέλλοντι. Cf. ii. 411: Plutinus contra Gnostices, c. 15: ὁ ὁ λόγος ἄτομος (τῶν Γυμνικῶν)—τὴν πρόωναν μεμφόμενος, καὶ πάντως τόμως τοὺς ἐνταθὲν ἑρμόσας, καὶ τὴν ἠρτήσας—το, τε σωφρόνεντο τοῦτο ἐν γέλαις ἡμέρας, ἵνα μέλει καλὸν ἐνταθή δὴ λοιπην ὑπάρχῃ, ἀκελεῖ το, τε σωφρόνεσθαι καὶ τὴν ἐν τούς ἡθεῖς σύμφωνα δικαιοσύνην, τὴν τελευτησθαι ἐκ λόγων καὶ ἀρκεσθαι—ὁπότε αὐτοῖς καταλείπεται τὴν ἡδονήν, καὶ τὸ πεῖρα αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ οὖ κοίνον πρὸς ἀλλοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τὸ τῆς φρεάτας μόνον.

\(^{1}\)J. J. Beilermann Versuch über die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxas-Bilde. Berlin 1817–19. 3 Stücke. U. F. Kopp Palaeographia critica, P. iii. et iv. Manhemii. 1829. 4. Good impressions of many Abraxas-gems are appended to Matter's Hist. du Gnosticisme; but many of them are not of Gnostic origin. See theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1830. Heft. 2. S. 403, ff. Ἀβραασᾶ appears as a powerful incantation-name of God, as well as the Jewish Jao, Sabaoth, Adonai, even in magical formulæ whose origin is obviously heathen-Egyptian, see C. J. C. Reuves lettres à M. Letronne sur les Papyrus bilingues et grecs du Musée de Leide (à Leide. 1839. 4). Prem. lettre, p. 22, 64.
light (ἀποκατάστασις), the νοῦς united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism. Hence the followers of Basilides celebrated the festival of the baptism as the epiphany (τὰ ἐπιφάνεια, on the 11th Tybi, the 6th of January). The man alone endured the sufferings, which, like all human sufferings, were expiations of guilt contracted, though in a former period of existence. The ἀρχων of Basilides is not evil, but only circumscribed; and therefore he subjects himself to the higher arrangement of the world, as soon as it is made known to him. The later followers of Basilides, on the contrary, conceived him to be an open adversary of the world of light, and thus rejected Judaism entirely; in which, however, Basilides could perceive types and preparations for something higher. In like manner, they received into their system the views of the Docetae, and contrived by sophisms to make their moral doctrine more loose. They rendered themselves particularly odious, by supposing that they could deny the crucified One; thus they escaped persecution. The party was still in existence about 400.

II. Still more ingenious is the system of Valentinus, who came from Alexandria to Rome about 140, and died in Cyprus about 160. From the great original (according to him βαθός, προπάτωρ, προφανή), with whom is the consciousness of himself (ἐν νοο, συγγεί) emanate in succession male and female aeons (νοῦς)

2 According to Jablonksi de origine festi nativitatis Christi diss. ii. § 8, ss. (Oppenheim. ed. to Water, iii. 335), they borrowed this day from the Egyptians, who celebrated on it the inventio Osiridis. This application of the Egyptian festival, however, rests on an unfortunate alteration of the text in Plut. de Isis et Osir. c. 39. The festival of the inventio Osiridis occurred in November. See Wytenbach. animadvers. in Plut. Moralia, ii. i. 295, Wieseler's Chronolog. Synopse der Evang. S. 136. In like manner Jablonksi incorrectly infers from Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. p. 340, that the followers of Basilides celebrated not only the baptism, but also the birth of Jesus, on the Epiphany.

3 The genuine system of Basilides is given in Clemens Alexandrinus; that of his later adherents in Irenaeus, see Neander gnost. Systeme, S. 31.

4 The sources of information concerning Basilides are: the tradition of Glaukias, an interpreter (ἔφησαν) of the apostle Peter, and a tradition of the apostle Matthias.—Prophets Βαρκαθά, Βαρκόφ, Παρχόρ.—He wrote twenty-four books ἐξηγητικά, which may have also been called his gospel.

5 J. F. Buddens de Haeresi Valentiniana appended to Introductio ad historiam philos. Ebrecr. ed. 2. Halae. 1730. 8, p. 373–736. It is remarkable that Valentinus not only received the New Testament, but made constant allegorical use of it in his system. Thus he formed his system of aeons for the most part after John i. Irenaeus i. 8, 5.—His secret doctrine is from Theodades, a disciple of Paul; his hymns, discourses, and letters are for the most part lost. From the work preserved in Coptic, entitled Fidelis Sophia, has been published D. Fr. Münter Odac gnosticae, thesauri et latine. Hainville. 1812.

6 On αἰών, see Numenius sp. Enseb. P.raep. evang. xi. 10: Τὸ ἐν οἴκε ποτὲ ἐν, οἴκε ποτὲ γένηται. ἀλλ' ἐστίν ἐν ἐν χρόνῳ μὴ ωριμένῳ, τῷ ἱστάσατε μόνῳ. τὸν μὲν
or μονογενής and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ζωή, ἀν-θρωπος and ἐκκλησία, &c.), so that 30 aeons together (distinguish into the ὑδάες, δεκάς and δωδεκάς) form the πλήρωμα. From the passionate striving of the last aeon, the σοφία, to unite with Βυθόσ, itself, arises an untimely being (ἡ κάτω σοφία, ενθομομορφος, Ἀχαμώθ, i.e., πνεύμα), which, wandering about outside the pleroma, communicates the germ of life to matter, and forms the δημιουργός of psychical material, who immediately creates the world. In this three kinds of material are mixed—τὸ πνευματικὸν, τὸ ψυχικόν, τὸ υλικόν. The goal of the course of the world is, that the two first should be separated from the last, and that τὸ πνευμ. should return to the pleroma, τὸ ψυχικὸν into the τόπος μεσάτητος, where the Achemoth now dwells. In the mean time, two new aeons, Christ and the Holy Spirit, had arisen, in order to restore the disturbed harmony in the pleroma; then there emanated from all the aeons, Jesus (σωτήρ), who, as future associate (σύζυγος) of the Achemoth, shall lead back into the pleroma this and the pneumatic natures. The σωτήρ united itself at the baptism with the psychical Messiah promised by the Demiurgus. Just so is the letter of the doctrines of Jesus for psychical men. On the other hand, the spirit introduced by the Soter or Saviour, is for the spiritual. These theosophic dreams were naturally capable of being molded in many different ways; and, accordingly, among Valentinus's disciples are found many departures from their teacher. The most important of his followers were Heracleon, Ptolemy, and Marcus.

III. To the system of Valentinus was nearly allied that of the Ophites, who, perhaps, existed as a party in Egypt even before the Valentinians. Their pleroma is simpler than that of

οὖν τὸν ἑνεστῶτα εἰ τις ἐθέλει καλεῖν αἰώνα, πάγω συμβοῦλομα. (I have believed it necessary to place the μή, which stands in the usual text before γένηται, before ὡρισμένον). Thus among the Gnostics αἰῶνες are developments of the Divine Being, who, as such, are elevated above the limitations of time.

7 On πλήρωμα see Baur's Gnosis, S. 157.
8 Of his Commentary on John there are numerous fragments in the commentary of Origen.
9 His epistola ad Floram apud Epiph. Haer. xxxii. A. Stieren de Ptolemael Gnostici ad Floram epist. P. 1, Jenae. 1843, distinguishes in the letter two parts proceeding from different authors, both which, however, could not have been written by Ptolemy.
Valentinus. From the Bythus emanate the first man, the second man or the son of man, the Holy Spirit. The last gives birth, by means of the first two, to the perfect masculine light-nature, the Christ, and the defective female sophía, Ἀχαμώθ, προύνεικος. The creator of the world (Ἰαλδαβαδόθ, probably Ἐσῆς, son of chaos), the first of the seven planet princes, is ambitious and malevolent, and is therefore involved in continual strife with his mother Sophia, who endeavors to deprive him of the pneumatic natures. The Ὀφιώμορφος, the ruler of Hyle, and the cause of all evil, is an image of him. The christology of the Ophites is altogether like that of Valentinus, with this difference, that Jesus is the psychical, Christ the pneumatic Messiah. The Ophites were divided into various sects (ex. gr. Sethians, Cainites). One of them looked for the Sophia in the serpent of Genesis, and hence the name of the whole party. This continued the longest of all the Gnostic sects. (So late as 530 a.d. Justinian enacted laws against them, Cod. lib. i. tit. v. 1, 18, 19, 21).

IV. Carpocrates struck out an entirely different way. In his view, Jesus was a mere man, like Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, who had set an example of the mode in which the Gnostic must free himself from the Demiurgi (ἄγγελοι κοσμο- ποιοί), and unite with the highest divinity (μονάς). As the Carpocratians had portraits of those Grecian philosophers and of Jesus in their sanctuaries, so they built in Cephalenia a temple to Ἐπίφανες, a youth seventeen years old, the son of

14 Fragments of this work περὶ δικαιοσύνης preserved by Clemens Alex. Strom. iii. p. 512, ss. His moral principles: Οἱ νόμοι, ἀνθρώπων ὑμᾶς καλάζειν μὴ δυνάμενοι, παρα- νομεῖν ἐδίδαξεν ἡ γὰρ ἡδονή τῶν νόμων τὴν κοινωνίαν τὸν θεὸν νόμον κατέτιμεν καὶ παραπτώγει.—Κοινὴ ο δίκη ἀντανα ἀνθρώπω γνώσει, καὶ τὸ θῆλυ τῷ ἄρρητῳ κοινῆς συναγάγει, καὶ πάνθε ὑμᾶς τὰ ζωὰ κολλᾶς, τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἀνέφερον κοινωνίαν μετ' ἱσότροφος. Hence, according to page 514, at the conclusion of their agape, concubitus promiscui.
their founder, after his death. The sects of the Antitactes and the Prodichtani,\textsuperscript{15} allied to the Carpocratians, were branded like it by immoral principles.\textsuperscript{16}

\section*{§ 46.}

\textit{(Continuation.)} 2. Syrian Gnostics.

The Syrian Gnostics developed the doctrine of dualism more decidedly than the Egyptian, to which the neighborhood of Persia may have largely contributed. With this was connected their fanatical asceticism, in which they excelled the Egyptians, and their Docetic views.\textsuperscript{1} Saturninus in Antioch, a cotemporary of Basilides, taught that by the original cause (πατήρ ἄγῳνοστος) the world of spirits was created by successive steps, and placed in the lowest gradation the spirits of the seven planets (ἀγγέλοι κοσμοκράτορες). In opposition to them stood the evil principle (δ Σατανάς), who set in antagonism to the race of men of light animated by the highest divinity, a race of evil men, so that both kinds of men are continued beside one another.

In order to avoid all contact with the evil principle, the followers of Saturninus abstained from marriage and the eating of flesh. The wide diffusion of the Gnostic opinions in Syria and the countries lying eastward of it may be seen in the case of Bardesanes in Edessa (about 172),\textsuperscript{2} who, although he believed

\textsuperscript{14} On the 'Ἀντιτάκται cf. Clemens Strom. iii. p. 506. Theodoret, Haer. fab. comp. i. c.

\textsuperscript{16} The inscriptions which, as pretended, were found in Cyrene, and brought to Malta, were regarded at first as Carpocratian (cf. G. Gesenius, l. c.), but were afterward shown to be recent fabrications, like many other spurious productions, particularly Eumali Cyrenaei Hist. Libycae, lib. vi., all of which were made known by the Marquis Fortia d'Urban in Avignon. They were meant to confirm the hypotheses which this person had formerly put forth respecting an island, Atlantis, in the Mediterranean Sea, which was sunk at the flood, in which island a St. Simonian community of goods and wives is said to have prevailed. See Boeckh preface to the Berlin Lectionskataloge, Easter, 1832. Gesenius in the Hallische A. L. Z. 1835, August, S. 462. When M. J. R. Pacho, Relation d'un voyage dans la Marmarique, la Cyrénrique, &c. Paris. 1837. 4. p. 158, believed that he had found in a pit at Lanfoudéh, in Cyrenaica, traces referring to a place where the Carpocratians assembled, he was led astray by the opinions at first pronounced on those inscriptions. A cross with a serpent is a common Christian symbol, according to John iii. 14; and Catholic Christians may as well have used that pit as a place of meeting, like those at Massahkit, p. 114.

\textsuperscript{1} A. L. Z. April, 1823, S. 633, ff.

\textsuperscript{2} Bar deison (Sayer hist. Ostsch. et Edess. p. 13) lived under the prince Abgar bar Mawas, and gave up his book, περὶ εἰμικράτιος, to Antoninus Verus, of which Euseb.
in two eternal principles, derived evil from the Hyle, and held many other Gnostic tenets, was still looked upon as orthodox in that place. Cotemporary with him was the Assyrian Tatian, who had been a disciple of Justin Martyr, but after his death had returned to his native land, and founded there a Gnostic sect, which was chiefly distinguished by abstinence (Ἐγκρατίας, ἦδροπαραστάται, Aquarii), and continued till after the fourth century.

§ 47.

(CONTINUATION.) 3. MARCION AND HIS SCHOOL.

The Gnosis of Marcion, the son of a bishop of Sinope, who attached himself to the Syrian Cerdo at Rome (between 140 and 150), and developed there a system of his own, has a character quite peculiar. He assumed three moral principles (ἀρχαί), viz., the θεὸς ἀγάθος, the δημιουργὸς δίκαιος, and the ὄλη (ὁ πόνηρος, ὁ διάβολος). To free men—who had only to expect from praep. Evang. vi. 10, has preserved a fragment (reprinted in Alexandr. Aphrodisiensis, Ammonii, Plotini, Bardesanis et Gemisti Plethousis de fato quae supersunt græce, rec. et notas adiunct. J. C. Orellius. Turci. 1824. 8. p. 292, sqq.). He gained over many adherents by his hymns. The fifty-six hymns of Ephraem Syrus against heretics are important for the knowledge of his system. Cf. Bardesanes Gnostici Syrorum primum hymnologus, comm. historico-theol. quam scripsit Aug. Hahn. Lips. 1819. 8. C. Kuelmer Astronomiae et astrologicæ in doctrina Gnosticorum vestigia, p. i. Bardesanes Gnostici numina australia. Hildburghusæ. 1833. 8.

3 Tatianus d. Apolget v. Dr. H. A. Daniel. Halle. 1837. S. 255. Respecting his ἐναγγέλχων διὰ τεσσάρων, see Credner's Beiträge zur Einl. in d. biblisch. Schriften, i. 437.

4 These names, as well as the appellation Docetæ, certainly designate a heresy, which was common to many parties; but they appear to have been specially given to the followers of Tatian, because a particular sect-name for them does not appear.

the Demiuragus, according to the principles of strict justice, either condemnation or at most a limited happiness—to free them, I say, from such a yoke, Christ suddenly descended into Capernaum with the appearance of a body, and proclaimed to men the good deity hitherto unknown. Those who believe in Christ, and lead a new, holy life, from love to the good deity, will be blessed with happiness in his heavenly kingdom, while others are left to the strict justice of the Demiuragus. Marcion required of the perfect Christians a strictly ascetic life, abstinence from marriage, avoidance of all earthly pleasures, and restriction to a few simple articles of diet. But all the disciples of this school were not “faithful” (fideles); many continued catechumens for a long time. Marcion’s gospel (.evag&g;ellon) was that of Luke, mutilated according to his system; in addition to which, he used ten of the Pauline epistles (δ. ἀπόστολος), not, however, without corruption. In a work entitled “Antitheses,” he endeavored to prove the different characters of Judaism and Christianity, by means of positions from both set over against one another.

Respecting metaphysical relations, as far as they do not affect the moral interests of men, no declarations are found in Marcion. His disciples, therefore, borrowed such principles partly from the Syrian Gnostics, partly, like Apelles, from the Valentinians, so that the school of Marcion was afterward divided into many branches.


3 Even Rhodon (ap. Euseb. v. 13) says: Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρ’ ἐαυτοῖς ἱσμήματοι γεγόνασι, ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς τούτων ἀγέλας Ἀπελλάης μεν—μίαν ἀρχήν ὀρολογεῖ—ἐτεροὶ δὲ, καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ναστίς Μαριάμ, δότι ἑαυτῆς ἐλπισθήσας—ἀλλοὶ δὲ πάλαι ἐκ’ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον ἑξεκείλαιτο, περί μόνον δόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τρεῖς ὑποτελεῖται φωνές. Comp. Δ. L. Z. i. C. S. 226, ff. The thoroughly practical tendency of the true Marcionites is expressed particularly in what Apelles said to Rhodon (l. c.): Μὴ δεῖν δὲν ἔξετάζειν τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ᾽ ἔκαστον ἡ τοπιστευκαί διαμένειν. αἰσθησαί γὰρ τοῖς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐπισταμένους ἡπτικότα ὑποφαίνετο, μόνον εἶν ἐν ἑργοις ἔγχειος εὐφύκειται. τὸ δὲ πάντων ἀσφαστῶν ἐδογ- ματίζετο ἀυτὸ πράγμα—τὸ πέρι τοῦ θεοῦ. Thus it is not incredible that, as Tertullian, de Praescr. c. 30, relates, Marcion at the close of his life wished to return to the catholic Church. He may have perceived that the practical interests of Christianity were more
§ 48.

MONTANISTS AND ALOGI.


As a peculiar impress is stamped on Christianity in all countries by the national character, so also in Phrygia it could not but experience the influence of the popular tendency to a sensuous, enthusiastic worship of deity. The doctrines of supernatural gifts of the Spirit,¹ the renunciation of the earthly, and the millennial reign, were susceptible of such development.² These subjects appear to have been peculiar favorites in Phrygia very early,³ where the oppression of persecution, and opposition to the speculations of the Gnostics, may have accelerated their one-sided development. Accordingly, Montanus,⁴ at Pepusa (about 150),⁵ in an ecstatic state,⁶ began to announce, that the injured than promoted by his opposition, and that they had a sufficient support even in the catholic Church.

¹ As they continued among the Christians even after Justin and Irenaeus. Schweigler, S. 94.
² As far as Montanism proceeded out of these doctrines, Schwelger designates it as a development of Ebionitism, which had been prevalent up to that time in the church; but he arbitrarily understands by Ebionitism the entire Jewish basis of Christianity.
³ Ex. gr. Philip and his daughters in Hierapolis (to whom the Montanist Proculus against Caius refers, Euseb. iii. 31). Papin (§ 25, not. 7).
⁴ According to Didymus de Trin. lib. iii. cap. penult., he had formerly been ἱερεὺς ἔλθολα. Jerome Ep. 27 ad Marcellam calls him abscissum et semivivum. He appears accordingly to have been a priest of Cybele, a circumstance which must have become of importance in respect to his conception of Christianity. Schweigler, S. 243, would have Montanus to be a mythic personage, but younger contemporaries, the anonymous writer in Euseb. v. 17, and Apollonius, l. c. v. 18, mention him.
⁵ According to Apollonius, who wrote under Commodus, Montanus had appeared forty years before (apud. Euseb. v. 18). This is the oldest and safest account. Eusebius in his Chronicle places the commencement of Montanism in the year 172; epitaphus Haer. li. 33, in the year 133; and Haer. xlviii. 1, in the year 157.
⁶ Following the example of Philo, Justin and Athenagoras also consider the state of prophetic inspiration as an ecstasis. The former (Coh. ad Graecos p. 9) compares the prophets during it to a lyre which is touched by the Holy Spirit as the plectrum; the
Paraclete had imparted itself to him for the purpose of giving the church its manly perfection. Two fanatical women, Maximilla and Priscilla, attached themselves to him as prophetesses; and thus a party was formed, the adherents of which, vainly presuming that they alone possessed the last revelations of the Spirit, as πνευματικοί, full of spiritual arrogance, looked down upon other Christians as ψυχικοί. These new prophets did not wish to alter the received creed, but to confirm it anew. On the other hand they prescribed new and rigorous fasts, forbade second marriage, attributed extraordinary value to celibacy and martyrdom, manifested profound contempt for every thing earthly, and taught that incontinence, murder, and idolatry, though they did not exclude from the grace of God (Tertullian de pudic. c. 3), shut a person out forever from the church. At the same time, they were not afraid to proclaim

latter (Legat. p. 9) compares them in the same sense to a flute (Schwegler, S. 100). In like manner the Holy Spirit, through Montanus, describes the ecstasy of the Montanist prophets, αυτος Epiph. Haer. xlviii. 4: ὕπο ἄνθρωπος ὑπελάχυρα, κάθω παραμαί παρελθών ἄνθρωπος κομίζοι, κάθω γορυφορώ: ἵποι κυρίως λατιν ξειστάνουν καρδίας ἄνθρωπων, καὶ ἄνθρωπος καρδίας ἄνθρωπος. Tertullian calls the ecstasy which he explains by amensia (lib. de anima c. 11) Sancti Spiritus vis, operatrix prophetiae. That which he describes bears a striking resemblance to magnetic clairvoyance (I. c. c. 9): Est hodie soror apud nos revelationum charismata sortita, quas in Ecclesia inter dominica solemnna per ecstasim in spiritu patitur, conversatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cunctum Domino, et videt et audit sacramenta, et quorundam corda dinoecit, et medicinas desiderantibus submitit, &c. A similarity also to the speaking with tongues among the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv.) can not but be noticed. Schwegler, S. 83.

7 The Montanists had not an uninterrupted series of prophets. The Anon. ap. Euseb. v. 17, wrote in the 14th year after the death of Maximilla, and says that since then none had boasted of the gift of prophecy. But in the time of Tertullian there was again a Montanist prophetess in Africa, see note 6.

8 So Tertullian ad. Praxeas. c. 2. § 13, appeals to the prophecies of the Paraclete in favor of his doctrine of the Trinity. Schwegler, S. 8.

9 At first there were two yearly, each one continuing a week, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday (Tertullian de jejun. c. 15) afterward three (Hieron. Ep. 27 ad Marcellinum), in case the third be not the usual ecclesiastical quadragesimal fast, as Valesius ad Euseb. v. 18, and Schwegler suppose, and which, therefore, Tertullian has not reckoned.

10 Tertull. de virginibus velandis c. 1: Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola imbibis, et irreformabilis.—Caetera jam discipline et conversationis admittant novitatem correctionis: cum propteram Paracletam miserit Dominus, ut, quoniam humana mediocritas omnem semel capere non poterat, paulatim diregeretur et ordinaretur et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina ab illo vicario Dei Spiritui Sancto. From John xvi. he draws the conclusion that the administratio Paracleti is, quod disciplina dirigatur, quod scripturae revelentur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficiatur. Just as in nature every thing ripens gradually, sio et justitia—primo fuit in radimentis, natura decem motu. Dehinc per legem et prophetas promovit in infundiam. Dehinc per Evangelium efferuit in juventatem. Nunc per Paracletum compostur in maturitatem. Compare the other writings of Tertullian in defense of single monastic institutions, de exhortat. castitatis, de monogamia, de fuga in persecutione, de jejunio adv. Psychicos, de pudicicia.
aloud the end of the world, and the millennial reign as near at hand.\(^{11}\) By this means they excited first of all dislike and opposition in their vicinity. Their opponents were satisfied for the most part with disputing their prophetic gift as not genuine;\(^{12}\) and on this ground alone they were excluded from communion by the churches of Asia Minor.\(^{13}\) Some, however, led on by opposition to farther inquiry, began to reject even the support which Montanism had in the doctrines of the church at that time.\(^{14}\) In this respect, those afterward called Alogi went

---

\(^{11}\) Maximilla announced, according to Euseb. v. 16, 8: Πολλοίς ἐσθεθαὶ καὶ ἐκκαταστα-σίας, according to Epiph. Haer. xlviii. 2: ὅτε μετ᾽ ἐμὲ προφήτες φύκτει ἵσταται, ἡλλὰ συν-τελεία. Priscilla or Qinithilla apud Epiph. Haer. xlix. 1: Ἐν ἑδρεί γεγονός ἐπιχειρηματικός ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῷ ἠκρυβεὐκα εἰς τὸν Ἱησοῦν ἐδοξασθήναι τῷ τὸν καταστα-σίαν. A collection of Montanist predictions in Wernsdorf de Montanista, § 4, others besides in Didymus Alex. de trinit. lib. iii. cap. penult. Cf. Tertullian, de resurrect. canis, c. 63: At enim Deus omnispotens—offendens in novissimis diebus de suo spiritu in omnem carmen, in servos suos et ancillae, et fidem laborantem resurrectionis carnis animavit, et pristinum instrumenta manifestis verborum et sensum luminibus ab omni ambiguitates ob-secratae purgavit.—(Spiritus sanctus) jam omnes retro ambiguitates et quas volunt parabo-lias, aperta atque perspicua totius sacramentorum praedicationis discursit, per novam propheticam de paraclito inaudiment. The same, in a fragment in the Praedestinatus Haer. 26: Hoc solum discrepanus (a Psychici), quod secundus nuptias non recipimus, et prophetiam Montani de futuro judicio non receptamus. How fanatical they were in their expectations may be seen in Tertullian, de spectaculis, c. 39: Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est, adventus Domini jam inebriati, jam superbi, jam triumphantis!—Quid admirae, quid videam, ubi gaudeam, ubi exultem, tot spectantes rege, qui in coelum recepti mundabitur, cum Ipso Jove et ipsis suis testibus in imis tenebris congregentescntes! Item praesides, persecutores do- minici nominis, saevo ritibus quam ipsi contra Christianos saevierunt flammas insulans libriquescentes! praeterea sapientes illis philosophos coram diciscipulis suis una confagranthibus orbescenentes, &c. Tertullian's last work, de spec fidelium, mentioned by him, adv. Marciou iii. c. 24, was exclusively devoted to this object.

\(^{12}\) Eusebius, iv. 27, and v. 16–19, mentions the polemic writings of Claudius Apollinaris, Miltiades, an anonymous person (who, according to Jerome, Cat. c. 37 and 39, was Rhodon; by several modern authors incorrectly supposed to be Asterius Urbannus, cf. Wernsdorf de Montanista, p. 4), Apollonius, and Serapios, and gives extracts from the last three.—The ἐκκατασία of the Montanist prophets gave special offense. It was asserted in opposition that all ἐκκατασία is an inspiration proceeding from demons, cf. Anonymous apud Euseb. v. 16, 3, and Miltiades σύγγραμμα περὶ τὸν ἢ δὲν προφήτη ἐν ἑκκατάσει λαλεῖν (Euseb. v. 17, 1). Tertull. adv. Marciou. iv. c. 22: Defendimur, in causa novae prophetiae, gratiae eca-stit, id est amentiam, conveniunt. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam Dei conspici, vel cum per ipsum Dei loquitor, necessa est excidit sensa, obnubritus collicet virtute divina: de quo inter nos et Psychicos quaecist est. According to Jerome, Cat. c. 33, Tertullian wrote de ecstasi libros vi.

\(^{13}\) Anonymous ap. Euseb. v. 16, 5.

\(^{14}\) To this number appear to belong the rejecters of Chiliasm, of whom Irenaeus, v. c. 31, says: Quidam ex his, qui putavissent recto credideris, supergenebritant ordinem promotionis justorum,—haeretici sensus in se habentes; and 32: Transverterunt quorundam sentimenta ab haeretica sermoneibus, &c. Further, the rejecters of the Apocalypse, of whom Dionysius Alex. περὶ ἐπιγεγείων apud Euseb. vii. c. 25, says: ΤιγETS mEN σΧ τον προ ἢmul 6βετηραν καὶ ἀνεσκαφαν πάπη το βιβλιων κ. τ. λ., who went so far as to hold Cerinthus to be the author.
farthest, who not only denied the continuance of charismata in the church, and millennialism, but rejected the Apocalypse, and even the gospel of John.\textsuperscript{15}

This very mode of opposition, against which, even in Asia Minor, Melito, bishop of Sardis, presented himself as an antagonist,\textsuperscript{16} contributed largely, perhaps, to procure Montanism many friends in the west.\textsuperscript{17} The western churches never declared themselves exclusively in favor of any of the conflicting parties in Asia;\textsuperscript{18} and thus the principles of the Montanists, which were, after all, only the carrying out of orthodox doctrines, could be diffused there,\textsuperscript{19} without the necessity of a Montanist party separating itself from the rest of the church.

The Montanists in Asia, who had their peculiar ecclesiastical

\textsuperscript{18} Compare especially the above cited work of Merkel, whom also Olshausen (Aechtheit der vier canon. Evang. S. 234, ff.) follows. Irenaeus, iii. c. 11: Alii vero, ut domum Spiritus frustrentur, quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum patris effusum est in humanum genus illam speciem non admittant, quae est secundum Joannis evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit; sed simul et evangelium et prophetarum repellunt Spiritum. Infelices vero, qui pseudoprophetae [leg. pseudoprophetarum] quidem esse volant, prophetiae vero gratiam ah ecclesia repellunt; similia patiuntur, qui, quapro eis, qui in hypocrisia venient, etiam a fratrum communicatione se abstinent. Datur autem intelligi, quod hujusmodi neque apostolum Paulum recipiant. In ea enim epistola, quae est ad Corinthios, de prophetis charismatisbus diligenter locutus est, et scit viros et mulieres prophetantes. Per haec igitur omnia peccantes in Spiritum Dei, in irremissibile incident peccatum. The name Άλογος appears first in Epiphanius Haer. li. adv. Alogos, comp. especially the passage cap. 33, according to the following correction of the text (so Merkel, S. 35, f.): 'Εν ουσιασάντων γὰρ τούτων διέκειται (εἰς Θεότερον) καὶ τῶν κατὰ Φύσας, [οὶ μὲν] δίκρινοι λόγων ἁρματών τὰς διαινοεῖ τῶν ἁκραίων πίστων, μητρόσφαγον τὴν πάσαν τόλμην εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν αἰρέσαν· οἱ δὲ ἐνομίσαντες τὴν 'Αποκάλυψιν, τὸν λόγου τούτον εἰς ἀνατροπήν, κατα' έκείνων καιροῦ ἐστρατεύματο.\textsuperscript{19}

To this subject appear to belong, his works περὶ πολειτείας, καὶ προφητῶν, λόγος περὶ προφητείας, περὶ τῆς ἀποκάλυψεως Ιωάννου (comp. Lücke's Einl. in d. Offenb. Johan. S. 289). They were naturally very welcome to the Montanists, and hence Melito was praised by Tertullian even in the Montanist period of the latter's life (Hieronymus, in Catal. c. 24): Hujus elegans et declaratoriam ingenuum laudans Tertullianus in septem libros, quos scripsi adversus ecclesiam pro Montano, diceit, cum a plericum nostrorum prophetam putari. But it does not follow from this, as Dana, Heinichen, and Schweger (S. 223) would have it, that Melito was a Montanist. See Piper's Melito, in the theol. Studia. Krit. 1838, i. 86.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Irenaeus above, not. 14 and 15. The account of Praedestinatus, Hær. 26: Scripsi contra eos (Montanistas) librum s. Soter Papa urbis is highly improbable, and is perhaps nothing more than a conclusion from Tertullian adv. Prax. c. 1, praecessorum ejus auctores tatingo.

\textsuperscript{18} The Christians of Lyons and Vienne had added to their account of the persecution they endured, a judgment on the controversy with the Montanists, which Eusebius unfortunately omitted, (Euseb. v. 3, 9): 'Εκθέμενοι καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτῶ συλλαβόντων μαρτύρων διαφόρων επιστολάς, ἢ σὲ διαμόρφω ἡ αὑτὸς ἡ ὑπάρχουσα τοῖς ἔτος Ἀσίας καὶ Φρωγίας ὑπελοφοῦς διεχερασάντων' οὐ μὴν ἢλλα καὶ Ἐλευθέρῳ, τῷ τότε ὘ραματίσητος, τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησίων εὕρησις ἔνεκα προσδεικνύτω ῥιν. Comp. the Praefatio of Maranus to the Opp. of the Apologists, P. III. c. 14, § 2, ss.

\textsuperscript{19} An instance below, § 53, note 39.
constitution, continued down to the tenth century. Besides their usual names, Montanistae, Cataphryges (οι κατὰ Φρόγας), other appellations were applied to them, some of which may have referred to particular sections, while others were mere names of derision.

---

THIRD CHAPTER.

INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 49.

The internal development of the orthodox church depended in a great degree on its external relations, the persecution of the heathen, and the attacks of heretics. Christian literature had been confined till now solely to didactic and admonitory letters, seven of which in this period also, proceeded from the pious bishop of Corinth, Dionysius; but now it developed itself in other directions, particularly in defending Christianity against the heathen, and in combating heretics. It was corrupted, however, by a mass of spurious writings. Those external relations could not be without an influence on the formation of doctrines, since they led of necessity to the exhibition and support of particular dogmas. In like manner, ecclesiastical usages received from them a more definite character. At the same time, it was a circumstance of great importance, that several Platonic philosophers had now come over to Christianity, by

---

20 Hieronym. Ep. 27, ad Marcellam: Habent primos de Pepusa Phrygiae Patriarchas: secludos, quos appellant Cenomas: atque ita in tertium, i.e., paene ultimum locum Episcopi devolvuntur.
21 The last laws against them proceeded from Justinian, A.D. 530 and 532, see Cod. lib. 1. tit. 5, l. 18-21.
22 Quintiliian, Priscillianistae, 'Ἀρτονυμίαι (see on this Noscelli de vera actate scriptt. Tertullian., § 47), Tascodrugitae (πασώσαλοργυχίται). The following are mere corruptions of words, Tascodrugitae (Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 10), Ascodrogitae (Phil. c. 72), Ascrodri (Theodos. iun. novella iii. in fine), Ascodrupelae, Ascodrupitae, (which, however, are enumerated among the Marcionites by Theodoret Haer. fab. comp. l. 10), Ascitae (Augustini de Haer. 62), cf. Gothofredus ad novellum iii. Theodosii san. From such corrupted names, however, new heresies have been etymologically deduced.
1 Ἐπιστολάς καθολικαῖς to the churches of Rome, Nicomedia, Gnosus, Athens, Lacedaemon, Gortyna, and in Pontus. Fragments are given by Euseb. ii. 25, iv. 23.
means of whom Platonism continued to gain more friends among the Christians. Besides, the Greek language was almost the only ecclesiastical tongue. Although several Latin translations of the Bible were made, yet the writers even of the western church wrote in Greek. But Christian ideas had a freshness of life in the people who spoke the language of the New Testament. In the west, they merely received, what the east produced.

§ 50.

APOLOGIES FOR CHRISTIANITY AGAINST HEATHEN AND JEWS.


The pressure of circumstances gave rise at this time to various apologies for Christianity, which are supposed in part to have been presented to emperors; the first to Hadrian (126), in Athens, by Quadratus and Aristides (Euseb. iv. 3; Hieron. Catal. 19, 20). The first apology of Justin Martyr († 166)

2 At this period originated the custom of the Roman Church, which continued down to the middle ages, of requiring those who were to be baptized to recite the creed first in Greek then in Latin. Cf. Edm. Martene de antiquis eccl. ritibus, ed. 2, t. i. p. 88; A. Gavanti Thesaurus sacr. rituum ed. G. M. Meratus, t. i. p. 42, and the other works quoted in Waldhii Biblioth. symbol. vetus, p. 57.


1 First doubted by Bayle, s. v. Athenagore. Semler Introduction to Baumgarten’s Po- lenik, ii. 43. Henke, i. 159. In opposition to these doubts, see Tzschirner Fall des Hei- dentums, i. 203. Semisch Justin d. M. i. 63.

2 The apology of Quadratus was still extant in the beginning of the seventh century (Photius, cod. 162). That Ade (about 860) had the apology of Aristides does not follow from his Martyrolog. ad d. 5, Nov. (cf. J. Dallaei de scriptis, quae sub Dionysii Aecop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumfuerunt, p. 90, s.) and the account of de la Guilletière Athénes anciennes et nouvelles. Paris. 1676. p. 146, of its being still preserved at that time in the monastery of Modelli at Athens, is as little worthy of credit as all the rest of the narrative of this pretended journey (see on it Spon Voyage d’Italie et Dalm. Chateaubriand’s Travels from Paris to Jerusalem, part i. p. 33.

3 According to Dr. A. Stieren in Ilgen’s Zeitschr. für d. hist. Theol. 1842, i. 21, the year

vol. i.—10
is addressed to Antoninus Pius (138 or 139), the second and smaller belongs, according to the usual opinion, to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (161–166). The other apologetic writings designed for the heathen, which are attributed to him, are of more doubtful origin. To Marcus Aurelius, Athenagoras addressed his προσβεία πρὸς Χριστιανῶν; and Melito, bishop of Sardis, and Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, their apologies since lost (Euseb. iv. 26; Hieron. Cat. 24, 26). At the same time appeared the apology of Miltiades (Euseb. v. 17; Hieron. Cat. 39); of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, in three books to Autolycus; and of Tatian, the λόγος πρὸς Ἑλλάνας.

On the other hand, the epistle to Diognetus is older. Per-
haps also *M. Minucius Felix*, a lawyer in Rome, who defended Christianity in a dialogue called *Octavius*, who belongs to the age of Marcus Aurelius, and is in this view the oldest Latin apologist. On the contrary, the διανομής τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων of *Hermias* must be placed in a later period.

All these defenders aim principally to show the groundlessness of the accusations adduced against Christianity, the reasonableness of it contrasted with the absurdity and immorality of heathenism, and the nothingness of the heathen deities. While they refer to the fact that Christianity agrees with the wisest philosophers, they represent the latter again as having drawn their wisdom from the Old Testament. In proving the divine origin of Christianity, they attach special value to the predictions of the Old Testament, the miracles of Jesus and the apostles, the miraculous powers continuing among Christians,
the rapid spread of Christianity, and the steadfastness of its followers in times of persecution. They demand, in fine, the same protection for Christians, which other philosophical sects enjoyed.

In defense of Christianity against Judaism, there appeared at this period two dialogues; under Hadrian the ἀντιλογία Παπίου καὶ Ἰσάους, which was afterward, but certainly without reason, ascribed to Aristob of Pella; and διάλογος πρὸς Τρίφωνα Τουδαίον, of Justin Martyr.¹

§ 51.

COMBATING OF HERETICS—CATHOLIC CHURCH—CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The writings of the earlier opponents of heretics, the work of Justin Martyr against all heresies;¹ the books of Agrippa Castor (about 135), who wrote against Basilides; of Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Rhodon, Philip bishop of Gortyna, and of Modestus, who all wrote against Marcion; of Miltiades, Claudius Apollinaris, Serapion bishop of Antioch, and Apollonius, who all wrote against the Montanists, have been lost, except a few fragments. On the other hand, we still possess the work of Irenaeus (bishop of Lyons, 177–202), ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνα-

¹ This ἀντιλογία or διάλογος, cited so early as by Celsus (Orig. c. Cels. iv. p. 199), is lost, and even of the Latin translation of one Celsus the Præf. ad Vigilium (in opp. Cypriani) is alone extant. Maximus († 663) comm. ad. Dionys. Areop. de myst. theol. c. 1, is the first who names Aristo as the author, but adds that Clement of Alex., Hypotyposon, lib. vi., ascribes this dialogue to Luke. On the other hand, Hieron., in quaest. in Genes., says: In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram. Plerisque existimat, sicut in aliorum quoque locis et Papiaci scriptum est—in Hebraeo haberi: in filio fecit Deus coelum et terram. Quod falsum esse ipsum rei veritas comprobat. A Hebrew Jewish-Christian like Aristo could never have written that. The Chron. paschale ad Olymp. 288, ann. 2, says that Ἀπελλάζης and Ἀρίστων (probably ὁ Πάλλαδος Ἀρίστων) handed over an apology to Hadrian. Since this is not found, it seems that some conjectured they discovered it in the dialogue in question.

¹ Ed. Sam. Jebb. Lond. 1719. 8. The doubts of its authenticity raised by C. G. Koch (Justini M. cum Tryph. Jud. dial.—suppositionis convictus. Kilom. 1700. 8. The controversial writings on the subject, see in Walchii Bibl. patriar. p. 210), Wetstein, Semler (Wetst. prolegg. in N. T. ed. Semler, p. 174), and S. G. Lange (Gesch. d. Dogmen d. christl. Kirche, i. 137), have been answered by G. Münchser, in a dialogus cum Tryphone Justinii M. recte adscribatur. Marb. 1799. 4 (also in Comment. theol. edd. Rosenmüller, Fuldner et Maurer, i. ii. 184), and Semisch, Justin d. M. i. 75.
τροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνυμίου γνώσεως in five books, but for the most part merely in an old Latin translation.²

The discordant opinions of the philosophical schools (αἰρέσεις), which were to have been removed by the one, certain, Christian truth, had again appeared within the province of Christianity at this period, in the different parties. The ecclesiastical idea of αἰρέσεις was formed from thence chiefly by the characteristics of separation from the unity implied in the true church, and of insecure subjective presumption;³ but since Christian truth appeared not likely to be mistaken without blame attaching to the individuals, it was generally believed that the sources of the heresies must be looked for in nothing else than self-will, pride, ambition, desire of rule, and want of love.⁴ To the opposition presented to unbelievers, in which alone the church had been engaged till the present time,⁵ there was now added the other opposition directed against heretics. By this means the idea of the church being farther developed, there arose the expression ἐκκλησία καθολική,⁶ i.e., the only


⁴ Irenæus, iii. 3, 2: Consfundimus omnes eos, qui quoque modo, vel per sibipliantiam vel vanam gubrium, vel per eacilitatem et malam sententiam praeterquam oporem colligunt. iv. 35, 7: Ἀναμένει δὲ τὸς τὰ σχίσματα ἐργαζόμενος, κενὸς ὁτα τῆς ὑπο ἀγίας, καὶ τὰ ἱδιον λοιπέλιες συμπόντως, ἀλλὰ μὴ τῆν ἐνώσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Clemens Alex. Strom. vii. p. 987: Ἀς φιλιαντεί καὶ φιλόδοξοι αἱρέσεις.

⁵ See above § 30.

⁶ The name first appears in Ignatii epist. ad Smyrn. c. 8, and in the epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de martyri. Polycarpi ap. Eusebii. iv. c. 15. 1. Tertull. de Praescr. haeret. c. 20. (Apostoli) ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem considerant, a quibus traductam fidei et semini doctrinae caeterae exinde ecclesiae mutatae sunt, et quotidiani mutanatur, ut ecclesiae flant. Ac per hoc et ipsae apostolicae deputantur, ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem eum consequatur necesse est: itaque tot ac tantae
church,⁷ out of which there is no salvation,⁸ which is destined to become universal, and has already given practical proof of this destination.⁹

The writers against heresies certainly went into the peculiar doctrines of the heretics, for the purpose of refuting them; but they particularly combated their pretensions in alleging that their doctrine was the genuine doctrine of Christ and the apostles, by proving, from the agreement of the apostolic churches, that the doctrine of the apostles had been preserved without alteration in the catholic church.¹⁰ The common interest which ecclesiæ una est, illa ab apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima, et omnes apostolicæ, dum una; omnes probant unitatem. The words can not refer to a formal founding of the catholic Church, as is assumed by J. E. Ch. Schmidt in his Bibliothek für Krit. u. Exegese, ii. 1. The idea first arose, and it afterward gave expression to itself by degrees, in the constitution and ordinances of the church. Comp. Müscher's Dogmengeschichte, ii. 379. Tweezen's Dogmatik, i. 109. Rothe's Anf. d. christl. Kirche, i. 555.

¹ In opposition to the sects which designed to form churches also, but which were only schools, διατριβαί (Clem. Alexandria. Strom. vii. p. 889), ἀνθρώπινα συνήλεύματα (i. c. p. 898).

⁷ Ireneæus, iv. 26, 2. Haeretici aliquem ignem afferentes ad altare Dei, i. e., alienas doctrinas, a eclesiæ igne combusturum, quemadmodum Nabad et Abiad. iv. 33, 7. Tertull. de Baptismo, c. 8. Ecclesia est arca figurata (cf. 1 Petr. iii. 20, 21).

⁸ Ireneæus, i. 10, 1. Η ἐκκλησία καθ ὅλης οἰκουμένης ἐως περάτων τῆς γῆς διε- σπαρμένη. Cf. i. 10, 2, iii. 11, 8, iv. 36, 2, v. 20, 1.

⁹ Tertullian. de Praescr. haer. c. 21. Quid autem (apostoli) praedicaverint, id est, quid illis Christus revelaverit: et hic praescribam, non aliter probari debere, nisi per eadem ecclesias, quas ipsi apostoli considerant, ipsi eis praedicando, tam viva (quod siunt) voce, quam per epistolam postea. Si hoc ita sunt, constat proinde omne doctrinam, quae cum illis ecclesiis apostolicis, matricibus et originalibus fidei conspiro, veritati deputandam. C. 36. Percurrit ecclesias apostolicas, quas quas ipsas adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident, quas authenticae literae eorum recitatur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantem faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippus, habes Thessaloniacenses. Si potes in Asiae tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjacess, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est. Ista quae felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostolorum cum sanguine sua profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adequantur, ubi Paulus Johannes exitu coronatur, ubi apostolorum Johannes, posteaquam in oleum ignem demersum nihil passus est, in insulum relegatur. Videamus quid dixerit, quid cum Africani quoque ecclesiis consessurarit, & c. (Comp. Neander's Antignostics, S. 313, &c.) In the west the Roman was the only apostolic church. Hence they naturally appealed to it tere chiefly, Iren. iii. 3. Traditianem itaque apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatum, in omni ecclesia adeo perspicere omnibus, qui vera veliunt videre, et habemus annunciarum eos, qui ab apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in ecclesiis et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt.—Sed quoniam valde longum est, in loc tali volumine omnium ecclesiariarum enumerae successiones; maxima et antiquissima et omnibus cognitum a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis, Petro et Paulo, Romanæ fundata et constitutæ ecclesiæ can, quam habet ab apostolis, traditionem et annucentiam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquomodo—praeter quæam oparet colligunt. Ad haec enim ecclesiæ propter potentiorem (so all MSS., Massuet was the first that altered it into potioriem) principaliatem
was felt against heretics, and the feeling of oneness, strengthened by the idea of a catholic church, led to a closer union, of which the apostolic churches were regarded as a center, though without the existence of an external subordination among them.

As the heretics appealed to apostolic traditions, and even used pretended apostolic writings in justification of their sentiments, the attention of catholic Christians was by this means more directed to the genuine writings of the apostles scattered among them. The apostolic epistles had always been read in the places to which they were addressed, and in the neighboring congregations; but there was no universally received collection of the

neceesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt unique fideles, in quae semper abs his, qui sunt unique, conservata est ea, quae est ab apostolis, traditio. Irenæus wishes to prove that the doctrine of the catholic Church is apostolic, preserved by the successors of the bishops ordained by the apostles. Since it is too prolix to point out this connection of the apostles with all churches, he wishes to limit his proof to the Church of Rome alone, and finally to represent the doctrine of the Roman Church as necessarily agreeing with that of the whole remaining church. Necesse est (ινάγηκα) must not be confounded with oportet (δέι): the former expresses a natural necessity, the latter an obligation, duty. Potentior is ἑκατώτερος (cf. iii. 3, 3: potentiissimas iteras, ἑκατώτερον γραφην), principalitas probably πρωτεία (iv. 38, 3: πρωτεύει μὲν ἐν πάσιν ὁ θεός, principalitate quidem inhabit in omnibus Deus). Accordingly the Greek text may have been: πρὸς ταῦτα γὰρ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διὰ τὴν ἑκατώτεραν πρωτείαν ἀνάκη πᾶσιν συμβιβάσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τοῦτο ἐστι τοῖς πανταχόθεν πιστοῖς, ἐν ἥ ἂν ἔστι τοῖς πανταχόθεν συντήρησαι ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσες. “For with this church must the whole church, i.e., the believers of every place, agree, of course, on account of its more important pre-eminence.” A pre-eminence belonged to all apostolic churches; to the Roman Church a more important pre-eminence, on account of its greatness, and its having been founded by the two most distinguished apostles. In the rest of the sentence, I conjecture that the Latin translator was mistaken. Supposing the Greek text to have stood as above, the translator took the words τοῖς πανταχόθεν for ὑπὸ τῶν παντ., which was certainly grammatically correct; “in which the apostolic tradition was always preserved by believers from all places,” referring to the many foreigners who constantly belonged to the Roman community, and who afforded a warrant for the uninterrupted agreement of the Roman tradition with that of the rest of the church. But Irenæus meant to say: “in which the apostolic tradition has always preserved in fellowship with the believers of all places.” Hence he addsuces, in what follows, Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, and Polycarp's abode at Rome, as proofs of this uninterrupted fellowship. Many other explanations may be seen in Grabe and Massuet on the passage. Paulus, in Sophronison, Heft 3. 1819. S. 141, ff. On the other side, Th. Kate- ramp über den Prumet. d. Apost. Petrus u. s. Nachfolger. Münster. 1839. S. 39, 35 Griesbach de potentiore Eccl. Rom. principalitate comm. Jen. 1778 (reprinted in his Opuscula Academ. ed. Gabler, vol. ii. p. 136, ss.). H. W. J. Thiersch in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1849, ii. 325. J. Wolf in Rudelbach's and Guericke's Zeitschrift für d. luther. Kirche, 1842, iv. 7. Thiersch reads τὰς ἑκκλησίας, and refers to it the ἐν ἥ in the sense: unqueaque aliæ ecclesias idem testabatur de traditione apostolorum, dummodo in ea a fideltibus, cujusvis sint loci, pure conservata sit tradi ta ab apostolis veritas. On the contrary, Neander, K. G. i. i. 349, says that the expression, qui unique sunt fideles, is not synonymous with omnis ecclesia, if the latter mean “every single church,” but only if it mean “every church,” i.e., all churches: and in the single churches the tradition was not preserved ab his qui sunt unique.
evangelical narratives, and the existing ones (comprehending, besides our canonical gospels, also the gospel of the Hebrews, that of the Egyptians, &c.) served in their spheres only for private use. After the churches had now come into closer connection, they communicated to one another, in their common interest against heretics, the genuine apostolic writings; and thus the canon began to be formed, in the first half of the second century, in two parts (τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον or τὸ Εὐαγγελικόν, and ὁ Ἀπόστολος or τὸ Ἀποστολικόν), although in the different congregations there continued to be other writings, which were valued almost, if not altogether, as much as those which were universally received (ἠμολογούμενα, ἐνδιάθηκα).

Instigated by the bold speculation of the Gnostics, which sought to lay an entirely foreign basis under Christianity, the catholic Christians began to establish as the unalterable regula fidei, that summary of doctrine which could be shown, as well in the consciousness of all Christian communities, as also in the apostolic writings, to be the essential basis of Christianity, and which must remain untouched by, and be necessarily laid at the foundation of, every speculation. Accordingly, even the originally simple statements of the baptismal confession (πίστις, σύμβολοι) were secured by additions against misunderstandings and perversions; but as the different wants of the church required this or the other doctrine to be made more clear, or to be emphatically exhibited, so the form of the baptismal confession became longer or shorter in different places.


12 ὁ κανών ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Clemens Alex. Strom. vi. p. 803. ὁ κανών τῆς ἁγιασίας. Ιren. i. 1, in fine. This rule of faith, therefore, as it is found, for example, in Irenæus, i. 10, 1, was not a formula handed down to the apostles (cf. Tertull. de Praes. c. 13: Hæc regula a Christo, ut probatur, instituta; particularly c. 21: Omnis doctrina, quam ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit; c. 37: Regula, quam ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo traditit), and was not placed above the interpretation of Scripture (for according to Tertullian de Corona militis, c. 3, it was a Catholic fundamental principle, etiam in traditionis obtenta exigena est auctoritas scripta), as was asserted, after Lessing’s example, by Delbrück, Philip Melanchthon der Glaubenslehrer. Bonn. 1826. S. 17, ff. 145, ff. Comp. on the authority of Holy Scripture, and its relation to the rule of faith, three theological epistles to Herr Prof. Delbrück by Sack, Nitzsch, and Lücke. Bonn. 1827.

13 Maximus Turinensis (about 430) hon. in Symb. p. 239: Symbolum tesserar est et signaculum, quo inter fideles perfidiosae sequentur. These additions are referred to by Tertull. de Corona militis. c. 3: Tert mergetamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit.

§ 52.

DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINES—SPURIOUS WRITINGS.

A speculative treatment of Christian doctrine was generally indispensable, if Christianity was to be accessible to the philosophical culture of the times, and it was rendered unavoidable by the progress of the Gnostics. It could only proceed from Platonism, which of all philosophical systems stood the nearest to Christianity. While many Platonic philosophers were brought over to Christianity by this internal relation, they received the latter as the most perfect philosophy, and retained, with their philosophical mantle, their philosophical turn of mind also. They set out with these positions, both that the Logos has constantly communicated to men the seeds of truth, and that the truth taught by Plato was derived from Moses and the prophets. The arbitrary mode of interpretation then current fur-


3 Comp. the remarkable history of Justin Martyr's conversion in his Dial. c. Tryph. c. 3, ss.: which he, c. 8, concludes with the words, taútê mònên éthraikhnon philewofán uosmalê te kai sómophai. Oéthos òy kai dia taútai filósofofó ègôw. Thus Christianity is designated by Melito, ap. Euseb. iv. 25, 4, as òy kath' ònymas filósofofia. Keilii Orac. ii. 463.


5 Justin M. Apol. ii. c. 13: Oi òk állolépti ësti tâ Plêstow of ðòagmatic toû Xristóte, òll òy ësti ðiânta òyma, ësêpê àddê tâ tâ tòm òllon, Stwêkôn te, kai poýtôn, kai synugrêfêmô ekkastos ùy tê òpê òmoupês tào apekmatiôn òtheôn lògon tò òunâphês òymon kalôs ephêgêto—òsa òn parà pàêi kalôs èthrapoi, òyma tôv Xristiôn êstî. Acording to c. 10, Christ was apprehended kai òpê òwtopátof òpê òmoupês: lògonas ùy ëîn kai ëstîn ò en pànti ën.

5 So the Jews had already asserted, Josephus contra Apion, ii. 8; and Aristobulus apud Clemens Alex. Strom. i. p. 410, according to whom Plato is said to have employed even the Old Testament in an ancient version. The heathen philosopher Nemesius (i. c.) goes so far as to say: 'Tí ësti Plêstw ò òy Mònê filosófous. The fathers derived all that was true and good in the Greek poets and philosophers from Moses and the prophets, Justin Apol. i. 44, ii. 13. Coh. ad Graecos, c. 14. Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 37. Because they found most truth in Plato, they represented him especially as drawing from this source. Hence he is called in Clemens Alex. Paed. ii. p. 324, 'ò kà Mònêphé filosófous, Strom. i. p.
nished them with the means of proving their views even from numerous passages of the Old Testament, which they could use, indeed, only in the Septuagint version. Thus, then, they overvalued even the actual agreement of Plato with Christianity, and believed that they found many a Platonic idea in the latter, which in reality they themselves had first introduced into it. The Christian philosophers of this time with which we are acquainted are Aristides, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatian, Pantaenus (§ 39), and Maximus (about 196). The questions with which they were chiefly occupied were the same as those the Gnostics set out with, respecting the origin of evil, and its overthrow by Christ, but especially regarding the divine in Christ. They found the latter designated by John as the λόγος, and in the development of this idea this took Philo for their guide; since, like him, they thought the Logos was met with everywhere in the Old Testament. Most difficult were the


6 Comp. Justinii Coh. ad Graecos, c. 20, ss. According to c. 29, Plato is said to have borrowed his doctrine of ideas from the passages Exod. xxv. 9, 40; xxvi. 30, incorrectly understood; and according to c. 31, to have imitated Ezek. x. 18 in the winged chariot of Zeus, &c. See Clausen, l. c. p. 101.

7 Justin finds in him the doctrine of the Son and Spirit; Clemens Alex. Strom. v. p. 710, the whole Christian Trinity. Clausen, l. c. p. 84.

8 The Platonism of the fathers was perceived even by Petavius, Dogm. Theol. t. ii. lib. i. c. 3. The dogma of the Trinity was derived from it by (Souverain le Platonisme devolū, on Essai touchant le verbe Platonicien. Cologne (Amsterdam), 1700 (translated by Loffler : Versuch über d. Platonismus d. KV. Züllichau, 1782. 2to Aufl, 1792. 8), and Jo. Clericus episc. crit. et eccl. (Artis criticæ, vol. iii. Amst. 1719), especially ep. vii. and viii. On the other side, the matter was exaggerated by the Jesuit Balus, Défense des saints pères, accusés de Platonisme. Paris. 1711. 4. Kell, de doctoribus veteris ecclesiae, culpa corruptae per platonica sententias theologiae librandis, comm. xxii. in cj. opusc. t. ii. Lips. 1821, has copiously given the literature of the subject.

9 Fragments of his work περὶ τῆς ὕλης are preserved in Eusch. Praep. Ev. vii. 92.


11 So particularly Proverbs viii. 92, ss., but also Psalm xxxiii. 6; xliv. 1; civ. 24. The doctrine that God created the world by the Logos was also naturally sought for in the Mosaic account of creation, where it was found: Gen. i. 1, ἐν ἀρχῇ is equivalent to διὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, and ἀρχὴ is, according to Proverbs viii. 92, ἡ σοφία or ὁ λόγος. Theophil. ad Autol. ii. 10, 13. Tatian. Apol. c. 7. Tertull. adv. Hermog. c. 20. This explanation was repeated in later times by Origenes, Hom. 1. in Gen., Basilius, Hom. 1, in Hexaëmeron, Augustinus de Genesal lib. i. Others believed that they might venture to presuppose the existence of that doctrine as still more obviously contained in the Hebrew original, which they did not know. According to the Alcæaticus Iasonis et Papisci, the original expressed.
questions respecting the essence of the Logos in relation to the Father, and his agency in relation to that of the Holy Spirit. With regard to the former point, there were several who did not assume a personal distinction of the Logos from the Father. But the view was more generally adopted, that he was a divine person, less than the Father, and produced out of his essence according to the will of the latter. Agreeably to both views, the Logos was the Word working all in the finite, so that no room appeared to be left for the agency of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit still remained entirely undeveloped. These speculations, whose object was to

this idea, in filio facit Deus coelem et terram (see above § 50, note 17); or as others believed (Tertull. adv. Praxeam c. 5), in principio Deus fecit sibi filium.  

12 Justini Dial. c. Tryph. c. 129: Πνεύματος τιμῶς—λέγεται—Ἀγίωστος και ἄχριστον τοῦ πατρὸς τάστικτα τὴν ὅνωμαν [τὸν λόγον] ὑπάρχειν, ἄπερ тό τὸν ἡλίον φαίνει ἐπί γῆς εἶναι ἄγιον καὶ ἄχριστον ὅσος τὸν ἡλίον ἐν τῷ ὠμορπόν, καὶ ὅταν δήσῃ, συνασφαλεῖται τὸ φῶς. ὁ λόγος ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρχήνα περιβάλλεται, καὶ τοῖς ἄγγελοις πατεῖν αὐτῶν διδάσκονται. Athenagoras represents the Logos in the very same way as Philo to be the manifest God, not personally distinct from the concealed deity. Legat. c. 9: Ἡ ἀρχή δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἑνῷ καὶ ἐνεργεῖ τό πρὸς αὐτὸν [καὶ] του πάντω ἐγένετο· οὐκ οὔτως τὸν πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ νῦν, οὔτως δὲ τοῦ νῦν ἐν πατρί, καὶ πατρός ἐν νύο, ἐνότητι καὶ ὁμοίως πνεύματος· νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ. Εἰ δὲ δὴ ὑπερβολὴν συνέλεξεν σΧέσεις σκοτεῖν ἄν τις ἐπιείκει, ὁ πατὴρ τί βούλεται, ἢ ἡ διὰ βραχὺς, πρῶτον γέννημα ἐν τῷ πατρί, ὡς ὧ ἐν δυνάμειν (ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ θεός, νοῦς ὑδάος ὁμι, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐν ἐνατό τῷ λόγῳ, ὡς λογικῶς ὃν ἄλλος ὃς, τῶν ὀλίκων ἑμπαίδευτος ἀποίκιος φύσεως καὶ γῆς οἰκείας [καὶ] ὑπακοιμωμένος ὅσον προηγοῦμεν πρὸς το ὀψιαντομένον καὶ τὸ φωτόν οὐ πρὸς αὐτόν, ιδέα καὶ ἐνέργεια ιδεῖ προηγοῦμεν. Συνάρχει δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ προφητικῷ πνεύμα· Κύριος γάρ, φύσιν ἐκτικει ἐν ὁράχει ὅσον αὐτὸ ἐν οἷς καὶ αὐτὸ (Proverbs viii. 29), καὶ τοι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἑνωμένου τοῦ ἱστορίου προφητικώς ἄγιον πνεῦμα ὑπήρχοι ἐναῖν ἐφημε τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀποθέθηκε καὶ ἑπασφαλομένων, ὡς ἀκτίνα ἱλίου. Comp. Münster’s Dogmengesch. l. 407. Martini, l. c. § 84. Clarisses comm. de Athenagora p. 98. Others supposed that the divine in Christ was exactly one with the Father: Scriptor xii. Testam. Patriarch: Κύριος ὁ θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ φαομένος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος (Sym. 6), τὸ πάθος τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Lev. 4). Cf. Nitzsch de Testam. xii. Patriarch. p. 29. Epiphanius Haer. ii. c. 2, respecting the Evangelium Aegyptiorum: Ἡ ἁγίωστα ἡμέρα ἐν τῇ ἁγίωστῃ μνήμῃ ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ Λάοτου ἀναφέρεται, ὡς αὐτῷ ἤλθε γίνεσθαι τὸν τοῦ παθήσεως. Εἰς τοῦτο καὶ τοῦτον ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμέρα ἡμέραν τοῦ Κυρίου διδασκόνται τοῖς σάμοις, τὸν αὐτόν εἶναι Πατέρα, τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἶναι Υἱόν, τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἶναι Ἀγίον Πνεύμα, comp. Neander’s Antistigmatica, S. 407, ff. According to Baur (Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit, i. 173) even Irenaeus had no definite ideas of the Son as personally distinct from the Father. On the other side see Licentiate L. Dancker’s des li. Irenaeus Christologie. Göttingen, 1833. S. S. 32.


14 Accordingly, the fathers of this period represent the prophets to be inspired sometimes by the Logos, sometimes by the Holy Spirit, and call both the Logos and the Holy
fathom the depths of the Godhead, might certainly at first wound the feelings of many, and Irenaeus openly expresses his disapprobation of the inconsiderate curiosity they manifest; 15 but, on the other hand, ecclesiastical orthodoxy could still endure diversities in doctrine and customs, which did not injure the religious basis of Christianity. 16

Notwithstanding this philosophical tendency, and although in other respects the Pauline mode of surveying Christianity predominated, yet the millenarianism of the Jewish Christians, 17 presenting a sensuous counterpoise to the external pressure of persecution, which had been announced in so many apocalyptic writings, 18 and for which the reputation of John (Apoc. xx. 4–6; xxii.) and his peculiar followers, afforded a warrant—this millenarianism became the general belief of the time, and met with almost no other opposition than that given by the Gnostics, 19

Spirit σοφίαν, &c. Semisch, Justin. d. M. ii. 305, 311. Note.—Theophilus ad. Autol. ii. 23, gives the members of the Divine triad thus: Θεὸς, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ σοφία αὐτοῦ, and says, ii. 14: 'Εχων οὖν τὸν θεὸν τὸν θεοῦ λόγου ενδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἱδίοις σπλαγχνοις, ἐγέννησαν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς θεοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευνώμενος πρὸ τῶν ἁλῶν. Τούτων τῶν λόγων ἴσχων ὑπομνῶν τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γεγενημένων καὶ ὑ’ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν.—Οὕτως οὖν ὁ πνεῦμα θεοῦ, καὶ ἀρχῆ, καὶ σοφία, καὶ μυστήρια, καὶ δόμων ὑπὸ τοῦ καθόρθου εἰς τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ ὑ’ αὐτῶν ἔλαλη τὰ περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τῶν υἱῶν ἀπάντων. οὐ γὰρ ἔστων αἱ προφήται, ὅτε ὁ κόσμος εγινετο, ἀλλὰ ἡ σοφία ἐν ᾧ ἀπό κατεστάθη ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἄγος αὐτοῦ ὁ ἰεὺς συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ. Here the Holy Spirit is the immanent wisdom of God, but the Logos the revealed God, who emanated from the Father.

15 Irenaeus adv. Haer. ii. 28, 6: Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: quoniam ergo Filius prolatus a Patre est? dicimus ei, quia prolacionem istam, sive generationem, sive nascientem, sive adaptionem, aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inennarrabilem existentem, nemo novit, non Valentinus—neque Angeli—neque solus qui generavit Patem, et qui natus est Filius. Inennarrabilis itaque generatio ejus cum sit, quiconque nunturat generationes et prolaciones enarrare, non sunt computes sui, quae inennarrabilia sunt, enarrare promitterent. Quamium enim ex cogitatione et sensu verbum emittitur, hoc utique omnes accipient homines: non ergo magnum quid inveniretur, qui emissiones excohaitaverunt, neque absconditum mysterium, si id quod ab omnibus intellegitur, transulerunt in unigenitum Dei Verbum: et quem inennarrabilem et inomnubilem vocant, buno, quasi ipsi obstetricaverint, primae generationis ejus prolacionem et generationem enunclandam, assimilantes eum hominem verbo emissionis (λόγοι προφητείας). Comp. Duncker’s des h. Iren. Christologie, S. 36.

16 This doctrinal latitudinarianism is shown in the fact of the Nazarene Hesegippos, being recognized as orthodox in the churches of Corinth and Rome, these churches agreeing with his orthodoxy. See above § 43, note 4. The same latitudinarianism may be seen in Justin’s declaration respecting those who denied the personality of the Logos (above note 12), in the estimation in which the Shepherd of Hermas was held. (See § 35, note 4, § 36, note 3).


18 See above § 31.

19 To the question of Trypho, whether Justin really believes in a millennial reign, Justin replies. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 89: Ἱσολόγησα σοι καὶ πρότερον, ὅτι ἔγνω μὲν καὶ ἠλλοι
and subsequently by the antagonists of the Montanists. The thousand years’ reign was represented as the great Sabbath which should begin very soon; or, as many supposed, after the lapse of the six thousand years of the world’s age, with the first resurrection, and should afford great joys to the righteous. Till then the souls of the departed were to be kept in the underworld, and the opinion that they should be taken up to heaven immediately after death, was considered a gnostic heresy.

In reference to the advancement of the various Christian interests, and in like manner also to the confirmation of those developments of doctrine already mentioned, the spurious literature which had arisen and continually increased among Jews and Christians, was of great importance. The Christians made use of such expressions and writings as had already been falsely attributed by Jews, from partiality to their religion, to honored persons of antiquity, and altered them in part to suit their own preferences.
wants, such as the book of Enoch and the fourth book of Ezra.\textsuperscript{26}  But writings of this kind were also fabricated anew by Christians, who quieted their conscience respecting the forgery, with the idea of their good intention,\textsuperscript{27}  for the purpose of giving greater impressiveness to their doctrines and admonitions by the reputation of respectable names, of animating their suffering brethren to steadfastness, and of gaining over their opponents to Christianity.\textsuperscript{28}  Hence there now appeared, in particular the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs,\textsuperscript{29}  and the Ἀραβαντίς Ἡσαίος,\textsuperscript{30}  the latter so peculiar in its contents, that in later times heretics only could still use it. To make an impression on the heathen, supposititious predictions, relating especially to Christ and the last things, were constantly ascribed to the Sybil.\textsuperscript{31}  To them were added those of Hystaspes.\textsuperscript{32}


\textsuperscript{26} See above § 31, notes 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{27} The anecdote respecting the Acta Pauli et Theclas is characteristic, apud. Tertull. de Baptismo c. 17: Quod si quae Paulo perperam adscripta sunt ad licentiam mulierum docendi tuggingendique, defendant, sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulus, convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli facias, loco decessisse.

\textsuperscript{28} A one-sided view is given by Mosheim de causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos sacce. i. et ii. (Disertt. ad hist. eccl. pertin. vol. i. p. 217, ss.) Comp. C. J Nitzsch de Testamentis xii. Patriarcharum, p. 1, ss.


\textsuperscript{30} Extant in an Ethiopic version. Ascensio Isaiah vata aethiop. cum versione lat. anglicanae, ed. Rich. Laurence. Oxon. 1819. 8: the old Latin fragments which Angelo Masius, Nova collectio scriptorum veterum, iii. ii. 238, has published, are corrected and criticised by Nitzsch in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1830, ii. 209. Another Latin translation preserved entire (ed. Venetis. 1529. 8), has been recently published by me, together with the Greek fragment in Epiphanius, and the Latin in Mai: Vetus translatio latina Visionis Jesuiae, ad atque praefatione et notis illustra (a Götttingen Easter Programm). That the work was not necessarily written before 68, as Laurence supposes, is shown by Größer Jahnhundert des Heils, i. 66. Comp. Gesenius Commentar über den Jesaias, i. 45, ff Lücke, i. c. S. 125.

\textsuperscript{31} See above § 31, note 4. According to Bleek in Schleiermacher's, De Wette's, and Lücke's theol. Zeitschrift, i. 231, old Jewish and Christian oracles were composed under Hadrian by an Egyptian Christian, and, after several enlargements, put together so as to constitute books iii.–v. The eighth book belongs to the time of Marcus Aurelius, books vii. and vi. to the third century, i. and ii. to the middle of the fifth.

\textsuperscript{32} Ammianus Marcellinus, xxiii. 6: Magic is divinorum incorruptissimius cultus, cajus
§ 53.

ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE.

As the prevailing desire was now to compare the Mosaic institution with the Christian, of which it was regarded as the type, and to trace out an analogy even in their individual features, the idea soon occurred to the mind, of comparing the Christian officers in the church with the Mosaic priesthood, and of giving them the very same titles (summus sacerdos, sacerdotes, Levitae). As a body, they were called, by way of eminence, κλῆρος, viz., τῶν θεοῦ, κληρικοὶ; among the Latins, ordo; in opposition

scientiae sacrae prisci multis ex Chaldæorum arcana Bactrianus addidit Zoroastres: delatae Hystaspes rex prudentissimus Darii pater. The latter traveled into India to the Brahmins, sorumque montis munera mundi motas et siderum, purosque aerorum ritus quantum colligere potuit eruditus, ex his quo didicit, aliqua sensibils magorum infudit: quae illi cum disciplinis praesentiendi futura, per annum quisque progignit, posteri aetatis tradant. Ch. G. F. Walch de Hystaspe ejusque vaticinis apud Patres i. d. Commentationes Soc. Reg. Gotting. i. 3.—So early as in the Praedictio Petri (which belongs to the beginning of the second century, see § 27, note 5) the Sybil and Hystaspe are recommended (cf. Clemens Alex. Strom. vi. p. 761), and by Justin Martyr several times quoted. According to Celsus ap. Orig. c. Cels. vii. p. 368, they were adulterated and used by a Christian party, whom he thence calls Σιδιλλασταί, lib. v. p. 372.


2 1 Pet. v. 3. Christians are called κλῆροι, a band belonging to God. In like manner, Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. c. 11: ὁ κλῆρος Ἐφεσίων τῶν ἡρωϊδῶν. In a narrower sense κλῆρος τῶν μαρτύρων in Epist. Eccl. Venen, et Lugd. ap. Euseb. v. i, § 4. The clergy are called so early as in Tertullian, clericus, and they afterward cited in their own favor, Numb. xviii. 20, Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1, 2: κύριος αὐτός κλῆρος τῶν Λευιτῶν; though here God is κλῆρος, not the Levites. In like manner, they appropriated to themselves in the fourth century, the names christiani and christinitas as their peculiar right (cf. Cod. Theod. v. 5, 2; xii. 1, 50 and 123; xii. 1, 123, du Fresne glossar. ad h. v.) cf. J. H. Bohemer de differentia inter Clericos et Laicos diss. (xii. dissert. juris eccles. ant. ad Plinium, &c. p. 340, sq. A different view is given by Neander, K. G. i. 1. 333.

3 Borrowed from the town councillors in the municipal boroughs, who, according to the analogy of the Roman senate, were styled ordo Decurionum, or ordo, in opposition to plebs and plebici; cf. Digest. lib. i. Tit. 3. de Decurioniibus. Boeheir, l. c. p. 342. Hoesck's rom. Gesch. von. Verfall der Republ. i. ii. 159. Even the verb ordinare, i. e., ordinem dare (Sueton. Vespas. c. 20), had already received in Cyprian an ecclesiastical use.
to the λαὸς, plebs, λαϊκοῖ. The idea, however, of a universal Christian priesthood was still maintained. The influence of the bishop necessarily increased when synods began to be common, at which the bishop chiefly represented his congregation (παροικία), although the presbyters also had a voice along with him.

All congregations were independent of one another, although some had a peculiar reputation more than others, on account of many circumstances, e.g. their apostolic origin, the importance of the city to which they belonged, or because they were mother churches. Many such circumstances united in procuring for Rome, particularly in the west, an especial reputation, even so early as the period of which we are speaking.

---

4 So λαὸς stands also in opposition to the Jewish priests, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14; Luke i. 10, 51.
5 Iren. iv. 29. Omos enim januti sacerdotalem habent ordinem. Tertullian. de Exhortat. Castitatis c. 7: Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Differentiam inter ordinem et plebeum constituat ecclesiae auctoritas, et honoer per ordines concessum sanctificatus. Adeo ubi ecclesiasticorum ordine non est concessus, et offer et ingruit, et sacerdos est ubi solas. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, fitet laici. Igitur si habes jus sacerdotis in totem ipsum, ubi necessario est, habebus ipserit etiam disciplinam sacerdotis, ubi necessario est, habebus jus sacerdotis. (Cf. de Baptismo c. 17, de Monog. c. 7, 12, de Corona mil. c. 3. See Nandor's Antignosticus, S. 134.) Against the impartial explanation of this language given by Nica. Rigaltius: Gabr. Aubespine (Albaspinus) de l'eucharistie. Controversy concerning offeries in this place (see on it below note 15), and de jure laicorum sacerdotii. For Rigaltius (Hugo Grotius) de administratione coenae, ubi pastores non sunt. 1638. Claudius Sahusius and others. On the other side are D. Petavius, H. Dodwell, and others.


8 Irenaeus apud Euseb. v. 24, § 5. The Christians considered themselves on this earth as πάροικοι, according to 1 Peter, i. 17; ii. 11. Comp. Epist. ad Diognet. c. 5: Πατρίδος οἰκοσκον υἱὸς, ἀλλ' ὡς πάροικος.—ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν ὄρανω πολιτεύονται. Hence the churches designated themselves companies of strangers, Clemens Rom. init. Epist. i. Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικία Ρώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικίᾳ Κόρεθων. In like manner Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. apud Euseb. iv. 15, § 1.

9 The ancient form is apparent from the introduction of the Conc. Eliberitani, ann. 305: Cum concedissent sancti et religiosi Episcopi—item Presbyteri—residibus suavis, adstantibus diacronibus et omni plebe, Episcopi universalis dixerunt.

10 To these belonged also the support of other churches. Dionys. Corinth. ad Rom. Epist. (ap. Euseb. iv. 22): Ἑξ ἀφρός γὰρ ὑμῖν ὕδατ ἐπὶ τοῦτο, πάντας μὲν ὑδελφὸς ποικιλος εὐφρενιτε, ἐκκλησίας τε ἐπολλαὶ ταῖς κατὰ πάναν πάλιν ἐφόσον πέμπετεν ὧν μὲν τῶν ὁμόνων πείναν ἀναφέροντος, ἐν μετάλλοις δὲ ὑδελφὸς ὑπάρχουσιν ἐνοχοργάζοντας.
Public worship was extremely simple. Without temples, altars, or images, the Christians assembled in houses appointed for the purpose, and, in times of persecution, in solitary places, sometimes even in the night, particularly on the night before Easter. The members of the church brought with them voluntary offerings, from which was taken what was necessary for the solemnization of the Lord's supper (εἰχάρστια), and the agape, which was still usually connected with it. The remainder belonged to the clergy and the poor, for whom also they provided by monthly contributions. After the clergy had been


12 Not always, indeed, on account of the persecutions. According to Tertull. de Corona militis, c. 3, the eucharist was celebrated even in antelucanis noctibus. Also in Justin's description, Apol. i. c. 85, the agape is not mentioned; 'Εστια (after the common prayers) προσφέρεται τῷ προσώπῳ τῶν ἱδρυσόν ὄργανος, καὶ πάντες ἱδρύσατο καὶ κρύματος. καὶ ἐπάνω λαῖβει λαῖβει καὶ λάβει τῷ πατρί τῶν ἱδρυμάτων, διέκυκλος διά τὸν ἱδρύσατον τῷ νόσῳ καὶ τῷ πυρόστρωτῳ τοῦ ἱδρύσατον τῷ ἱδρύσατον τῷ καθεξήςεις τῶν παρασκευασμάτων μεταλαβήνων, ἐκ τῆς εικονοθηκής τοῦ ἱδρύσατον τῶν ἱδρυμάτων, καὶ τοῖς ἱδρυμαῖς ἱδρυμαῖς. A description of the agape is given in Tertullian's Apologet. c. 39: Coena nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit, id vocatur quod dilectio penes græcos. Quantisque numero sumptibus costatis, lucrum est pictatis nomine facere sumptum, sicuti inopes quosque reperiero isto jannus. Non prius discumbitur, quam oratio ad Deum praegustatur; editur quantum esurientes cupiunt, bibitur quantum pudicia est utile. Ita surastrant, ut qui memineint etiam per noctem adorandum deum sibi esse; ita fabulantur, ut qui sciant dominum audire. Post aquam manualem et luna, ut quiasque de scripturis sanctis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere; hinc probatur quomodo bibi. Aequo oratio conviviam dirimitt, &c.
come a priestly caste, it was the more necessary to look for a sacrifice in Christianity, because the ancient world generally could not conceive of divine worship without sacrifice. For this purpose the solemnity of the supper presented several points of comparison. First of all, the prayer; which, indeed, had always been considered spiritual sacrifice. But next, the gifts of the church members, as also the bread and wine set apart by the bishop by prayer as holy food, might be considered as offerings dedicated to God. Of both the same expressions were used, προσφέρειν, προσφέρα, officare, oblatio: both were compared with the Old Testament sacrifices and first fruits. As, accordingly,

14 Justin. M. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 41: Προσφέρειν τοῦτον τοῦ πάθους ἐξ θεοῦ τῶν ἰδιῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιών, τούτην τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαρίστιας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὑμαῖς τῆς εὐχαρίστης προλαβόν τίτη (namely, Mal. i. 10-12). Irenaeus iv. 17, 5: Sed et suis discipulis dixit consilium, primitias Deo offere ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti sed ut ipsi nec infraestu, nec ingratì sint, cum, qui ex creatura est panis, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum. Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quae est secundum nos, solum sanguinem confessus est: et novi Testimoniœ novum docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis praestat, primitias suorum munerum in novo Testamento, de quo in xii. Prophetis Malachias sic praesignificavit (Mal. i. 10, 11), &c. Cap. xviii. 1: Ignitar Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offeri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigent a nobis sacrificium, sed quamuis est qui offer glorificateIpse in eo quod offerit, si acceptetur minus euis. Irenaeil fragm. II. ed. Pfeffi: Προσφέρειν γάρ τῷ θεῷ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτήριου τῆς εὐχαρίστης εὐχαριστώντος αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσε εἰρήσαι τῶν καρπῶν τούτων εἰς τροφῆν ἡμέραν, καὶ ἐναπάθη της προσφορὰς τέλεσται εἰκολογόμεν τῷ πνεύμα τῷ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφέρη τῷ θεοὶ ταύτην καὶ τοῦ ἄρτου σώμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα αἱ μεταλαβόντες τῶν τῶν ἀρτιότερος τῆς ἁφάνειας τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ἁλίμων τῆς τῆς ἡμερών τῆς. Cf. Chr. M. Pfeffli Diss. de oblatione Veterum eucharisticae, in his syntagmata dissert. theol. Stutt. 1720, p. 219, ss. Ständlins History of the dogma of the sacrifice of the Lord's Supper, in Scolenius's u. Ständlins Götting, Biblioth. d. neuesten theol. Literatur, ii. 163. This idea of oblations is expressed not only in the sacrificial prayers of the old liturgies (see Constit. Apost. viii. c. 13, comp. Pfeffli Syntagma, p. 378, ss.), but also even now in the commencing words of the canon missae of the Roman church: Te igitur, clementissime pater—supplies rogamus ac petimus, uti accepta habeas ac beneficae haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata (i. e., the still unconsecrated bread and wine).
the Mosaic law of first fruits, and soon, in consequence, the law of tithes also, appeared to be still valid, the Christians obtained in them a rule for their oblations, without, however, any kind of external compulsion being used for enjoining the observance of them. The eucharist being considered the symbol of the intimate communion of the church with itself and with Christ, it was also sent to the absent as a token of this communion, and taken by those who were present to their homes.

Baptism was preceded by instruction, fasting, and prayer. The baptism of children was not universal, and was even occasionally disapproved. While Christians were supposed to be engaged in constant warfare with the world and the devil under the banner of Christ, they generally used the sign of the cross.


17 Cf Justin above, note 12. Ireneeus ap. Euseb. v. 24, § 5: The presbyters of one church eijanastai to those of another.

18 Tertull. ad Uxor. ii. c. 5. De Orat. c. 14.
19 On the creed see above, § 51, note 13.
21 Tertull. ad Martyres, c. 3: Vocati sumus ad militiam Dei vivi jam tunc, cum in sacramenti verba respondimus, &c. De Corona mill. c. 11.
22 Tertull. adv. Marc. iii. 18, de Cor. militis, c. 3. But no adornation of the cross. Minucius Fel. c. 29: Cruces etiam nec colimus, nec optimus.
and often exorcism, as a powerful defense against the machinations of evil spirits. Probably they already began to apply the latter in the case of those persons who, renouncing the prince of this world, prepared themselves for baptism. Many new usages were connected with baptism itself toward the end of the second century. The concluding of a marriage was announced by the bishop of the church; and with this was very naturally connected the giving of his blessing on the new union. Second marriages were condemned by many in all cases, and began to be expressedly disallowed in the case of the clergy. But when the

23 Tertull. de Idololatr. c. 11, of the Christian Tharrarins: Qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suis (i. e., the demons, ironically), quibus dominum suum celliarium praestat? De Cor. millitis, c. 11, of the Christian soldiers: Quos interdum exorcismis fugavit, noctibus defensabit, incumbens et requiescens super pilam, quo perfossis est latas Christi?

24 Barnabas Epist. c. 16: Πρὸ τοῦ ημῶν πιστεύσαι τῷ θεῷ, ἵνα ἡμῶν τὰ κατοικητήρια τῆς καρδίας φθάσων καὶ άσκενη—οἰκος δαιμόνων, διὰ τά ποιεῖν βασίν εν εαυταίᾳ τῷ θεῷ. From this view, the application of exorcism in the case of candidates for baptism resulted as a matter of course.

25 The ceremony of baptism was still very simple, as described in Justin Apol. i. c. 79. Otherwise in Tertull. de Cor. mil. c. 3: Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia, sub antistitia manu contestavamus, nos renunciare diablo (ιπτάμεσθαι διαβόλοις) et pompaec et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergimur, amplius aliquam respondentes quam dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Inde suscepi lactis et mellis concordiam praestatimus (qua infantiam, adv. Marc. i. c. 14): exque ea die lavacron quotidiano per totam hebdomadem abstinentemus. There is an opinion that the last-mentioned rite was borrowed from the heathen mysteries; see Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 321. An excursus to the whole passage is given in Neander’s Antiquilogia, S. 149, ff.—Tertull. de Baptismo. c. 7: Exinde egressi de lavacron perusingum beneficiæ unctione (χριστής) de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oele de cornu in sacerdolum sollevant. (This anointing, according to Thilo Acta Thomæ, p. 177, was of Gnostic origin.) Cap. 8: Dehinc manus imponentur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans spiritualum sanctum (χειροθεῖα). Jo. Dallaoco de duobus Latinorum exunctione sacramentis. Genev. 1659. 4, p. 126, ss. Neander’s K. G. i. 1. 543.


27 Athenagoras Deprcc. c. 28: Ο ἐνθρος (γύμος) εντρεπτος ἐστιν μοιχεία. On the other hand, Hermæ Past. lib. i. mand. iv. 4: Si vir vel mulier alicujus decesserit, et nusserit alicuius illorum, numquid pecusat? Quis nubit non peccat, inquit, sed si per se manersit, 

28 Tertull. ad Uxor. i. 7: Disciplina ecclesiæ et præscriptio apostolici—digamos non sinit præsiderere. Yet de Monagrum. 12: Quot enim et digami præsident apud vos, insultantes utique apostolos? Derived from 1 Tim. iii. 2. Tertullian read also in Lev. xxii.: Sacerdotes mei non plus nubent [de Exhort. castit. 7]. Comp. Heydenreich’s Pastoralbriefe Pauli. Bd. i, S. 166, ff.
Montanists forbade them universally, they met with opposition. Fasts, which were looked upon as a suitable preparation for prayer, and celibacy, were valued, but continued to be left to the free choice of every one, although the opinion of Philo, that the marriage intercourse was something that rendered a person unclean, had been already introduced. Many Christians devoted themselves to a certain abstinence (ἀσκησία); but all forced and artificial asceticism was disapproved. The only custom of the kind which was universal was the celebration of the passion-time of Jesus by a fast; but this was observed in very different ways. In other cases, for voluntary fasting and prayer (stationes, stationum semijunia, Tert. de Jejun. c. 13) they chose Wednesday and Friday. Sunday and the Sabbath


30 Semisch, Justin d. M. i. 199.

31 This appellation formerly applied to the atheists (Plato de Republ. iii. p. 297), was afterward by Philo (de Praem. et Poen. 914, 917, 920) to the exercises of virtue in the wise. So also among the heathen philosophers (Arrian diss. in Epict. iii. c. 12, περὶ ἀσκησεως. Arminius, about 100. Onoeceol. iv. c. 33, says of a philosopher, Alexander: 'Ἐμελεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἀνδρὶ ἀσκητῷ ὑμῖν γὰρ, ὡς κοιμωμάς, ὡς πλάσουσαν. Διαφοραν τε. c. 28: Εἴρον τὸν πόλλῳς τῶν παρ᾽ ἂν καλόνθρως καὶ γνώσεις καταγράφουσαι ἐκλειδῶν συνεχέσθω τὸ θεόν. Tertull. de Carit. Poen. 11: Non enim et multi ita faciunt, et se spadonasti observant proprium regnum Dei (Matth. xix. 19), tam foret et usque permansse volupatem sponte ponentes (continentes, ἀγαθαρχεῖς, cf. de Vel. virg. 31). Nuncupid non aliqii ipsi Dei creaturar sibi interdictum, abstinenter vino et animalibus con-escentibus, quorum fructus nulli periculo aut sollicitudini adjacent, sed humili-tatem animae sua in victus quoque castigatione Deo immolant? Galenus, see above, § 41, note 16; cf. Sal. Deyling de Ascetic. veterem, in ejusd. Observat. saec. lib. iii.


33 Respecting the stations, watches of milites Christi, which were usually continued till three o'clock in the afternoon, see Hermæ Pastor iii. Sim. 5, and Fabrinius ad h. i. Ga. Bevercgii. Cod. canumoum eccl. primitiae indicatus, lib. iii. c. 10.—Tertull. de Jejun. c. 2: Certe in evangelio illos dies jejunii determinatos putat (Psychici), in quibus ablatas est sponsus (Matth. ix. 15): et hos esse jam solos legimus jejuniorum christiorum. (De Orat. 14: De Paschae communis et quasi publica jejunii religio est)—sic et apostolos observasse, nullum alium imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus beobaudorum jejuniorum: prōinde nec stationum, quae et ipsae suas quidem dies habebant, quattuor feriae et sextae, passim tamen currant, neque sub leg. preceptati, neque ultra supremum dici, quando et orationes fer haora nona conclatur, de Petri exemplo, quod actis refertur. (De Orat. 14: Statio de militari exemplo nonem accipit: nam et militis Dei sumus). C. 13.
were observed as festivals; the latter, however, without Jewish superstitution. In the celebration of the passover, there was a difference between the churches of Asia Minor and those of the west. The former adhered to the Jewish passover feast, giving it a reference to Christ; the latter, on the other hand, kept Bene autem, quod et Episcopi universae plebi mandare jejunia assolente—ex aliqua solidicitudinis ecclesiasticae causa.—Ireneaeus ad Victoriam ep. Euseb. v. 24. 4: Ohe ygr μόνον περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἡ ἁμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἰδώς αὐτοῦ τῆς νυστείας: οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴοντα μίαν ἡμέραν δὲν αὐτοῖς νυστείαν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ καὶ πλειονας, οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὡρας ἡμερῶν τε καὶ νυκτερινάς συμμετείχα τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν. On the last words see the Excursus in Heinichen. Euseb. t. iii. p. 377, ss. I am inclined to read τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτῶν. "Others measure off forty hours along with their day" (μετροῦσιν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ), i. e., they fast the day which they celebrate as the passover, or the day of Christ's death (for in this there was a difference), and begin with the hour of the death (three o'clock, afternoon), a new forty hours' fast till the resurrection.— Cf. Jo. Dallaius de Jejuniis et quadragesima. Davenr. 1654. 8.


28 The most important in this festival was the passover day, the 14th of Nisan, which, after it had been probably spent in fasting, closed with a Christian paschal meal (love-feast and Eucharist). (Epiphan. Haer. i. 1, ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους μιᾶν ἡμέραν τὸ πάσχα βιολογεῖας ἄγοντες. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who defended, in the year 196, this solemnity against the Romish bishop Victor, designates it in Euseb. v. 24, as a τηρεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκευαστάτη τὸ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. The whole day, therefore, was kept, but it might be observed merely by fasting. Comp. Tertull. de Orat. c. 14, see above, note 33). In favor of this they appealed to a passage of the law, (Epiphan. Haer. i. 1): ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος, δὲ ὁ ποιήσε τὸ πάσχα τῇ τεσσαρεσκευαστάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ του μνήμον. They said (apud Hippolytus in chron. Pasch. p. 6): ἐποίησε τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστὸς τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἐπέλεξεν διὸ κάθε δὲν ἐπὶ τρόπον ο σώματος ἐποίησε, οὗτοι ποιεῖν. In it they ate unleavened bread, probably like the Jews, eight days through; they said (Chrysostomus contra Jud. Orat. iii. ed. Montfaucon, i. 610): ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ ἁμερίου τὸ πάσχα ἔστη. On the contrary, there is no trace of a yearly festival of the resurrection among them, for this was kept every Sunday. Since the Christians of Asia Minor appealed in their passover solemnity on the 14th Nisan to John, (Polycrates, l. c.), and yet, according to his gospel Christ partook of the last supper with his disciples so early as the 13th Nisan; an argument has been lately deduced from this fact against the authenticity of John's gospel, (Bret Schneider Probandibälla, p. 129, after him Strauss and Schwengler). To judge correctly of this matter we must set out with that which is remarked very truly respecting it by Socrates, Hist. ecl. v. 22: ὁδόμαντον τοῖς ὁ ἀπόστολος, οὐδὲ τὰ εὐαγγέλια ζεῦγον δουλείας τοῖς κηρύγματι προσέλθασιν ἐπιθυμήσαν· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡρῴη τοῦ πάσχα καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαῖς ὀρθὰς τιμής· τῇ εὐγενεσίᾳ τοῦ εὐεργετηθέντων κατέλειπον—σκόπος μὲν οὐν ἡ γένος των ἀποστόλων, οἵ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀρχιτικοῦ νομοθετεῖν, ἀλλὰ μοῦ ὀρθόν καὶ τὴν θεοσβέσιν ἐνλήμασθαι· ἔριο δε φανερά, ὅτι ὑπέρ ἀλλὰ πολλὰ κατὰ χώρας συννόηθην ἐλάβων, οὗτω καὶ τὸ πάσχα ἡρῴη παρ' ἐκάστος εἰς συννόησις τοῦ ἀδιάκοπως ἐκ τῆς παρατήρησεν, διὰ τοῦ μὴνεν τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὡς ἑφ' ἑαυτοῦ νευρομοθηκόμενον περὶ αὐτῶς. In the Christian assemblies the Jewish passover was at first kept up, but observed with
up the recollection of the death and resurrection of Christ, as in every week, so with greater solemnity every year, at the passover festival, on the corresponding days of the week, so that the passover Friday was always regarded by them as *dies paschae*. When Polycarp visited Rome, about 160, he had a conference on this point with the Roman bishop Anicetus (Epist. Iren. ap. Euseb., v. 24). Both remained of the same opinion as before, but separated in perfect friendship. Among the Christians of Asia Minor themselves, there was a controversy in Laodicea respecting the passover, about 170; but the proper point debated is not certainly known.

Public sinners were excluded from the church, and the way for restoration could only be prepared by public repentance.

reference to Christ, the true passover. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). Thus John, too, found it in Ephesus and allowed it to remain unaltered. He corrected it in his gospel only so far as it proceeded on the supposition that Christ had eaten with the Jews the passover on the day before his death, by making it apparent that Christ was crucified on the 14th Nisan. But that solemnity needed not to have been changed on this account; on the contrary, if the 14th Nisan was the true Christian passover day, the fulfillment of the typical pasch took place on the same day with it.

Melito περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα απ. Eusebius iv. 26, 2: Ἑπὶ Σερονίλλου Παῦλου, ἀνθυπάτου τῆς Ἀλιας, ὁ Δάγναρις καιρῷ ἐμαρτύρησε, ἐγένετο χήτης πολλὴ ἐν Λαοδίκειᾳ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, ἐμπέσων τοῦ καίρῳ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς ἥμερας. Eusebius adds, that Clement of Alexandria was induced to write his book on the passover by this work of Melito. Since now Melito is quoted by Polycrates (Euseb. v. 24, 2) as an authority for the custom as observed in Asia Minor, but since the Paschal Chronicle, p. 6, s., quotes the writings of the contemporaneous Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, and Clement of Alexandria, on the passover, together in favor of the view that Christ had not eaten the Jewish passover on the day before his death, it has been inferred that Apollinaris had attacked the Axiatie practice, and that Melito defended it. But no trace of this is found in Eusebius; on the contrary, both writers are named by him beside one another as working together harmoniously, (iv. 26). In the fragment of Apollinaris’s work which remain, those persons are combated who said: ὅτα τῇ ἐν τῷ πρόβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῇ δὲ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ὥρων αὐτὸς ἔστηθεν, and appended to Matthew in their favor. This view, says Apollinaris, contradicts the law (so far as the passover, and consequently also Christ as the passover, must be offered the 14th) and the gospels, and he asserts in opposition: ἡ ἐν τῷ ἑλθοντι τοῦ Κυρίου πάσχα, ἡ θεσία ἡ μεγάλη, ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἓγερτο παῖς Θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ. Hence he does not combat the keeping of the 14th as the paschal day, but merely intends to vindicate the right significance of it against erroneous conceptions. This day was to be celebrated as the Christian passover, not because Christ had eaten on it the typical passover with the Jews, but because he himself, as the true passover, had offered himself to God.

E. ξερόλογησις. Iren. i. c. 9 of a female penitent: αὐτῆς τῶν ἁπαντά χρώνον ξερολογήσεις διετέλεσε πενθοῦσα καὶ θηρυνώσα. Tertull. de Pecnit. c. 9: Exomologesis — qua delictum Dominum nostrum confitemur: non quidem ut ignorant, sed quatenus satisfacit confessio diuinatis, confessione postremae nascitur, postremata Deus mitigat. Itaque exomologesis prosernendae et humilificandi hominis disciplina est, conversioneem injungens misericordiae illicem. De ipso quoque habitat utque virtus mandat, succo et cineri inebriare, corpus sordibus obscurare, unum moeroribus dejicere; illa, quae poccavit,
After baptism only a public repentance was generally allowed. In the African church they proceeded so far as frequently to exclude forever those who had been guilty of incontinence, murder, and idolatry. This was done in pursuance of Montanist principles.

Those persons were highly honored who endured persecutions for the sake of the Christian faith. The death of a martyr (μάρτυς, Acts xxii. 20; Heb. xii. 1; Apoc. xvii. 6) was supposed, like baptism, to have the efficacy of destroying sin (lave-rum sanguinis; τὸ βαπτισμα διὰ πυρός, Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 39), supplied the place even of baptism (according to Matthew x. 39), and alone introduced the person immediately to the presence of the Lord in paradise (Matt. v. 10–12; Apoc. vi. 9: hence ἡμέρα γενέθλιος, γενέθλια τῶν μαρτυρῶν, natales, natalitia martyrum. But the surviving confessors also (ὁμολογήται, confessores, Matt. x. 32; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13) were held to be chosen members of Christ. People were zealous in visiting them in

tristi tractatione mutare. Caeterum pastum et potum pura nosse; non ventris silicet, sed animae causa. Plorumque vero jeaniis preces alere, ingemescere, lachrymari, et magis dies noctesque ad dominum Deum tunam, presbyteris adolvi, et caris Dei adgenialisii, omnibus fratribus legationes decrepationes suae injungere.—In quantum non pepercitis tibi, in tantum tibi Deus, crede, parce. 38

38 Hermas Pastor ii. Mand. 4, § 1. Servia enim Dei pociuentia una est. (Cf. Cotelerius ad h. 1.) Then he softens, § 3, the principle afterward asserted by the Montanists, quod alia pociuentia non est nisi illa, cum in eam descendimus, et accipimus, remissione peccatorum, so far: quod post vocacionem illam magnum et sanctum, si quis tentatus fuerit a Diabo, et perseveraverit, unam pociuentiam habet. So too Clemens Alex. Strom. ii. c. 13, p. 459, s. Cf. Bingham, lib. xviii. c. 4, vol. viii. p. 156, ss.

39 Tertull. de Pudic. c. 12, appeals in favor of this to Acts xv. 29. Cyprian. Epist. 59: Apud antecessores nostros quidam de Episcopis istic in provincia nostra dandum pacem moechis non putaverunt, et in totum pociuentiam locum contra adulteria clarenserunt. Non tamen a Coepiscoporum suorum collegio recesserunt, aut catholicave Ecclesiae unitatem vel duritiae vel censuras suae obstinatione ruperunt; ut, quia apud alios adulteris pac dabatur, qui non dabat, de ecclesia separaretur. Mane concordiae vinculo et perseverante Catholicae Ecclesiae individuo sacramento, suum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino reditaturas. Though this severity was afterward relaxed in reference to the Moechi (see below, § 59, note 4), yet they still remained at first united with the Montanists in asserting this principle, Tertull. de Pudic. c. 12: Quod neque idololatriae neque sanguinis pac ab Ecclesiis reeditur.

40 Hermes (Pastor. iii. Simil. ii. 38, says to the martyrs: Vitam vobis donat Dominus, nec intelligitis. Delicta enim vestra vos gravabant: et nisi passi essetis hujus nominis causa, proper peccata corte vestra mortui eratis Deo. Tertull. de Resurr. carnis, 43: Nemo enim perorganitas a corpore statim immoratur pene Dominium, nisi ex martyrii praerogativa silicet paradiso, non infiri diversurus. (In like manner, according to the ancient Greeks, only heroes attained to the Ἡλύσιον or the μακάρων νόμος, of whose situation similar ideas were entertained as of Paradise, see Dissen de Fortunatorum insulae disp. Gotting. 1837. On Paradise see Ulemanus in Illgen’s Zeitsschr. f. d. hist. Theol. i. f. 146.) Clemens Alex. Strom. iv. p. 596: ἐκεῖνος ὁνὸν τὸ μαρτύριον ἀποκαθαρσις εἶναι ἡμαρτωλῶν μετὰ δόξης.
the prisons, and taking care of them; and this was enjoined on the deacons as a peculiar duty. If the lapsed (lapsi) had been admitted by them to communion, there was a general aversion any longer to refuse them restoration to the privileges of the church. As it was an important point in the estimation of Christians generally to keep up the consciousness of enduring communion with their departed, this communion, accordingly, with the blessed martyrs, was especially valuable and dear to them. In this sense, families celebrated the remembrance of their departed members, churches that of their martyrs yearly on the day of their death, by prayers at the

41 Tertull. ad Martyres, c. 1, init.: Inter carnis alimenta, benedicti martyres designati, quos nobis et domina mater ecclesia de iberibus suis, et singuli fratres de opibus suis pro praesidio in carcerem subministrant, capite aliquid et a nobis, quod faciat ad spiritum quoque educandum. Carcem enim sagiarii et spiritum exserire non prodest. The excess of care which he here only refers to (cf. Lucian de morte Peregrini, c. 19), he afterward cenused with bitterness in the Psychics, de Jejunio c. 12: Plene vestrum est in carcerebus popinas exhibere martyribus inerteris, ne consuetudinem quærant, ne tædiant vitae, ne novi abstinenteis disciplinis sanctificanter. He even accuses them of endeavoring to put courage into the prisoners before their judges, condito mero taman antidoto.


43 In opposition to the stanes, as Romans xiv. 4, 1 Cor. x. 12.


45 Tertull. de Exhort. Cast. c. 11, to the man who had married a second time: Negne enim præstam potiora odisse, cui etiam religionem reservas affectioneum, ut jam receptae aput Deum, pro cujus spiritu postulas, pro qua obligationes annuas reddis. Stabis ergo ad Deum cum tot uxoribus, quot in oratione commemoratas, et offeres pro duabus, et commendabis illas duas. De Monogamia c. 10: Enimvero et pro anima ejus (mariti mortui) orat (uxor), et relinquum interin adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus.

graves,⁴⁷ and by agapae. So high an estimation of martyrdom induced many Christians to give themselves up to the authorities, thus furnishing cause for the charge of fanatical enthusiasm brought against them by the heathen.⁴⁸ This mode of proceeding, however, was for the most part discountenanced, in consequence of the express command of Christ (Matt. x. 23).⁴⁹

instructions to his clergy how they should take care of the confessors. Epist. 37: Officium meum vestra diligentia repressentec, faciat omnia quae fieri oportet circa eos, quos in tabulis meritis sidel ac virtutis illustrat divina dignatio. Denique et dies eorum quibus excedant annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias Martyrum celebree possimius —et celebrator hic a nobis obligationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum quae cito volibiscum Domino protengent celebrae. Further notices of the martyrs were the affairs of private individuals; and the representation of Anastasius (liber Pontificalis in vita Clementis) originated in the respect paid to saints in later times. Hic fecit viii. regiones dividit Notarialis fideibus Ecclesias, qui gesta Martyrum sollicite et curiosæ, unusquisque per regionem suam, perquirerent (cf. vitae Anteri et Fabiani), which was afterward copied into martyrologies. How few genuine histories of the martyrs may be expected from this age is evident from Augustini sermo xciii. de diversis: Hoc primum primi Martyris (Stephanis) meritum commendatum est charitati vestrae: quia, cum aliorum Martyrum vix gesta inveniamus, quae in solemnitatis eorum recitare possimus, hujus passio in canonicom libro est. Gregorius M. lib. viii. ep. 29, ad Eulogiam Episc. Alex.: Praeter illa quae in Eusebii libris de gestis SS. Martyrum continetur, nulla in archivio hujus nostrae Ecclesiae, vel in Romanaeae urbis bibliotheciae esse cognovi, nisi paxea quaedam in suis codicis volumine collecta. Nos autem paene omnium martyrum, distinctis per dies singulos passionibus, collecta in uno codice nomina habemus, atque quotidiani de diebus in eorum veneratione missarum solemnia agimus. Non tamen in codem volumine, quis qualiter sit passus indicatur, sed tantummodo nomen, locus, et dies passionis positur. The cause of this may not indeed have been that assigned by Prudentius per sto philo, i. v. 75:

Chartusas blasphemos olim saeque abolitit,
Ne tenebris libellis erudita saecula
Ordinem, tempus, modumque passionis proditum,
Dulcitibus linguis per aures posteriorum spargereat.


⁴⁷ Hence the cry of the heathen: Arene non sint. s. Tertull. ad Scapul. c. 3.
⁴⁸ Tertull. ad Scapulam, c. 5. : Arrinis Antonius [at the time of Hadrian] in Asia cum perseverentur instanter, omnes illius civitatibus Christiani ante tribunalia ejus se manus facta obtulerant, cum ille, paece duci jussis, reliquis ait: ô deioli, el ëleuthe ëpohëskes, ἐπισκόπους ἄνδρας ἐξέρχεται. In like manner, Justin makes the heathen say to the Christians, Apol. ii. 4: πάντες οὖν ἡμοίοι φανερώσαμες προεύθεθε ἡ γένεσι παρά τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἡμῖν πρόμαχον μη παρέχετε. Afterward the Montanists especially, see Tertull. l. c. de fuga in persec. &c. Cf. S. F. Rivini dies. de professoribus veteris Ecclesiae martyribus. Lips. 1739. 4.
THIRD DIVISION.

FROM SEPTIMUS SEVERUS TO THE SOLE DOMINION OF CONSTANTINE.
A.D. 193-324.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 54.

CONDITION OF HEATHENISM.

While the Roman empire appeared hastening to its fall, the throne being occupied by soldiers, the provinces devastated by barbarians, and the government changed into the most arbitrary despotism, the kingdom of superstition, in which alone the men of that time sought for peace and security from the dangers that surrounded them, had established itself firmly. Not only were the emperors themselves addicted to this superstition, but they also openly confessed it, and in part introduced even foreign rites into Rome. The Platonic philosophy, which had confined itself till now to a defense of the popular religions, and to securing for the wise a more elevated worship of deity, endeavored, since the beginning of the third century, to give to the people's religion a higher and more spiritual form, under the pretense of bringing it back to its original, purer state. This philosophy had been unquestionably forced to this by the spiritual preponderance of Christianity. With this view, Philostratus

1 P. E. Müller de hierarchia et studio vitae asceticae in sacris et mysteriis Graec et Rom. latentibus, Hafn. 1803. Abschl. 3 (translated in the N. Bibl. d. schön. Wissensch. Bd. 70. S. 3, ff) The Jewish religion also was continually incorporated into this religious mixture (comp. above, § 17, note 9), see Commodiani (about 270) instructiones adv. gentium deos pro christiana disciplina (in Gallandii Biblioth. vett. Patr. T. iii.):

Inter urumque putare dubie vivendo enare,
Nullatus a lege decreptus luxu procedis?
Quid in synagoga decurris ad Pharisaeos,
Ut tibi misericors flat, quem denegas ultero?
Exis inde foris, iterum tu fana requiris.
the elder composed the life of *Apollonius* of Tyana (220), in which the latter was represented as the reformer of heathenism. But all the preceding tendencies of philosophy, and this also, were perfected in the so-called *new-platonic* school. The founder of it, *Ammonius Saccas*, Σακκάς (i.e., σακκοφόρος) of Alexandria († about 243), an apostate from Christianity to heathenism, appears to have borrowed the pattern of his heathenism defending philosophy principally from the Christian Gnostics. He communicated his system only as a secret; but by his disciple, the Egyptian *Plotinus* († 270), it was farther developed, and spread abroad with incredible rapidity. With no less renown, Plotinus was followed by his disciple, *Porphyry* of Tyre (Malchus † 304), and he by *Jamblichus* of Chalcis († 333), who survived the overthrow of paganism.

The leading principles of the theology of these philosophers, who wished to find the absolute, not by a process of thought, but by immediate intuition, like the Christian Gnostics, are the following: From the highest existence (τὸ ἐν) arises intelligence (ὁ νοῦς), and from this the soul (ἡ ψυχή). The highest world of intelligence or understanding (κόσμος νοητός), is the totality of all intelligences, of the gods as well as of human spirits. By the soul of the world (hence called the δημοσιογράφος), the visible world was formed. The gods are divided into those dwelling above the world (ἄνωτα, νοητοί, ἀφανεῖς), and those inhabiting the world (περικόσμωτα, ἵππηρτοι, ἐμφανεῖς). To the latter the different parts of the world are intrusted for oversight (hence θεοὶ μερικοὶ, μέρισται, ἑκάράκι, πολλοῖκα); and from them the various nations

---

2 Comp. § 14, note 10, and Baur’s treatise there quoted. Tschirner’s *Fall. d. Heidenthams*, l. 405, 461.
have derived their peculiar character. Lower than the gods stand the *demons*, some good, and others bad. While the people worship the highest god only in their national deities, and that with propriety, the wise man must, on the contrary, endeavor to attain to immediate union with the highest deity. While Neo-platonism endeavored in this way both to prop up heathenism, and to give it a higher and more spiritual character, it adapted itself, on the one hand, to the grossest popular superstitions, and, on the other, adopted the purest ideas respecting the supreme deity. Accordingly, it communicated, at the same time, the most excellent precepts regarding the moral worship of God, and recommended asceticism and theurgy, in order to elevate its votaries to communion with the deity, and to obtain dominion over the demons. It can not well be doubted, that Christianity influenced the development of the purer aspect of the neo-platonic doctrines, when we look at the striking agreement of many of these doctrines with those of Christianity. This source, however, was not acknowledged by the new Platonists, who wished that the root of their doctrine should be considered as existing only in the national philosophy, and, along with it, in the oldest Chaldean and Egyptian wisdom. In consequence of this view, neo-platonic productions appeared sometimes in the form of *Chaldean oracles*, and in the name of *Hermes Trismegistus*.

6 Lobeck Aglaophamus, i. p. 104, ss.
8 Respecting the *Χαλδαϊκὰ λόγια* among the New Platonists, see J. C. Thilo, Comm. de coelo empyreo, pp. iii. Halae, 1829, 40. 4.
FIRST CHAPTER.

EXTERNAL FORTUNES OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 55.

DISPOSITION OF THE HEATHEN TOWARD IT.

Though the reports of secret abominations said to be practiced by the Christians in their assemblies vanished by degrees among the heathen people, yet other prejudices against them remained unchanged. Every public calamity was continually regarded as a token of the wrath of the gods against the Christians, and excited fresh hatred and persecution. The cultivated heathen held fast by the old view, that whatever truth they could not avoid perceiving in the Christian religion, was disfigured by a barbarous form, and the admixture of rude enthusiasm, and was found in a purer form in their national traditions. From this point of view began, from the commencement of the third century, the efforts which were made to reform the popular religion, that it might be elevated to the same height as Christianity. In this way either both religions might be blended together, or greater power would be given to heathenism to withstand Christianity. Philostratus, in his life of Apollonius of Tyana, might have had in view this syncretistic object, but Neo-platonism, on the contrary, appeared in an attitude decidedly hostile to Christianity.


2 Comp. above, § 41, note 26. The constant reproach of the heathen may be found in Cyprianus lib. ad Demetrianum: Dixiti, per nos fieri, et quod nobis debant imputari omnia ista, quibus nunc mundus quasiur et urgetur, quod dii vestri a nobis non colantur. Origenes in Matth. commentariorum series, c. 39 (or Matth. xxiv. 9), Arnobius adv. gentes i. c. 1: Postquam esse in mundo christianum gens coepit, terrarum orbem peruisset, multiformibus multa auctum esse genus humanum: ipso etiam Coelites decretisti curis solenisibus, quibus quandoam solent invicem res nostras, terrarum ab regionibus exstinguentes, c. 3, ill. 36, iv. 47. Cf. Maximini Epist. ap. Euseb. ix. 7, 4.


4 Mosheim de turbata per recentiores Platonicos cecesia, in his Dissert. ad hist. eccl. pert. i. 120, 173. Kell de Causis alieni Platonici. recent. a rel. Christ. animi Opusc. acad. ii. 393, ss.). Tschirner’s Fall d. Heidenth. i. 569.
nists, for the most part, regarded Christ as the most distinguished sage and theurgist. On the other hand, however, they asserted that the doctrine of Christ perfectly agreed with theirs at first, but that it had been in many ways corrupted by his disciples, especially by the doctrine of Christ's deity, and forbidding the worship of the gods. In this manner the Christians appeared to be a crowd of misguided enthusiasts who had strayed from their leader, in contrast with whom, the heathen in their philosophy, and in their purified popular worship, possessed the purer truth, and occupied a higher position. The contest of these philosophers with Christianity, which continued till the sixth century, had thus a more earnest character than the earlier attacks. In the works of Plotinus many passages are aimed at the Christians, without their name being introduced.

---

5 Porphyrius πέρι τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας (a book which Ficinus had read even in the fifteenth century. See his Comment. in Plotini Ennecad. ii. lib. iii. c. 7, p. 121, and frequently, and which is probably still preserved in some Florentine library) apud Augustin. de civ. Dei, xii. 23: Praeter opinionem profecto quibusdam videatur esse quod dicturi sumus. Christum enim Didii piissimum prouocaverunt et immortalem factum, et cum bona praedicacione ejus meminerunt (namely by oracles). Christianos autem pollutus et contaminatus et errore impatientes esse dicit, et multos talibus adversus eos blasphemiis utuntur.—De Christo autem interrogantibus sibi est Deus, ait Hecate: "Quoniam quidem immortalis anima post corpus ut incedit, nosti: a sapientia autem absissa semper errat: viri pietate praestantissimi est illa anima, hanc colunt alii a se veritate." The same in Euseb. Demonstr. evang. iii. c. 8:—

6 Οὕτω μὲν ἡμῖν ἀνανίστησιν ψυχή μετὰ σώμα προσβαίνειν,

Τιμῶσθαι σοφί τετιμημένος. ἀλλάζει ψυχή

Ἀνέφες ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος προφητεύατά ἑστιν ἐκείνος.

Direct attacks against them were the κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγοι, fifteen books of Porphyry;⁷ and the λόγοι φιλαλήθεις πρὸς Χριστιανοὺς, in two books of Hierocles, governor of Bithynia under Diocletian.⁸ The lives also of Pythagoras by Jamblichus and Porphyry, had a hostile reference to Christianity.⁹

§ 56.

CONDUCT OF THE EMPERORS TOWARD THE CHRISTIANS.

After Christianity had been favorably regarded by several emperors in this period, and had been introduced into the general religious syncretism, there arose in the second half, not only new persecutions, but such as partook of a far more hazardous character than any of the earlier, since they were generally commanded by the emperors, and aimed at nothing less than the complete annihilation of Christianity. Septimus Severus (193 till 211) was, indeed, not unfriendly to the Christians at first (Tertull. ad Scapulam, c. 4); but they had much to suffer in the provinces from the popular rage¹ and the avarice of the governors.² These persecutions increased considerably after the emperor (203), changed, perhaps, by the excesses of the Montanists, had forbidden the adoption of Christ-

---

⁷ Whether he was an apostate from Christianity, as Socrates, iii. 23, Augustin. de civit. Dei, x. 28, says, is questionable. See the correspondence between Sibyllus and Thomas in Miscellan. Lips. tom. i. p. 331, ss. Ullmann in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1892, ii. 360.—Fragments of his writings have been collected by Luc. Holtenius Diss. de vita et scriptis Porphyrii. Rom. 1630, 8 (reprinted in Fabrici Bibl. Gr. t. iv. p. 367, ss.). The works written against him by Methodius, bishop of Tyre, Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, and (the best) by Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, have also been lost.

⁸ Cf. Lactant. Institut. div. v. c. 2 and 3. Against his comparison of Christ with Apolloius of Tyana see Eusebius contra Hieroc. lib. appended to his Demonstratio Evangelica ed. Paris 1628, and Colon. 1688. Baum's Apollonius von Tyana und Christus, S. 1. Even in Chrysostom's time, the writings of the heathen philosophers against Christianity were for the most part lost (Chrys. de S. Babylon. Opp. ed. Montf. ii. 339). According to a law of Valentine III. and Theodosius II., A.D. 449, they were enjoined to be burnt (Cod. Justin. i. 1, 3).


Tertullian. de Fuga in persecut. c. 12: Persecutionem—non esse—redemptio summamia fuga est.

¹ Tertullian. de Fuga in persecut. c. 12: Persecutionem—non esse—redimendum—redemptio summamia fuga est.

ianity. Under Caracalla, however (211–217), they gradually ceased. Elagabalus (218–222) went so far as to think of blending the Christian religion with the worship of his god. Severus Alexander (222–235), and his mother, Julia Mamaea, were addicted to a similar but more rational syncretism, and gave the Christians many proofs of their good-will. But Maximin the Thracian (235–238), persecuted the Christian clergy, and overlooked the persecutions in which the people of some provinces, excited against the Christians by an earthquake,
indulged. After the reign of Gordian (238–244), and Philip the Arabian (244–249), during which they were unmolested, Decius (249–251), immediately after he had ascended the throne, gave the signal by an edict for a fearful (the first really general) persecution, in which many Christians suffered martyrdom, while many others, enervated by long quietude, apostatised (sacramentum, thurificatum, libellatici). Gallus also (251–253), after a short interruption, continued this persecution.

---

7 Eusebius, vi. 28, Firmilianus ad Cyprian. (in Epp. Cypr. 73) Origenes Commentarii in Matth. xxiv. 9 (tom. 28).

8 Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 34: Τοῦτον κατέχει λόγος Χριστιανῶν ὡστα νὰ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ὀστά της τοῦ Πάσχα παναγιώζων ἐκαί τῆς ἐκάλυψεν ἑκάτον τῷ πλήθει συνιέταις ἔλε γος. οὐ πρόσθεν ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ταμιάδε προστάτων (according to Leontius, bishop of Antioch, about 350, in the Chronic. Pasch. ad Olymp. 357, it was Babylas, bishop of Antioch) ενπαράσχειν εἰσαλέξειν, ὡς ἤθικολογήσατοι, καὶ τοὺς ἐν παπατώμασιν εξευτε λέμους, μετανοεῖς τῷ χρόνῳ ἱσχομεν, ἐναντίον καταλέξει —καὶ πεπερατέσαι γε προθυμίως λέγεται. Hieron. in Chron. ad ann. 246. Philippus primus omnium ex Romaniis imperatoribus Christianus fuit. First condemned by Jos. Scaliger ad Euseb. Chron. and Is. Casambouas ad Jul. Capitolin. p. 201, especially Frid. Spanheim de Christianismo Phil. Ar. (Opp. t. ii. p. 100, ss.). It looks like a disposition of this emperor toward the Christians, that Origen wrote letters both to him and his spouse. Severus, Eusebius, vi. 36.

9 Of the earlier persecutions, it is said by Origenes, contra Celsum iii. p. 116: Ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιρὸν καὶ σφόδρα εὐρήμησεν τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς θεοσεβεῖς τεθνήκας.


11 Cypriani lib. de Lapsis: Ad prima statim verba minarit inimici maximis frustram numerum fidem suam profudit, nec prostratus est persecutionis impetu, sed voluntario lapes se ipso prostravit. — Non expectaverunt saltum, ut interrogerent negarent, ut ascendenter apprehen. Ante aciem multo victi, sine compressione prostrati, nec hoc sibi reliquerunt, ut sacrificare idolis viderentur inviti. A later pretext of the libellatici see Cypriani Epist. 52: Ego prius legeram et Episcopo tractante cognoveram, non sacrificandum idolae; — et idcirco ne hoc facearem, quod non liceret, cum occasio libelli fuisse, oblatu, quem nec ipsum acciperem, nisi ostensa fuisse occasum, ad magistratums vel venivi, vel alio corte mandavi. Christianam me esse, sacrificare mihi non licere, ad aras diaboli me venire non posset; dare me hoc loquere, ne quid non ficeret faciam. Different kinds of them, Cypr. Ep. 31: Sententiam nostram — protulimus adversus eos, qui se ipsum insidias illicita nefario rum libellorum professione prodiderant, — quod non minus, quam si ad naturas ars accessissent, hoc ipso quid ipsum contestatis fuerat tenerentur; sed etiam adversus illos qui acta fecissent, licet praeantos, cum fuerant, non afferrent, cum praeantum suum utique, ut sic scriberentur mandando, fecissent. Id lib. de Lapsis, 52: Nol sibi quimatis agnus perpendiantur blanduantur, qui eti nefanidis sacrificis manus non contaminaverunt, libellis tamen conscientiam polluerunt. Et illa professio de negantis contestatio et Christiani: [est Christiani], quod fuerat abuentis. Feceris se dixit quidquid alius faciendo commissit. Cf. Mosheim de reb. Chr. ante Const. M. p. 483.

12 Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 1.—Cypriani Epist. 57, 58, et lib. ad Demetrium
Valerian (253–260), gave the Christians rest for some time, but was induced by his favorite Macrianus (257) to renew the persecution. 13 Gallienus (260–268), first put a stop to it; 14 and in the stormy times that now succeeded, the emperors had much to do with antagonist emperors, rebellions, and barbarians, to think of persecuting the Christians. Only Aurelian (270–275) issued an edict against them, the execution of which was prevented by his murder that immediately followed. When the empire of Diocletian had received (284–305) four rulers (285, Maximian, Augustus of the west; —292, the Caesars, Galerius, and Constantius Chlorus), the church was at first undisturbed, notwithstanding the enmity of Galerius. The Christians attained to the most important offices, and the church was raised to a condition externally prosperous (Euseb. viii. 1). The alleged persecution of Maximian in Gaul and Rome is very improbable. 15 But in February 303,


14 The first laws of toleration. Two rescripts addressed on this subject to Christian bishops are quoted by Eusebius, vii. 13. The first is that by which Gallienus, after he had conquered Egypt (261), makes known to the bishops in that country the toleration which had been already announced to the rest of the empire: Τὴν ἐνεργείαν τῆς ἰδίας ὁμολογίας διὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου εκπροσώπησαν προσεύχοντες. Ὑπὸ χάριον τῶν τῶν πάντων τῶν θρησκευόντων ἀθροισμῶν. καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦτο βλέπει τῆς ἀντιφασίας τῆς ἰδίας τῆς τούτων οἰκουμενίας. 

15 The other he issued to the Caesarenses, cum et ipse in urbe.
Diocletian, moved by superstition and the persuasions of Galerius and Hierocles, caused the splendid church in Nicomedia to be destroyed, and then issued in succession three edicts against the Christians, which were finally succeeded by a fourth in 304, by virtue of which all Christians without exception were compelled to worship the gods. Thus there arose in the entire Roman empire, with the exception of Gaul, where Constantius Chlorus was even now well-disposed toward the Christians, the most violent persecution against them, abundant both in martyrs and in apostates (a new class called traditores). After the two Augusti had laid down their dignity (305), the persecution continued to rage in the east under the new Augustus, Galerius and his Caesar, Maximin. In Gaul

de gloria martyry. i. 62. Est apud Agrippinensem urbem basilica, in qua dicitur L. viri ex illa legione sacra Thebaeorum pro Christo nomine martyrium consummasset. Aido (about 869) has, on the other hand, even: Gereon et ali ci cccxvii. Pavia has had the whole scene transferred to its neighborhood in later times (Act. SS. September, t. vi. p. 377, 908, ss.). Perhaps the misunderstood expression, milites Christi, gave rise to most of these legends.

16 Constantine, ap. Euseb. de Vita Constant. ii. 50, 51, speaks of this from report.

17 Concerning all these persecutions, comp. the contemporaries, Lactantius de Mortibus persecutorum, c. 7, 8, and Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. libb. viii.—x. First edict, Euseb. viii. 2: 'Τὰς μὲν ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἑδαφὸς φέρειν, τὰς δὲ γραφὰς ὁμαίεις ποιεῖ γενεσθαι καὶ τοῖς μὲν τιμῆς ἐπελημμένοις, ἀτίμαις· τοῖς δὲ ἐν ὁλαισίας, ἐν ἑπιμένοις ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χριστιανικοῦ προβάσει, ἐλευθερίας στρεφείσθαι.' (Rufin. No, se quis corpusse permanisset Christianus, libertatem consuque posset.) Lactant. de Mort. perscc. c. 13. Postridie propositum est edictum, quo cavebatur, ut religiosis illius hymonis carerent omni honore ac dignitatu, tormentis subjecti essent, ex quoque unde ordinem ac gradum venirent, adversus eos omnium actio calceret; ipsis non de injuria, non de adultero, non de rebus ablatis agere possent; libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent. For explanation of this edict, see Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 925, s.—Second edict, Euseb. viii. 6, 8 (cf. viii. 2, 3): 'Τοῖς πανταχότεροι τῶν ἐκκλησίων προσπούσας ἐκκλησίας καὶ δεκαστην ἐνετέρας. Third edict, Euseb. viii. 6, 10: 'Τοῖς καταπλαίτως, βέσισας μὲν, ἐν ἡμῖν βαδίζεις ἐπὶ ἐλευθερίας, ἐνστα- μένον ἤ βυθίας καταβαίνεις βαδίσοις. (Cf. Euseb. viii. 2, 3: Πάντα μηχανή θύειν ἐξαναγκάζεσθαι.)

18 Fourth edict, Eusebius de martyribus Palestinae, c. 3: Καθολικῶ προστάμματι πάντας πανθηρεῖ τοῖς κατὰ πόλιν θείων τε καὶ σπέρμα τοῖς εἰδώλων ἐκειλέθης, κ. τ. λ.

19 Lactant. de Mort. perscc. c. 15: Constantius, ne dissentiunt a majorem (i.e., Augustorum) praeceptis videtur, conventualia, id est patietares, qui restituissent, divini passus est, verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incoluim servavit. C. 16: Vexebatur ergo universa terra, et praeter Gallias ab oriente usque ad occasum tres acerbissimae bestiae saeiebant. Hence the Donatist bishops, A.D. 313, wrote to Constantin (Optat. Milevit. i. c. 23): Pater inter caestros imperatorum persecutionem non exercebat, et ab hoc facieis immunes est Gallia.

20 Martyrs in Palestine: Eusebius de mart. Pa. lib. (Pamphilius, presbyter in Caesarea); in other countries, Euseb. H. E. viii. 7–13. (Peter, bishop of Alexandria; Lucian, presbyter in Antioch), Ruinart Acta primorum martyrum. Respecting the martyrs in Egypt comp. the Coptic acts, which, at least in later times, have been greatly overstated, in De miraculis S. Coluthi et reliquis actorum S. Paneasvir martyrum thebaica fragmenta duo opera A. A. Georgii. Romae. 1793, 4. In the praef. p. excl. ss. there is a chronological survey of the persecution, and of the Egyptian martyrs.
and Spain, however, it ceased entirely under the Augustus Constantius Chlorus; and in Italy and Africa under the Caesar Severus, it at least abated. After the death of Constantius Chlorus (306), his son Constantine not only granted full liberty of worship to the Christians in Gaul and Spain; but the two Augusti also, Maxentius and Maximian, caused persecution to cease in Italy and Africa.\(^{21}\) In the east, the persecution had been terminated by the edict which Galerius issued shortly before his death (311);\(^{22}\) but in the Asiatic east, six months after, Maximin caused it to be renewed.\(^{23}\) When Constantine, after conquering Maxentius (312), had become sole lord of the west, he issued, in conjunction with Licinius, ruler of the European east, an edict of universal toleration for all religions. This was soon followed by a particular edict in favor of the Christians, issued from Milan (313).\(^{24}\) This edict became valid

\(^{21}\) Lactant. de Mort. persequ. c. 24: Suscepto imperio Constantinus Augustus nihil egi primis, quam Christianos cultui ac Deo suo rediret. Haec fuit prima ejus sancte sanctae religionis institutae (i.e. restitutae). Euseb. viii. 14: Μαξεντίος—ἀρχιμένος μνὴ τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐν’ ἀρεσκείᾳ καὶ κολακείᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ἀρμονίων καθιστηκίνατο ταύτῃ τοῦ ἐπίθηκου τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνεῖναι προστατέει διωγμῶν.


\(^{23}\) See the description in Euseb. xi. 1-8.

\(^{24}\) Ap. Lactant. de Mort. persec. c. 48. The beginning has been preserved only in the Greek version apud Euseb. x. 55: 'Εδώ μὲν πάλαι ἐκπάντως τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆς θρησκείας οὖν ἔφηθαν εἰς τὸν ἔκαστον τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ βουλήδα ἐξοντισὶν δοτόν τῷ τὸ δίκαιο πράγματα τηλελευθέρωσεν τὸν τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῶν ἑαυτῶν τῆς πίστεως ἐπίσκοποι. 'Αλλ’ ἐπειδή πολλάκις καὶ διάφορας ἐκπάντως (i.e., conditiones, as below) ἐν ἑνῷ τῇ ἀντιγραφῇ, ἐν τῷ τῶν αὐτῶν συνεχουμενή τῇ οὖσῃ ἐξοντισὶν, ἐκάνει προστεθθῆναι σαφῶς, τεχνῶν ἴσως τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπ’ ἄλλον ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης παραφολάξεως ἀνακρούσεως.' (Quamob-
through the whole Roman empire after the overthrow of Max- 
imin, which soon followed.

With regard to the history of Constantine's religious de-
velopment,\textsuperscript{25} till the time when he fully embraced Christianity, we
rem) cum feliciter tam ego Constantinus Aug., quam etiam ego Licinius Aug. apud 
Mediolanum convenissemus, atque universa, quae ad commercia et securitatem publicam 
pertinere, in tractatu habercmus; haec inter cetera, quae videbamus pluribus hominibus 
profutura, vel imprimis ordinanda esse credidimus, quibus divinissatis reverentia continue-
batur: ut darentus et Christianus et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem, 
quam quisque voluisset, quae quocund quid est divinitatis in sede coelesti, nobis atque omnibus, 
qui sub potestate nostra sunt constituti, placatam ac propitium possit existere. Itaque 
 hoc consilio salubri ac rectissima ratione ineundum esse credidimus, ut nulli omnino facul-
tatem abnegandam putaremus, qui vel observationi Christianorum, vel ei religioni mentem 
sum dedecet, quam ipsi sibi aptissimam esse sentiret, ut possit nobis summa divinitas, 
cujus religio liberis mentibus obsequi mori, in omnibus solitudinem suum benevolentiae 
praestare. Quare scire dignationem tuam convenit, placuisse nobis, ut amoris 
ombus omnino conditionibus (Euseb. t\textsuperscript{on} \textit{olphæw}), quae prius scriptis ad officium tuum 
datis super Christianorum nomine videbantur, nunc caveres, ut similem uniusque 
orum, qui eandem observandae religionis Christianorum gerunt voluntatem, citra uliam 
implicitudinem ac molestiam sui ejus observare conteriam. Quae solicitudini tuae 
plonissime significanda esse credidimus, quae scires, nos liberam atque absolutam colenda 
religionis sunt facultatem hicie Christianis deside. Quam cum hicie a nobis inulsum 
esse pervideas, intelligi dignato tu, etiam illis religionis suae vel observantiae potesta-
tem similiter apertam et liberam pro quique tempore nostri esse concessum, ut in colendo, 
qui quisque delegatis, habeat liberam facultatem, quia [nolumus detrahili] honor neque 
cuiquam religioni aliquid a nobis. Atque hoc insuper in persona Christianorum statuenc-
dum esse cessivimus; quod si eadem loca, ad quae ante convenire consueverant, de quib-
bus etiam datis ad officium tuum litera certa anteluce forma fuerat comprehensis, priore 
tempore aliui vel a fisco nostro vel ab alicu quoque videntur esse mercati, eadem 
Christianis sine pecunia et sine ulla profici petitione, postposita omni frustratiuo atque 
ambiguitate, restituantur. Qui etiam donec fuerint consecuti, eadem similiter hicie 
Christianis quantos reddant. Et vel bi, qui emergunt, vel qui donec fuerunt consecuti, si 
putaverint, de nostra benevolentia aliquid vicarium postulent, quod et ipsae per nostram 
clementiam consumatur. Quae omnia corpori Christianorum pronomas per intercessionem 
tuam ac sine mora tradi oportebit. Et quoniam idem Christiani non ea loca tantum, ad 
quae convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse nosceuntur, ad jus corporis eorum, id 
est ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum, pertinet: ea omnia lege, qua superius, 
comprehendimus, citra ullam prorsus ambiguatatem vel controversiam hicie Christianis, 
il est corpori et conventionibus eorum, redili jubebis; supra dicta sollicitatione ratione servata, ut 
ii, qui eadem sine pretio, sicut diximus, restituuerint, incommunia nostra benevolentia 
sperant. In quibus omnibus supra dicto corpori Christianorum intercessionem tuum effic-
cacissionem exhibere deboebis, ut praecipsum nostrum quantiociam compleantur; qui etiam 
in hoc per clementiam nostrum quieti publice consulari. Hocenum fiet, ut sicut super-
rius comprehensus est, divinis justo nos favor, quem in tantis sumus rebus experti, per 
onne tempus prorsus successibus nostris cum bidentudine publica perseveret. Ut autem 
hujus sanctiis benevolentiae nostrae forma ad omnium possit pervenire notitiam, prolata 
programmata tuo habes scripta et ubique proponere, et ad omnium scientiam te perferre 
conveniet, ut hujus benevolentiae nostrae sanctio Intere non possit.

\textsuperscript{25} Concerning him Præc. Baldunii Constantiuæ M. s. de Coest. Imp. legibus eccl. et 
civ. libri ii. Hal. 1757. 8. C. D. A. Martini Ueber die Einführung der 
christl. Rel. als Staatsrelig. durch den Kaiser Conut. 
München. 1813. 4. J. C. F. Manso 
Leben Constantius d. G. Breslau. 1817. 8. (Hug's Denkschrift zur Ehrenrettung Con-
Heinemchen Excurs. 1. appended to his edition of Euseb. do vita Constant. p. 507, ss.
have only isolated intimations and hints. His first religious sentiments, like those of his father, were essentially the new-platonic. He acknowledged one supreme God who had revealed himself in many ways among men, and honored Apollo in particular, as the revealer of this Being. As this idea of Apollo and the Christian idea of Christ were obviously similar, so Constantine may have thought that he found in it very soon a point of union between Christianity and heathenism. That the phenomenon which appeared to him in the war against Maxentius, respecting which the accounts of his contemporaries are so different, did not yet bring him over exclusively to Christian-

26 According to Euseb. de vita Const. I. c. 27, when he first began the expedition against Maxentius: Εἰ δὲ ἐννοοῦσα, ὡς κρείσσον ἤ κατὰ στρατιωτικὴν ὁδὸν ἀυτῆς βοήθειας, διὰ τὴς κακοτέρους καὶ γοητείας μεγανάτας τῆς παρὰ τὸ μέγαν ἐποδαθεμένας, θεὸν ἁνεκείται βοήθεια.—Ενμένη δέ τα ἕποιόν ἡδίν ἐπεργάσασθαι βοήθεια. Ζητόντως δὲ αὐτῷ ἐννοεῖ τὴν ἐποδαθεμένην ὡς πλείον πρότερον τῆς ἐρήμου ἐφοδιασμένην, οὐ μὲν πλείον θεῶς τῆς σφέναντων ἀνυπήργασαντας ἔλλοις—τέλος όμων άλλοι, ἔχοντε—μόνον ὑπὸ τὴν ἐκείνων παρακλήσας τὴν ἐπεκέντρον τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν διὰ πάσης τιμήσασθαι σωζά, σωτῆρα καὶ φύλακα τῆς βασιλείας, ἀγαθόν τε παντὸς ἱερότητα εἰρήνης. Ταῦτα παρ' ἐκείνων διακρίνει—τὸ μὲν πρὸς τοὺς μηδὲν ἦνας θεοὺς ματαιάζειν—μορφῶς ἐργών ἐπέλαμβανον τὸν δὲ πατρὸς τιμῶν μόνον ἐρετὸ δεῖν θεῶν. The Panegyricus incerti, c. 26 (ed. Jaeger, p. 548), addressed to the emperor in 313, corresponds with tolerable accuracy to his religious views at the time: Τοι, summe rerum sator, cujus tota sana, hoc gentium linguas esse voluisti, quem animo te ipsa dixi velis, scire non possunmus: sive in te quaedam vis mensque divina est, qua totō infusus mundo omnibus miseras elementis, et sine ullo extrinsecus excedere vigoris impulsu per te ipsa moveris: sive aliqua super omne caelestium potentas es, quae hoc opus tuum ex altiore naturae arce despicius; te, inquam, omnium, caet.


28 On the idea of Apollo, see Baur's Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus, S. 168. So Julian accuses the Alexandrians (Epist. 51, ed. Spanheim, p. 434) of believing Ἱσραήλ χρῆναι θεὸν λαγὸν ὑπάρχειν, and exhorts them, on the contrary, to worship τὸ μέγαν Ἡλιον, τὸ ἐν ἀγαλμα καὶ ἑμφορον, καὶ ἐννοον, καὶ ἄγαθεργον τὸν νοῦς πατρός. That Christ was frequently compared with Apollo, may be seen from Ptolemy Latinus minores, ed. J. Chr. Wernsdorf, iv. 767.

29 30 Lactant. de Mort. persec. c. 44: Commonitatis est in quie Constantinus, ut coeleste signum Dei notaret in secess, atque ita praelium committaret. Hecit, ut iussus est, ut traversa x. littera, summo capile circumflecto, Christum in secess notaret. On the contrary, the heathen Nazarius in Paneogr. ad Constantinum, c. 14: In ore denique est omnium Gallarum, exercitus visos, qui se divinitum missos praec se forebant. Haec ipseorum sermocinatio, hoc inter audientes ferrebat, Constantinum petimus, Constantinum imus auxilio. Constantin, immediately after his entry into Rome, caused a cross to be put into the
ity, is proved by the edict of Milan, which breathes entirely the former syncretistic spirit. But he acted only in the spirit of this decree when he bestowed favors on the Christian church, such as the old religion had always enjoyed. Thus he released their clergy from the burdensome municipal offices (312; 30) made valid the manumission of slaves in the churches (prior to 316); 31

hand of the statue erected to him, with the inscription, τὸντὸντὸντὸνστηρικὸςτημεῖον, τοῖς ἀληθείᾳ ἠλέηγμα τῆς ἀνίψεως, τοῦ πόλεως ἠμῶν ἀπὸ γυνὸν τοῦ τυμάνου διασωτεῖον ἡλεθρώσα (Euseb. H. E. ix. 9). It was not till this was an old man that he related to Eusebius the story of a cross, which appeared to him at clear mid-day, with the inscription, ΤΟΥΤΟΝ ΒΙΝΑ. Euseb. de vit. Const. i. 28-32. Sozomen, however, i. 3, and Rufin. ix. 8, suppose it to have been a mere dream. The heathen, of course, derided all these stories. See Gelasius Cyric. Hist. Conc. Nicaen. i. 4. Cf. Moscheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. M. p. 978, s. s. Concerning the cipher of Christ’s name, see Münster’s Sinnbilder der alten Christen, Heft i. S. 53, ff. The imperial standard, bearing this cipher, was afterward called Labarum. See Du Cange Dias. de nummis infer. aov. § 29. It is certain that Constantine, even before the battle, supposed that he was directed to the cross as to a propitious sign, and that this could not have happened in a way to attract general notice. If the later narrative of the emperor be not an invention, a light cross of clouds may have appeared to him while in a musing and hesitating mood, and have led him to decide; a phenomenon which was of importance, for this very reason, only to himself, and which remained unobserved by all others. Thus a purple cross, Christmas, 1517, was looked upon as a divine sign at Weimar, under the important circumstances of the time (Oratio de Joanne Duco Sax. in Melanthiana Opp. ed. Bretschneider, xi. 938). In like manner a white cross, which appeared at the entrance of John Frederick, the elector, into Weimar, when he returned from captivity (Horteder vom teutschen Kriege, Th. 2, S. 966). Several like traditions owed their origin at this time to the feeling that the decisive struggle between heathenism and Christianity, between Christ and demons, was come. Thus it is related that a victory-bringing prayer was taught by an angel to Licinius before the battle with Maximin (Lactant. de Mort. persecut. c. 46). Thus, according to Gregory of Nazianzus, an army of demons accompanied Julian on his Persian expedition; but according to Libanius, it was an army of gods. See Ulmann’s Gregor. v. Nazianzus. S. 100.


31 According to Sozomen, i. 9, he issued three laws on this subject. The first is lost. The second may be seen in Cod. Justin. i. tit. 13, l. 1, A.D. 316. The third, ibid. l. 2, and Cod. Theod. iv. tit. 7, l. unius. A.D. 391. That this manumission was transferred from the heathen temple to the churches, is shown by Gothofredus on the last law.
allowed legacies to be left to the catholic churches, and contributed a considerable sum himself to the support of the African clergy. Other regulations in favor of the Christians owed their immediate origin to that syncretistic tendency of the emperor. Thus he set bounds to the enmity of the Jews against the Christians, their rigid inflexibility not at all agreeing with his feelings. He abolished several regulations offensive to the Christians (315); and decreed the general observance of Sunday (321).

It can not appear strange that, although he

32 Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. 2, l. 4, and Cod. Just. i. tit. 2, l. 1: Habeat unusquisque licentiam, sanctissima catholic o venerabile concilio decadus honorum quod opus ad reliquias.


33 Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. 8, l. 1, A.D. 315: Judaeis, et Majoribus corum, et Patriarchis nunnus intimari, quod si qui, post hanc legem, aliquem, qui corum foralem fegerit sectam, et ad Dei cultum resperexerit, axis aut alio fuerit genere (quod nunc fieri cognoscimus) ausus fuerit adtempore, non fames dedendus et cum omnibus suis particibus concernandus. Si quis vero ex populo ad corum nefarium sectam accesserit, et conciliabilis corum se adplicaveret, cum ipsis poenas meritas sustinebit.


35 The first law of March, 331, is in Cod. Justin. iii. tit. 12, l. 3: Omnes judaei, urbanoque plebes, et ecatarum artiam officia venerabilia die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positum agrorum culturae libere licentorique inserviant: quoniam frequenter eventum ut non aptius alio die frumenta sula, aut vinum scribendas mandentur (as agricultural labors of this kind had been permitted on festivals, according to a Roman custom, Virgil. Georg. i. v. 368, ss. Cato de Re rust. c. 2; cf. Erycias Patenius de Nundinis Romanis, c. 10 in Grævii Theos. Antiquit. Rom. t. viii. p. 658). The second of June, in the same year, in the Cod. Theod. ii. tit. 8, l. 1, with the addition: Emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibentur. The Egyptian week, the seven days of which were dedicated to the planets, had been made known to the Romans by the astrologers even since the first century. In the same year, the days were frequently named after the planets (Dio Cassius, xxxvii. c. 18. S. Marsium de hebdomadis gentilium et dieum a planetis denominationibus in Jo. Orelliis Germaniae literaturae opuscula historico-philologica-theologica. Brennus. 1772. l. 113). As Christ was often compared with Sol, or Apollo (see above, note 28), so Constantine believed, perhaps, that in the festival of the dies solis, as a festival of Christ and the sun at the same time, he found a point of friendly union between both religions, directly opposed though they were to each other. He transferred the Nundines to Sunday; comp. the stone inscription apud Erycias Patenius de Nundinis Romanis, c. 26: Constantianus—provisione etiam pietatis suae Nundinas die solis perpetui anno constituit. Still the Nundines and weeks were both in use, and both are found in a calendar composed about 324 (in Graevii Theos. t. viii. p. 97) beside each other, until Theodosius I. made the law respecting the observance of Sunday strict, Cod. Theod. viii. tit. 8, l. 3. Eusebius do vit. Constant. iv. 18, and Sozomen, i. 8, relate that Friday was also observed, as well as Sunday, by order of Constantine.
allowed exactly the same freedom to heathenism, and not only so, but even, in his capacity of emperor, observed the heathen practices at the same time that he gave so many privileges to Christianity,\textsuperscript{27} he should notwithstanding prejudice the minds of the heathen people by those very measures, inasmuch as he gained over the affections of the Christians toward himself. In the mean time, the successful issue of his undertakings must have strengthened him in the direction he took, in accordance with his peculiar mode of thinking; and it could not escape his political sagacity, that it would be most advantageous for him to have on his side even the smaller party, since it was the more closely united, and more animated by a living soul. In this manner the Christians formed the nucleus of Constantine’s party when the relation between him and Licinius became looser. Hence, for this very reason, Licinius sought to obtain a more decided party by renewed attention to the religion of the pagans, and by persecution of the Christians.\textsuperscript{38} Accordingly, the struggle that arose between Licinius and Constantine, A.D. 323, was at the same time a struggle between Christianity and heathenism. Licinius was defeated, and Constantine openly professed the Christian faith,\textsuperscript{39} though he still put off baptism.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{27} Cod. Theod. ix. 16, 1, 2 (A.D. 319), xvi. 10, 1 (A.D. 321), Zosimus, ii. 29, Ἐχρητό δὲ ἔτι καὶ τοῖς πατρίοις λεγοῖς.

\textsuperscript{38} Euseb. H. E. x. 8, de vita Constant. ii. 3, ss.

\textsuperscript{39} Euseb, de vita Const. iii. 2: Τῶν Χριστῶν τοῦ θεοῦ σὺν παρῆσαι τῇ πάσῃ προσβεβλητι εἰς πάντες διετέλει, μὴ ἐγκαταπτόμενος τῶν σωτήρων ἐπηγγείρατο. After the year 323, heathen symbols disappear from Constantine’s coins. J. Eckhel Doctrin Numorum veterum, p. ii. vol. viii. (Vineb. 1798. 4.) p. 79.

\textsuperscript{40} Modern Catholic Church historians no longer maintain what was asserted as late as Baronius, Schelstraten, and others, that Constantine was baptized in Rome, by Sylvester, A.D. 324. Comp. Euseb. de vita Constant. iv. 61, 62. That Constantine made donations to Sylvester on this occasion is related first in the Acta Sylvestri, then by Hadrian I. A.D. 789 (see below, in volume second. Div. 1, § 9). In the ninth century an original document respecting a great gift of land came to light. The suppositional character of both authorities was perceived so early as 999, by Otto III, and in 1152 by the Romans (vol. ii.). The spirited attack of Laurentius Valla (about 1440, vol. ii. Div. 5, § 154) did not produce much effect till after the Reformation. Since then the investiture has been defended merely by some of the older Catholic scholars, especially the Jesuits J. Gretser and Nic. Schaten; but the deed of investiture has been generally given up as spurious.

The number of persecutions has been fixed at ten since the fourth century, agreeably to Exod. vii. 10, and Apoc. xvii. 1–14. Different calculations: Sulpicius Severus Hist. sacr. ii. 33: Sacris vocibus decem plagis mundum affiliendum pronuntiatur: ita quam jam novem fuerint, quae superest, ultima crix. On the other side, Augustin. de civ. Dei, xviii 59: Nonnullis visum est, vel videtur, non amplius ecclesiam pasuaram persecutiones usque ad tempus Antichristi, quam quot jam passa est, id est decem, ut unde decima novissima sit ab Antichristo. The enumeration in Augustin I. c. is the following (the devia-
§ 57.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

In this division of time also, the progress of Christianity was considerable, especially in Gaul. In the end of it we find the first traces of bishops on the Rhine. About the same time

1 Origines c. Cels. iii. p. 116, points to this: Χριστιανοίς μη ἐμελεῖν τῷ πανταχοῦ τὸς οἰκουμένης ἑπισκέψεως τοῦ λόγου. Τίνες γὰρ ἐργαν πεποίηται εἰπερίπραξθαι οὐ μόνον πόλεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κώμας, καὶ ἐπάθεις. Respecting the extension of Christianity about 300, see Ammodius, i. c. 16. Si Alamannos, Porsus, Scythas (Dili) incirclo voverunt devincii, quod habitarent et degere in eorum gentibus Christiani; quemadmodum Romanis tribuere victoriam, cum habitarent et degere in eorum quae gentibus Christiani? Si in Asin, Syria, incirclo maris et locustas effervescere prodigialiter voverunt, quod ratione consimili habitarent in eorum gentibus Christiani; in Hispania, Gallia cur eodem tempore horum nihil natum est, cum innumeris viverent in his quae provincies Christiani? Si apud Getulos, Tungitanos hujus rei causa siccitatem satia ariditatemque miserunt, eo anno cur messes amplissimas Mauris Nomadibusque tribuerunt cum religio similis his quoque in regionibus verteretur?

2 Passio Saturnini Episc. Tolosani, c. 2, apud Ruinart: Postquam sensim et gradatim in omnem terram Evangeliorum sonus exivit, parvi progressa in regionibus nostris Apostolorum praedicatio coruscavit: cum rarae in aliquibus civitatibus ecclesiae pancerum Christianorum devotione consurgere;—ante annos L. sicut actis publicis (Codd. ali.): ante annos satia plurimos, i. e., Decii et Grato Consulis (i. e., 230, a.d.) sicut fidelissimae recordatione reificatur, primum et summum Christi Tolosae civitas s. Saturnini habere cooperat acercolatom. From this Gregorius Turonensis (about 290) Hist. Franc. i. c. 28: Decii tempore soptem viri Episcopi ad praedicandum in Gallias missi sunt, sicut historia passionis s. martyris Saturnini donatur. Ait eodem: Sub Decii et Grato Consulis, e. c., as above. Hi orci missi sunt: Turonicia Gratianus Episcopus, Arlesianius Episcopus, Merovingiis Martialis est destinatus Episcopus. This is evidently an arbitrary combination of several traditions. Trophimus must have been first bishop of Arles even before Decius, for in 254 Marcellus had been for a long time bishop of the place. See Cypriani, Ep. 67, Pearson Annales Cypriani ad ann. 234, § 7, ss. With this also agrees Zosimi P. Epist. i. ad Episcopos Galliae, a.d. 417 (apud Constant): Metropolitanae Arlesiani urbi vetus privilegium minime derogandum est, ad quam primum ex hac sede Trophimus summus Antistes, ex cujus fonte totae Galliae fidei rivos acceperant, directus est.

3 First, in the commission appointed by Constantine to decide upon the Donatist controversy in Rome, in the year 313, Opit. Miliar. de schism. Donatist. i. c. 23: Dat sunt iudices Maternus ex Agrippina civitate: then among the names subscribed to the acts of the Concil. Arelateuse, in the year 314: Maternus episcopus, Macrinus diaconus de
they also appear in *Britain*. The first traces of Christianity are now seen in *Vindelicia*. Even among the Goths it had become known by means of captives.

SECOND CHAPTER.

**HERETICS.**

§ 58.

**ELCESAITISM OF THE CLEMENTINES.**


As Christianity had come to the west from the east, so the occidental church continued in the second century to be entirely dependent on the oriental. Without a peculiar development of doctrine and literature of its own, it merely received the product of the east; but in this way it also drew within itself the different parties of the east. Rome in particular, the capital of the empire and seat of a great church, presented an alluring field to all parties to call forth their activity. The different Gnostic sects, like the Montanists, labored with emulation to gain over this important church to themselves; and all found in it more or less sympathy and adherence. Accordingly, Romish Christendom in the second century was internally divided in many ways; a condition which was calculated not only to lead many Christians astray, and to induce them to waver, but to

4 Names subscribed to the Concil. Arelat.: Eborius episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi, provincia Britannia.—Restitutas episcopus, de civitate Londinensi, provincia suprascripta. Adelius episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensis (perhaps Colonia Lindi, i. e., Lincoln); comp. Jac. Usserii Britanniæarum ecclesiar. antiquit. Lond. 1687. Bingham Orig. eccl. tom. iii. p. 327, ss.

5 Afra burnt in Augsburg A.D. 304. See the Acta in Reinart.

6 Soszmena, H. E. ii. 6. Philostorg. H. E. ii. 5.

1 Valentinus (§ 45) and Marcion (§ 47) came in person to Rome.
lay open a dangerous unprotected side to the attacks of heathenism. There, a philosophically educated Christian of Rome, toward the end of the second century, took up the idea that Christianity in its original state must be preserved among the Jewish Christians as the descendants of the oldest church. Probably he sought out this church in its isolation, and found it divided into several parties, but he also discovered among the Elcesaites a speculative doctrinal creed already formed, which seemed to him perfectly adapted both to vanquish heathenism and to remove the multiplicity of Christian sects. He received it, therefore as the original Christian doctrine which had obtained its central point in James, and in Peter its most important defender, and appropriated all the more readily the Elcesaite rejection of Paul, who, insomuch as he was not an immediate disciple of Christ, could not have been a genuine apostle, because the Pauline development of Christianity had run out into so great a state of disunion, and appeared to have attained its height in the Marcionite errors. Hence he composed the Clementines (τὰ Κληρεντία) consisting of three prologues and twenty (but now only 19) homilies, that he might be able to proclaim to Christendom at large the apostolic truth which had long been concealed, by apostolic lips also. The historical form in which he clothed the whole work, he took in part from the events of his own life. But he reckoned upon it also for the purpose of procuring apostolic authority to his doctrine, and obtaining an introduction for it into Rome in particular. As he himself prosecuted the search, so he represents the apostolic Clement (who was highly esteemed in the recollection of the Roman church, and who appears here in the char-

---

2 For evidence to show that the author of the Clementines was a Roman, see Baur's Christuspartei in der korinth. Gemeinde, in the Tübingen Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1831, iv. 190 Schliemann, p. 549.

3 See above, § 32.

4 In the Clementines, James appears as the chief bishop of all Christendom, to whom Peter must constantly give an account of his doings, Schliemann, S. 86, 213. In the letters prefixed to the Clementines, Peter writes to him as τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας. Clement writes: ἦκακωδή, τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐπισκόπῳ ἐπισκόπος, διέστηκα θεῷ τῶν ἱερουσαλήμ ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶς πανταχῦ θεόν προνοεῖ οὐδεὶς ἀδικήσας καλῶς.

5 What Peter, Hom. xvii. 19, says against Simon Magnus, is said to refer to Paul: Εἰ τῆς δὲ ὁ προσκήνας πρὸς θεοδοσίαν σωφρονίζει καὶ διανοεῖ, Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκεῖ, ὡς ἢ πρώτοις ἔστιν· διὰ τί οὖν ἤναυτῷ ἐγγεγορήθην παραμένων ἐμφάνισαν ὁ δικάσκεις; Schleierm. S. 96.
acter of a distinguished Roman, whose mind had received a philosophical culture as journeying in the East, impelled by thirst for the truth long vainly sought, there meeting with Peter, and obtaining full satisfaction from him. Peter, the only one of the immediate disciples of Christ who had come to Rome, appears here in opposition to Paul, as the proper apostle of the Gentiles, as the founder of the Romish church, and the first bishop of Rome. He triumphantly refutes all kinds of error which had been advocated by different persons; not only the popular faith and philosophy of the heathen, but also the Christian aberrations of the second century. The Gnostics in particular are combated in the person of Simon Magnus; and in addition to them the Montanist prophesying, the hypostatic doctrine of the Trinity, and millenarianism. On the other

---


7 The narrative in Hom. i., in its essential features, may have been modeled after the experiences of the author.

8 Peter says, Hom. ii. 17, with reference to the law of synagoges: 'Εν γενεσιοις γυναικων προς Ήλίαν (John the Baptist, Matt. xi. 11), εύτε δ' εν υιοις άνθρωπων δεκτηρος έπιλεξεν. Ταυτί τη τάξει άκολοουθον δυνατον ή νοει, τινος έστιν. Σωμα το προ μοι εις τα την προς Ήλιου, και τινος άν την εις, ομηρον, στη έκεινον άκλητον, και έπελθων οι σκότων φώς, ός γανεια γυναικας, ές ναοι λαος. Θεος δή, ός άλλης δε προδρόμς είρηκεν, δι' άυτου ήταν εις αγγέλλων επρόσει τον πλανον τους, και έδω ήταν καθαρεύσας τους το άγνω τους εις αγγέλων άλμης κρόσων διαπερρέθη από επανόρθωσις των ουσιων αλητέων.

9 In the letter prefixed to the Clementines, of Clement to James, Peter is designated, ο άλλος τοις ουσιωδοις των κοσμον μερος, ός άγνω Καθαρεύει, φωτιζε κελευθερωθεί, και καταρθοθείναι δυνασθείσες—μάλιστα εντέθος Τούρα γελευων θεοθεολογες διδασκαλεις σώζων ανθρώπων. It is then related how he transferred his καθαρεία to Clement, shortly before his own martyrdom.

10 Schliemann, S. 101.

11 Schliemann, S. 90. In particular, the doctrine of the Maccabian, see Baur's christliche Gnosis, S. 313.


14 It is the false feminine prophesying which, τον παρομον έτυκεν πλάσθεν αυς προικα διώρους έπαγγελλαται (Hom. iii. 23): on the contrary, the male prophesying το μελλοντος ανθρωπος των υλοσιων μυστας (c. 26).
hand, Peter proclaims and supports by mighty miraculous deeds the following doctrine: God, a pure, simple being of light, has allowed the world to be formed in antagonisms, and so also the history of the world and of men runs off in antagonisms (συμψύκτιτι) connected by pairs, in which the lower constantly precedes the higher. From the beginning onward God has revealed himself to men, while his Holy Spirit (σοφία, νός θεοῦ, θείου πνεύμα, πνεύμα ἄγιον) from time to time in the form of individual men (Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Jesus), as the true prophet (ὁ προφήτης τῆς ἀλήθειας), constantly announced the very same truth, and in Jesus caused it also to be communicated to the heathen. According to the law of “γυρίζεις,” false prophets also are always produced in addition to the true (γεννητοί γυναικῶν Matth. xi. 11), who corrupt the truth. Thus the original doctrines of Mosaism are perfectly identical with Christianity; though they have not been preserved in their purity in the Pentateuch, which was not composed till long after Moses; and in the present form of Judaism have been utterly perverted. In general, the truth has been constantly maintained in its purity only by a few by means of secret tradition. Man is free, and must expect after death a


17 Hom. iii. 20: Ἐκεῖνος... αἰῶνος αἰῶνος ἀμα τον ἀνόμασι μορφάς ἄλλαζον, τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει, μέχρι τοὺς ιδίων χρόνων τυχόν, διὰ τοὺς καμάτους θεοῦ εἴλεις χρυσεῖς, εἰς λεί ἐξες τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν. The original unpersona Holy Spirit united himself in Adam with a human person, which appeared, constantly the same, as the true prophet successively in different forms (Barn’s Gnosis, S. 303), and is destined for the government of the everlasting kingdom. If one abides by this view, he will not have to assume with Schleierm. S. 142, that a variation prevails in the Clementines respecting the doctrine of the Spirit of God, because he is represented sometimes as an unpersonal energy, sometimes as an hypostasis.

18 Hom. iii. 23: Δῶ χρόνιος γενικά εστώσιν προφητεῖαι: ἡ μὲν ὀρενεία: ἡ δὲ δευτέρα, θύλης οἶσιν, πρώτη όρισθη ἐξεσθείων ἐν τῷ τῶν συλλογῶν προελεύσει. 'Η μὲν οὖν ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν οἶσιν, ως θύλης, τοῦ τῶν κόσμων ἐπαγγελλομένη, ἑρμηνεία εἰναι πιστευθῆται θύλης: διότι κλέπτωσα τά τῶν ἁρετήν σπέρματα, καὶ τοῖς ιδίοις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτής ἐπικάλυπτον, ως ὧν ἦν συνεκφυεῖ τό γεννητόν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖνον πᾶσα, καὶ τοῖς παρανόμω πάσην, ως προϊσκέυειν ἐπαγγελλέται.


20 Hom. iii. 47.

21 Hom. iii. 19: Christ designated as τά ὧν αἰῶνος ἐν ερμοδῷ ἄξιος παραδοδώμενα κηρύσσων, μέχρις αὐτῶν ἥνων τοῦ ἐλεούς ἐκτείνων, καὶ ψυχῆς πάλιν ἐλέον.
spiritual continuation of life, with rewards and punishments. The conditions of happiness are love to God and man, and struggling against the demons which draw away to evil, through sensuality. For this last purpose these sectaries prescribed abstinence from animal food, frequent fastings and washings, recommended early marriage and voluntary poverty, but rejected all sacrifices.

While the author of the Clementines, from the position of the Elcesaite doctrine, combats parties with which the Elcesaite had never come into contact, he must necessarily go into many new developments of doctrine. How free his movements were in these may be seen from the fact that he frequently used for his purpose our four gospels, unknown to the Elcesaite, with great critical and exegetical arbitrariness. On this very account we might indeed doubt whether he left the Elcesaite doctrine itself entirely untouched.

Although the doctrine here presented could not calculate on any general dissemination, and found several adherents only in Rome and Cyprus, yet many felt themselves attracted by the historical contents of the production, and its refutation of the heathens and the Gnostics; and since the author knew how to account for the late appearance of his work, which pretended to proceed forth from the apostolic age, they rather thought of it as the corruption of a genuine writing by heretics than a forgery. Hence, another person was soon found, probably an Al-

21 Hom. iii. 26: (Ὁ ἄρθρος προφάτος) γάμων νομιστέει, εγκράτειαν συγχωρεί, εἰς ἀγνοίαν πάντας ἀγεί. C. 68: (Ὁ προβλέτετο) νέων μή μάτων καταπεκίετον τοὺς γόμους, ἀλλά καὶ τῶν προβλετητῶν, μή τῶν γίνοντας ἡ ὄριξ προβάτες πορνείας ἡ μοιχείας λαμόν προσενέγκου ἣ ἑκληρεῖ.

22 A complete collection of the passages from the gospels in the Clementines may be found in Cremer’s Beiträge zur Einleitung, in d. bibl. Schriften, i. 284. According to him the Gospel of Peter lies at the foundation of it. But the passages characteristic of John that appear in the work, can hardly be referred to another gospel; and, if we take these as the standard, we can not expect that the gospel citations generally should be made verbatim.

23 Epiphanius, Hær. xxx. 18, says, that Ebionites were in Cyprus (by this general appellation for all heretical Jewish Christians he here means this party). Origen (ap. Euseb. vi. 38) calls the heresy of the Elcesaite, κατοπίσταταιν. Since no trace is found of it in the second century beyond Palestine, we may assume that it was first established in those places by the Clementines.

24 Peter entreats James, in his letter prefixed to the Clementines, to communicate his sermons (τῶν ββλίων μου τῶν κηρυγμάτων) only to faithful persons under the seal of secrecy; and James guarantees the secrecy by a διαμαρτυρία added, according to which those books should be made known only to tried brethren, after they had agreed by an oath to keep the secret. Comp. Hom. ii. 17, above, note 8.
exandrian, who conceived the idea of purifying it from heretical deprivations, by altering it entirely according to the standard of orthodoxy in his day. In this way arose the production which appears under different names among the ancients,\textsuperscript{25} and which still exists, but only in the Latin translation of Rufinus, under the title \textit{Recognitiones Clementis}, libb. x.\textsuperscript{26} The requirements of a much later orthodoxy gave rise to the \textit{ἐπιτομή}.\textsuperscript{27}

§ 59.

OPPOSITION AT ROME TO MONTANISM, AND THE ASIATIC TIME OF CELEBRATING EASTER.

About the time when the Clementines appeared, there was generally apparent at Rome a lively striving after unity by removing all elements whose tendency was to disturb it.

Montanism had not only obtained many friends in the western church, without giving rise to an external division,\textsuperscript{1} but had even gained besides an important influence over the prevailing ecclesiastical principles.\textsuperscript{2} The bishop of Rome was already on the point of entering into ecclesiastical communion with the Asiatic Montanists, who had been excluded from the churches of their native country, when \textit{Praeaeas}, a confessor, came from Asia to Rome (about 192), and so altered the disposition toward them, that all communion with them was renounced.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Περίοδος Πέτρου} or \textit{Κλάμυντος} (Origenes in Genesis, t. iii. c. 14), \textit{Πράξεις Πέτρου} (Philitus Bibl. cod. 113 and 113), \textit{Historia Clementis} (Opus imperf. in Matth. ad xxiv. 24), \textit{Gesta Clementis}, \textit{vera disputatio Petri Ap. contra falsatatem Simonis Magi} (in Codl.).

\textsuperscript{26} Schleiermacher's die Clementin. \textit{Recognitionen eine Ueberarbeitung der Clementinen} (reprinted from Pels's Theolog. Mitarbeiten. Jahrg. 4, Heft. 4). Kiel. 1843. The same author's Clementinen, S. 265, ff. According to him the composition of them took place in the period between 212 and 230. But the reasons adduced in favor of Rome, as the place of writing, can not be regarded as decisive. The Christology of the \textit{Recognitiones} (Schleiermacher, S. 331) obviously points to Alexandria.

\textsuperscript{27} Schleiermacher, S. 334.

\textsuperscript{1} See above, § 48, note 17–19, below, note 4.

\textsuperscript{2} See above, § 53, note 39.

\textsuperscript{3} Tertull. adv. Praxean, c. 1. \textit{Nam idem} (Praxeas) \textit{tunc episcopum Romanum, agnecentem} jam prophetas Montaul, Pracaes, Maximilliae, et \textit{ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesias Asiae et Perygiae inferrentem, falsa de ipsis prophetis et ecclesias eorum adeverando, et praeecessorum ejus sanctitatis defendoing, coegit et iteras pacis revocare jam emissas, et a proposito recipiendorum charismatum concessare}. Victor is usually regarded as that Roman bishop (185–197); but Neuiler (Antignosticus, S. 445) and Schweger (Montanismus, \textit{vol. 1.—13}).
Thus, then, there began in the west also a controversy concerning the distinguishing doctrines of Montanism, which was conducted with violence, especially in Africa. At the head of the Montanist party stood Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, presbyter in Carthage, and the earliest Latin ecclesiastical writer of note—a man whose modes of thought were strict and severe, of a violent character, and of a rich though somewhat too sensuous imagination. In his writings it may be seen that he developed his Montanist tendency in a way increasingly rug-

S. 250 declare themselves in favor of Elenthus (170-185), because an incipient yielding to the Montanists does not appear like the stiff hierarchical character of Victor. That character has been inferred merely from his conduct toward the Quatredica. But since experience shows that those who renounce certain views, become the most violent opponents of Montanism, may be best explained on the supposition that he was at first favorably disposed toward them. Chronology is in favor of Victor; for, by the supposition that Elenthus was the person, there is too long an interval between the first appearance of Praxeas in Rome, and of Tertullian’s, lib. adv. Praxeum (composed according to Novسأل 294 or 295).

4 An important particular of it is given by Tertullian de Pudicit. c. 1: Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum, edicit: ego et moechian et farnicionis delicta poenentiis functis dimittit. Cap. 5: Quia agis moliussima et humanissima disciplina? Idololatrarum quidem et hominidam semel damnas, moechum vero de medio excipis? Comp. above, § 53, note 39. According to Petavius (not. ad Epiph. Haer. 59. p. 228), it is usually assumed that this Pontifex Maximus is the Roman bishop Zephyrinus (197-237). But the appellation in question does not refer to a real, but to an usurped dignity. It points ironicaly to the circumstance, that the bishop who had made the regulation arrogated to himself, by so doing, the prerogatives of the only high-priest, Christ. Most probably the allusion is to the bishop of Carthage. Particularly important for the history of the controversy is Tertullian, lib. de Velandis virgibus. In support of his demand, virgines nostras velati oporete, ex quo transitum actatis sano fecerat; in order to set aside the argument brought against him from custom, cap. 2, Tertullian appeals to the consecration of the apostolic churches in Greece, and some barbarous countries: Non possimus respuere consecrationem, quam dammare non possimus, utpote non extraneam, quia non extraneorum: cum quibus scilicet communicamus jus pacis et nomen fraternitatis. Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem laesa sacramento. Semel dixerim, una ecclesia sumus. Hence this book was written before the division in the church, when both contending parties still belonged to the same church. Cap. 3 describes how the controversy sprung up from a peaceful living together, and how the parties gradually became more and more embittered. Tamen tolerabilius quod nos ad usque proxime: utrique consuetudine communicabatur. Arbitrio permisit res erat, ut quaeque voluptatem aut legi aut prostitui, sicut et usum neque cogitari, neque prohibetur. Contenta erat veritas pacis cum consuetudine, ut tacite sub consuetudinis nomine scriberetur se vel ex parte. Sed quumiam cooperar agnitio proficere, ut per licentiam utrinque moris indicium melioris partis emergere: statim illo adversarius bonorum multoque institutorum opus suum fecit. Ambianti virgines hominum, adversus virginum Dei, nulla pace fronde, in temeraria audaciae excitatae, et virgines videntur.—Scandalizamur, inquinat, quia aliae aliter incedunt: et malum scandalizari quam provocari, etc. Soon after a complete separation took place, adv. Praxeum, c. 1: Et nos quidem postea agnitio parari, atque defensio disjuxit a Psychicia.
ged, being heated more and more by controversy (Spiritualium contra Psychicos). Others also followed him, in the same spirit, till at length in the west also separate Montanist churches were formed. In the mean time, Montanism had become too deeply rooted in the western church; and now also the circumstance operated in its favor (comp. p. 143) that its most zealous opponents, as Praxeas and the Roman presbyter Caius, fell into other serious errors. Thus, though from this time onward, Montanism was rejected in name even in the western church, yet all Montanist elements were by no means expelled from that church. Not only do we find remaining that


6 Augustinus, de Haer. c. 86, relates, that in his time the remnant of the Tertullianists in Carthage had returned to the catholic church. Hence the Montanists in Carthage were named after their leader. But they neither gave themselves this appellation, nor can it be inferred from the difference of names, as the Praedestinatus, Haer. 86, does, that the followers of Tertullian had formed a peculiar sect separated from the other Montanists.

7 See below, § 60.


strictness and tendency to lay stress on external rules of piety, but what is still more striking, even the writings of the Montanist Tertullian (about 220) were always valued very highly, and became the model of succeeding Latin ecclesiastical writers.  

With the rejection of Montanism in Rome was probably connected Victor's opposition to the Asiatic mode of celebrating Easter (see p. 166). He called upon the bishops of Asia Minor pariter repromissas et agnoscimus et honoramus, &c. Cap. 4. Pastor (Christus)—de caso quod mulgebant dedit mihi quasi baccellum, et ego accepi jucundus manibus, et manuexavi, et univeri circumstantes dixerunt Amen (cf. § 48, not. 22). The enigma, that those Montanizing martyrs should have been constantly considered as members of the Catholic church, is accounted for by supposing, that although at the time of their death the controversy between the two parties had begun, yet the separation had not taken place. But undoubtedly, the Montanist spirit must have been fostered in the church by the high estimation in which such writings were held.

For instance, the principle which was maintained in the African church till the time of Cyprinian (Tertull. de Pudic. c. 19), quod neque idololatrasis neque sanguini pax ab Ecclesias redditur. See above, note 4, below, § 71. Neander’s Antignostics, S. 265. The Spanish church, which seems to have adopted the African as its model, expressed the same view in its greatest strictness as late as the Council. Hiliberitamum (about the year of our Lord 305). This council ordained, with regard to those who have defiled themselves with such crimes as idolatry, magic, adultery, incest, placuit nec in fine communem accipere (can. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, &c.—The error against which Cyprinian, Ep. 63 ad Caecilianum, inveighs, quod aliqvis existimati, sequendum esse quorumdam consuetudinem, si qui in praeteritum in callice Dominici aquam solam offerendum putaverint, may also have sprung from Montanist asceticism.


Some details relating to this matter are given, perhaps, in the Appendix ad Tertull. de Prescript. haeret. c. 53: Est praeterea huius omnibus etiam Blastus accedens, qui lateutur Judaismus vult introducere. Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse, nisi secundum legem Moysi quattuordecima mensis. But this Blastus appeared in Rome (Euseb. v. 15), and Irenaeus wrote to him an ἐπιστολη περὶ εὐρήματος (Euseb. v. 29). From Eusebius, it is clear that he did not entirely coincide in sentiment with the Gnosticizing Polianus; he appears to have been an Ultra Montanist. Comp. Pascianus (bishop of Barcelona about 370) Epist. 1. ad Symponem in Gallandii Biblioth. vii. 257: Phryges plurimum nitutur auctortitates, nam puto et Graecus Blastus ipsorum est. The Asiatic Montanists have always retained the mode of celebrating Easter which he advocated. See Anonymi Orat. vii. in Pascha in Chrysostomi opp. ed. Monfacon. t. viii. App. p. 976. Schwiegler’s Montanismus, S. 351.
(about 196) to adopt the custom of the west on this point, and after their refusal, when he had been assured of the assent of the bishops in Palestine, Pontus, Gaul, and Corinth, broke off church communion with them. Several bishops, however, and Irenaeus himself among them, admonished him on account of his too great haste; peace was again restored, and both parties continued undisturbed in the observance of their own customs till the council of Nice.

§ 60.

MONARCHIANS.


The doctrine which regarded the divine in Christ as a personality not distinct from the Father, had subsisted without opposition in the second century alongside of the emanation-doctrine, since it was capable of being united with it in the confession which alone was important in relation to the faith,

14 Euseb. v. 24: ΑΛΛΑ' οι πάσι γε τοις ἑπισκόποις ταύτ' ἡμάκεστα. ἀντίπαρακελεύονται δήτα αὐτῷ, τὸ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς πρᾶξιν τόσον πλησίως ἐνώπιον καὶ ἐγκαίρως ἐφοβοῦντον φέρονται δὲ καὶ αἱ τοῦτον φωναὶ, πληκτικότερον καθαπτομένων τοῦ Βικτόρος. Ἐν αὐτὶ καὶ ὁ Ἐλευθαῖος ἐκ προσώπον ὄν ἤγειτο κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστειλα—τὸ γε μὴν Βικτὸρος προσφέρων, ὡς μὴ ἀποκρίσις ἑταίρα παραιτεῖ. Then follow fragments from this letter. Irenaeus expresses his opinion of such disputes very plainly in the Fragn. iii. ed. Pfeff. Εταξαὶ οἱ 'Απόστολοι, μὴ δεῖν ἡμᾶς κρίνειν τινὰ ἐν βραταί καὶ ἐν πάση [καὶ ἐν μέρει] ὁρθῆς ἡ νεομνήμαται ἡ σαβδατών. Πόθεν οὖν ταῦτα αἰ μάχαι; πόθεν τὰ σχέσια; ἐνοτάμεν, ἀλλ' ἐν ζῷω κοιναῖ καὶ πονηρίας, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ διαφημίζων, καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς τερμαθέν, ἕνα τὰ κρείττονα τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἐγκαίρως ἀπαύγαλω- μεν. Ταῦτα οὖν ἐνοτάμεν καὶ νήστεια ἀπαφέρεσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἱκώσαμεν.

12 According to Constantius de Syn. c. 5, it was one reason for summoning the council of Nice, that οἱ ἄνω τῆς Σωμαίας, καὶ Κηλίκιας, καὶ Μεσσηνίας ἔχωνεν περὶ τῆν ὁρθν., καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐσωθίνων τῷ Πάσχα. Cf. Euseb. de vita Const. iii. c. 5.
13 See above § 58, note 12.
viz., that God is in Christ. It found a welcome reception particularly among the Antimontanists, who were averse to all sensuous ideas of Godhead; and on this very account was first combated by the zealous Montanist, Tertullian, in his treatise against Praxean. In the controversies which extend from this time onward through the third century, and terminate in the ecclesiastical rejection of this doctrine, it developed itself more definitely in different forms, which may be reduced to two great classes. The one looked upon the divine in Christ as continually teaching and acting through him; the other looked upon it as acting only on the human person, so that according to the former, the entire agency of Christ was divine, derived from God; according to the latter, a human agency directed by God. To the first class belonged Praxean, who,
notwithstanding the opposition of Tertullian, appears to have been unmolested in Rome on account of his doctrine. But *Theodotus* (ὁ σκυτεύς) who had come to Rome from Byzantium about the same time, was excluded from church-communion by Victor, when he declared Christ to be a mere man; and his disciples (Theodotus ὁ τραπεζίτης, Asclepiades, Natalius Confessor) continued to exist in Rome for some time separated from the church. By means of these Theodotians, however, the Monarchian doctrine generally became so notorious, that *Artemon* (Artemas) under bishop Zephyrinus, although he did not agree with the Theodotians, was included in the same class with them, and attacked in various writings. Hence this theory was rendered suspicious everywhere, even in Asia where it took its rise; and *Noetus* was excommunicated in Smyrna (about 230) on account of his doctrine, which harmonized with that of Praxeas. On the other hand, Origen succeeded in

---


6 Comp. the extracts from the anonymous work against Artemon apud Euseb. v. 28, which designates Theodotus as the πρῶτον εἰσόντα ψεύτων ἀνθρώπων τῶν Χριστῶν. Append. I. de Praesert. 53: Ex Spiritu quidam Sancto natum, ex virgine, sed hominem solitariam atque nudum, nullo allo prae ceteris nisi sola justitiae auctoritate. After post hunc Theodotus (Trapezita) haereticus erudit, qui et ipse introduxit alteram sectam, et ipsum hominem Christum—inferiorum esse quam Melchisedech, eo quod dictum sit de Christo: Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech (Hebr. vii. 21). Nam illum Melchisedech praecipue gratiae coelestis esse virtutem: eo, quod agat Christus pro hominibus, deprecator et advocatus ipsorum factus, Melchisedech facere pro coelestibus angelis atque virtutibus. (Melchisedeciani.) According to Theodoret (Haer. fab. comp. 3, 5), even ὁ σμικρὸς Λαξύρωμος accused them of corrupting the Holy Scriptures.

7 From the οποίαπασα κατὰ τῆς Ἀρτέμωνος αἰρέσεως extracts are given in Euseb. v. 28. In which Artemon, without a clearer explanation of his doctrine, is compared with Theodotus. But the Artemonites asserted, 1. e., τῶν μὲν προτέρους ἀπαντάς καὶ αὐτοίς τοῖς ἀποτολόναι συναρκεί τε καὶ διδάσκοντο τεῖτα, ἢ τόν οὗτοι λέγωντες: καὶ τετραγάθι τῇ ἀλήθεια τοῦ κηρύγματος μέχρι τῶν Βίατορος χρησ,—καὶ ὡς τὸ διαδόχοι αὐτῶν Ζεφυρίου παρασκήφαρχαι τῇ ἀλήθεια. According to these extracts they must have propounded a doctrine different from that of Theodotus, who was excommunicated by Victor, and such a doctrine, too, as might be reconciled with the earlier doctrine of the Roman church still indefinitely expressed. In the same work, § 6, they are reproached with their dialectic tendency (οὐ τί αἱ δείκνυσι γραμμαί ζητούντες, ἀλλ’ ὑπάνω σχήμα συλλογισμοῖς εἰς τὴν τῆς ἀλήθειας εὑρισθεί σώης, φιλοτονώς άνοικτάς), and with their preference for Aristotle and Theophrastus. Theodoret (Haer. fab. comp. 3, 5) gives extracts from the σμικρὸς Λαξύρωμος, written against Theodotus and Artemon, which some falsely ascribe to Origen. When Nicephorus (Hist. eccles. iv. 21) looks upon that οποίαπασα of Eusebius as identical with the Λαξύρωμος of Theodoret, and when Photinus (Cod. 48) makes Caius to be the author of both works they advance nothing but conjectures.

8 Theodoret Haer. fab. comp. iii. 3, names Epigonus and Cleomenes as Noetus’s prede-
drawing off Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, from that view, at a
council held in that place, in 244 A.D.9 Sabellius, presbyter in
Ptolemais (250–260) renewed it in a form still farther de-
veloped.10 Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, endeavored in vain

9 Euseb. vi. 33. His doctrine was: Τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ήμῶν μὴν προφετεύσαται κατ‘ Ιδίων οὐδαίς περιγραφέοις πρὸ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιθύμησας· μηδέν μὲν θεότητα Ιδίων έχειν, ἀλλ‘ ἐμπιστευόμενον αὐτῷ μονὴν τῆς πατρείας. Comp. Origenes fragm. ex libro in epist. ad Titum (from the apology of Pamphilus, Origens Opp. ed Lommatsch, v. 287). Sed et eos, qui hominem dicunt Dominum Jesum præcogitum et prædestinatum, qui autem advenit caro et substantiâliter et propriâ non exitur, sed quod homo natus Patris solam in se habuerit deitatem, ne illos quidem sine periculo esse ecclesiae numero sociari: sicut et illos, qui superstesio magis, quam religiosi, uti nuncadant duo duo dicere, neque rationem negare Salvatoris deitatem, unam cambemque substantiâm Patris ac Filii asseverant, i. e., duum quidem nominà secundam diversitatem causârum recipiântem, unam tamen Ípóstassan subsistere, i. e., unam personam dubio nominâ subjacentem, quæ latina Patrissinni appellântur. The first opinion is that of Beryllus, the second that of Noetius. C. Ulpianîi de Beryillo Bostreno eujouque doctrinae comm. Hamb. 1833. 4. (in Halle Christmas programm.)


11. 25: 'Ὅστη διαιρέσεις χάρις ἐπικρατήσεως εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ πατέρας ὁ αὐτὸς μὲν ἐστι, πληθυνέται τῇ εἰς ὑπόστασι καὶ πνεῦμα. Αριστ. αὐτὸν Aeludr. Alex. v. Epiph. Haeres. 69: Σαβελλίος τῶν μνάδα διαφόρον πνεύματος εἶπεν. (Gregorius Nyss. contra Arian et Sabellianam in Ang. Maji Script. vett. nova coll. viii. 1. 1: Οἱ κατὰ Σαββαλλίου—ἀναφερόμενοι μὲν περιστότερον τῆς ὑπόστασις τοῦ νόσου, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν πατέρα ένα ήντα δύον όρμωσεν γεραφόραν νόσμαν, πνεύματα προαγορεύοντες). According to Epiphanius Haer. ixii. 1, he compared the Godhead to the sun, ὡς τὸν μὲν ἐν μιᾷ ὑπόστασι, τρεῖς δὲ ἑρωτούσις ἐν τῇ ανευρετώ εἰκονικά, τοῦ φαινόμενος, καὶ τὸ δόλον. The Monas is the divine essence in itself, in its concealed state, which reveals itself in the trinity, by interchangeably assuming three characters (προ-
σώπα) according to the nature of the revelations. These three προσώπα are ὁ πατέρας, ὁ νόσος, τὸ πνεῦμα. The Logos is never called a second prosonos, but it is the Logos which became man, and, as such, took the name ὁ νόσος (Athanas. c. Arian. Or. iv. 22: 'Εν ὃρθῳ μὴν λόγων
to refute him by personal interviews and letters, and in unfolding antagonist views, went so far as to make new and objectionable assertions. Sabellians were found so late as the fourth century, in Rome and Mesopotamia. Still greater offense was given by Paul of Samosata, who, being at the same time bishop of Antioch (from 260) and holding a civil office, exhibited a vanity and love of display hitherto unexampled in a Christian bishop. While he maintained with strictness the unity of God, he declared Jesus to be a man begotten by the Holy Spirit, on whom the Divine wisdom descending exerted its influence in a peculiar manner. Three councils

ἀπλοῦ: ὅτε δὲ ἐνυποθύμη, τὸν ἐποδόσαν νῦν. Hence Baur’s opinion (Dreieinigkeit, i. 361) is very probable that, in the sense of Sabellius, the Logos, in opposition to the Monas, is the manifested God generally, and that the three πάσομα are to be considered as the changing forms of the Logos. If in some accounts the divine essence is styled ὁ πατὴρ generally, this may have been done by Sabellius, as well as, according to the Catholic doctrine, ὁ πατὴρ may even designate the trine God ὁ ὅσιος. Finally, with regard to the question whether Sabellius considered the πατήμων of the Son as a transitory appearance united to the earthly existence of Jesus (as Baur, l. c. p. 266, thinks), or whether he believed that the person of Christ should cease to be only with the final consummation (according to Neander, i. ii. 1031), Gregory of Nyssa decides in favor of the former view, contra Arian et Sabellium in Ang. Maji Coll. viii. ii. 4: Οἱ δὲ κατὰ Σαβελλιον—εἰς τὴν μεγάτην τῆς ἁγίασεις ἑκατέχωσα πλην, οἵομενοι δὲ μὲν λειποτάξαν ἄνθρωπον προελθλέκθην τὸν νῦν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προςαρῴ τόθεν δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἀκροβατίας τῶν ἄνθρωπων πλημμελημάτων ἀναλυκότα ενόντοι το καὶ ἀναμειχθαὶ τὸ πατρι.

He was a Dacenarius, Esus. vii. 30. We must not here think of the Dacenarii whom Augustus created as the fourteenth order of knights, so called because they must have property to the amount of dacea sextaria (Sueton. Octav. c. 29), but the Dacenarii procurators, officers of a higher rank, who had so much yearly revenue, to whom Claudius granted the ornaments consularia (Sueton. Claud. c. 24), and who still continued under Constantine (Cod. Justin. x. 19, 1).

His history is given in Euseb. vii. 37–30. Here also, cap. 30, is found the historical part of the circular letter of the last council of Antioch which was held against him. Doctrinal fragments of the same are given in Leontii Byz. contra Nestor. et Eutych. lib. iii. in the Greek original from a Bodleian MS. apud J. G. Ehrlich diss. de erroribus Pauli Samos. Lips. 1745. 4. p. 23. Among other original documents put together in the collection of councils (apud Mansi, i. 1033), the Epist. Episcoporum ad Paulum is still the most trustworthy. The others are partly suspicious, partly spurious beyond a doubt; such as the epistle of Dionysius Alex. ad Paulum.—Fragments of Paul himself are found in the Contestatio ad Clerum Constantinop. in the Acts of the council of Ephesus apud Mansi v. 393, ap. Leontius, l. c. In Greek from a Paris MS. in J. G. Feuerlin diss. de haresi Pauli Sam. Gotting. 1741. 4. p. 10, and in Justinian Imp. lib. contra Monophysistas in Ang. Maji Nova collect. vii. i. 999: The texts contain much that agrees word for word, and may be supplemented and improved by each other. Besides fragments of Paul κα τῶν πρὸς Σαβίναν (or Σαβίναν) λόγων from a Clermont MS. in Feuerlin diss. p. 15, more correctly from a Vatican MS. in Ang. Maji Nova coll. vii. i. 68.—The doctrine of Paul was, according to Epiphanius Haer. lxvi. 1: Εἴνει ἐκ τοῦ τῶν κατὰ τὸν οὐσιὰν καὶ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου καὶ τοῦ οὐσιαστατοῦ ἡ αἰτία ἡ λόγος. μὴ εἶναι τοῦ τῶν κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τοῦ οὐσιαστατοῦ ἡ αἰτία οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ τῶν κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τοῦ οὐσιαστατοῦ ἡ αἰτία, ὡς ἀνακαλεῖ (Epist. ad Paul)—ἐξουσίων τῆς τῶν οὐσιαστάτων καὶ τῆς ἀνακαλήσεως (Epist. synod. Antioch. apud Leontius: ὡς συγγενε
were held in Antioch on his account. At the last of them (269), he was convicted of heresy, by Malechion, his opinion having been hitherto disguised under ambiguous expressions, and deposed from his office. 13 But his newly elected successor, bishop Domnus, could not take possession of his office until Ze-nobia, the patroness of Paul, had been defeated by Aurelian (272). 14 The party of Paul (Samostenian, Paulian, Paulianistae) existed till the fourth century. 15

13 It was established by the council: μὴ εἶναι ὑμοσωφίαν τὸν ἱέων τὸν θεόν τὸν πατρί, first mentioned in a letter of the Semiarians of 338, allowed by Athanasius de Synod. 43. Hilarius de Synod. 86. Basilii Epist. 52. On the other side, Prudentius Maranis. 14 A remarkable command of Aurelian, Euseb. vii. 30, 9: Τούτως νῦμα τὸν οἶκον, οἷς ἂν οἱ καὶ ἡ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ρωμαίων πόλιν ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ὁμογένους ἐπιστσόλου. 15 The usual most universal for all those who assorted τὸν ἄνων εἶναι πατέρα καὶ νῦν καὶ
MANICAEANS.

§ 61.

MANICAEANS.


Since the Syrian Gnosis, which had spread even to Persia,² presented so many points of union with the doctrine of Zoroaster,³ it is not surprising that the Persian Gnostics should have been led to connect their Christianity still more closely with the Zend doctrine.⁴ After the spiritual aspect of the religion of Zoroaster had declined under the Arsacidæ, and become a rude dualism and mere ceremonial worship, the Sassanides (from 227) did every thing in their power to restore its ancient splendor. In the assemblies of the Magi a supreme principle was acknowledged (Zeruane akerene); and, on the other hand, unqualified dualism with its adherents (Magusæans, al thanavia) condemned. These commotions in the bosom of Parsism prob-

1 Fragments of the Greek original are given by Epiphanius (Haer. 66). Respecting their spuriousness, see Beansobre, i. p. 120, ff. Yet even by Jerome they were regarded as authentic (Catal. c. 72). Cf. Fabricii bibl. Graecæ ed. Harles, vol. viii. p. 275, ss.
4 In opposition to Baur, who in the work already quoted, p. 433, assumes Buddhism as a third element, and with whom even Neander, l. c. second edition, p. 927, agrees, see the opposite objections of Scheckenburger in the theol. Studien u. Kritiken. 1833, iii. 895.
ably gave rise to the attempt of Manes to unite Christianity with the system of these Magusaeans. Eastern and western writers differ from one another not only in the name of this sect-founder (Mani—Cubricus, Manes, Manichaeus), but also in their accounts of him. They agree only in this, that he was hated by the Magi, persecuted by the Persian kings, compelled to flee, and lastly, at the command of a king (according to the orientals, Baharam or Bararanes I., from 272–275) barbarously put to death, as a corrupter of religion, in a fort or castle (according to the oriental writers, Dascarrah, according to the occidental, Arabion).

His system of religion rests on the assumption of two everlasting kingdoms coexisting and bordering on each other, the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness, the former under the dominion of God, the latter under the demon or Hyle. After the borders had been broken through by a war between the two kingdoms, and the material of light had been mixed with the material of darkness, God caused the world to be formed by the living spirit (ζων πνεύμα, spiritus vivens) out of this mixed material, in order that by degrees the material of light here captured (anima and Jesus patibilis) might be again separated and the old boundaries restored. Two exalted natures of light, Christ (whom Mani calls in preference dextra luminis, τοῦ άδιον φωτός νίς, &c.) and the Holy Spirit, the former dwelling in the sun and moon (naves), the latter in the air, conduct this process of bringing back the material of light; while the demon and the evil spirits, fettered to the stars, endeavor to hinder them. In every man there dwells an evil soul besides the soul of light; and it is his commission to secure to the latter the sway over the former, to unite with it as many as


7 An old Persian notion: so says the Persian Araspas in Xenoph. Cyrop. vi. c. 1, § 21: Ανό χάρο σαφές έχε ψυχάς.—ού χάρο όμω με το ὀνόμα τα πάντα και τα κατά τον θάνατον έκκλεισθήτω, και τατό αίμα βούλεται τα και σο βούλεται πράξειν. άλλη δηλούση διό εστών ψυχάς, και όντω μέν τό άγαθή κατά τα καλά πράξειν· όταν δε δάνια, τό αίσχρο επιχειρεῖται. On the later Persians, see Kleuker's Appendix to the Zend-Avesta, Bd. 1, Th. 1, S. 261.
possible of the elements of light, which are scattered in nature, especially in certain plants, and thus to free it from the fetters of the evil principle, and prepare the way for its return to the kingdom of light.⁸ After men had long been led astray by the demon, by means of false religions (Judaism and Heathenism), Christ descended from the sun to earth in the appearance of a body, to lead them to the worship of the true God, and by his doctrine to help the souls of light in their struggles for liberty. But his instructions were not fully understood even by the apostles, and after his death were still more falsified by the Christians.⁹ Hence he promised a still greater apostle, the παράκλητος, who should separate all that was false, and announce the truth in perfection and purity.¹⁰ This person appeared in Mani. The Manichaens accordingly rejected entirely the Old Testament.¹¹ All that they thought they could make use of in favor

⁸ Manes in Epist. ad filiam Menech (in Augustinii Op. imperf. lib. iii. c. 172): Sicut animae gignuntur animabuls, itaque figmentum corporis a corporis natura digeritur. Quod ergo nascitur de carne, caro est, et quod de spiritu, spiritus est: spiritum autem autem intellige.—(C. 177.) Sive enim bonum geramus, non est carnis—sive malum geramus, non est animae. Hence the Manichaens had other definitions of freedom and sin. Fortunatus Disp. ii. cum Augustino, c. 21: Id est peccatum animae, si post communionem Salvatoris nostri et sumam doctrinam ejus a contraria natura et huiusm. est stripe se non se goodavertit animae. Secundanus Epist. ad Augustin, § 2: (Anima) carnis commixtione ducitur, non propria voluntate. At si, cum se ipsum cognoverit, consentiat malo, et non se armet contra inimicum, voluntate sua peccavit. Quam se iterum prudent erasse, paratum inventit miracularem auctorem. Non enim punitur, quia peccavit, sed quia de peccato non doluit.


¹⁰ Mani begins his Epistola fundamentali (ap. Augustinum contra epist. Manichaei, c. 5) thus: Manichaeus Apostolus Jesu Christi providentia Dei patri. Hace sunt salubria verba de renum et vivo fonte, quae qui audierit et eisdem primum crederit, deinde quae inimicum custodierit, nuncum evit morti obnoxias, verum acertam et gloriosam vita fractur, caet.—The Manichaean Felix (Augustin. de Act. cum Felice, i. 9): Paulus in altera epistola dicit: “Ex parte simus et ex parte prophetamus: cum venerit autem quod perfectum est, abolebuntur, ut quae ex parte dicta sunt.” (I Cor. xiii. 9, 10.) Nos audientes Paulum hoc dicere, venit Manichaeum cum praedicatione sua et susceptionem cum secundum quod Christus dixit: “Mitto vos hab spiritum sanctum.”—Et quia venit Manichaeus, et per saum praelectionem ducit nos initium, medium et finem: ducit nos de fabrícia mundi, quae facta est, et unde facta est, et quae fecerunt: ducit nos, quae dies et quae nox: ducit nos de censa solis et lunae: quia hoc in Paulo nos audivimus, nec in cacorum Apostolorum scriptura: hoc credimus, quis ipsi esse Paracletus. Itaque illud iterum dico, quod superius dixi: si audieris in altera scriptura, ubi Paracletus loquitur, de quo voluisti interrogare, et ducerus me, credo et remittio.—Without doubt, Manes made a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete, but was misunderstood by the Catholics (for example Euseb. H. E. 7, 31: Tote μὲν τῶν Παράκλητον καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ ἄγιον αὐτῶν ἐνεμήσατο τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀναστηκτών).

of their doctrine belonging to the canonical and apocryphal writings of the New Testament, was regarded by them as a remnant of the original truth. Whatever was opposed to their views was supposed to be error which had been subsequently mixed up with the truth. Thus, they appealed, where it served their purpose, to the canonical gospels and the epistles of St. Paul as well as to apocryphal gospels without entirely adopting these writings, but at the same time, without attempting to purge them from error, as Marcion did. Since they found least truth in the history of the apostles written by Luke, they confronted this canonical production with another, under the name of Lucius or Leucius. All these writings could not be canonical in their estimation, meaning by that term, absolutely authoritative. The works of Mani alone were canonical.

Their morality had for its object to procure for the good the


13 Faustus (ap. Augustin. c. Faust. xxxiiii. 3): Nec ab ipso (Christo), haec (Evangelia) sunt, nec ab ejus apostolis scripta: sed multo post eorum assumptionem a nescio quibus, et ipsis inter se non concordantibus Semjazaides per famas opinionesque comperta sunt: qui tamen omnia cadem in apostolorum Domini conferentes nomina, vel eorum, qui secuti apostolos videreant errores ac mendaciam suas secundum eos se scripsisse mentiti sunt.

14 Cyril. Hieron. Catech. iv. and vi. pronounces the gospel of Thomas to be a Manichaean production, and many have followed him; but the Manicheans may have quoted it for particular sentiments, without entirely adopting it (see Thilo Cod. apocr. N. T. Pro leg. p. lxxx). The gospel of Philip was of Gnostic origin, which document is said to have been used also by the Manicheans, Trechsel, S. 59. — A catalogue of such writings, which in part at least may have been first used by the later Manicheans, may be found in Timotheus (presb. Constantinop. about 511) l. de his qui ad ecclesiam accedunt, in J. Meursii Varia divina, Lugd. Bat. 1619. 4. p. 117.

15 Leucii Acta Apostolorum (Augustin. de Actis c. Felice, ii. 6): Αι τῶν ἀποστόλων περιοδοί (Photius Bibl. cod. 114), written by Leucius Charinus, containing the Πράξεις Πέτρου, Ἰωάννου, Ἀνδρέου, Θωμᾶ, Παύλου. Several of them exist in MS. There have been published Acta S. Thomae Apostoli ed. J. C. Thilo. Lips. 1833. 8. Comp. the Prolegomena to this work, p. lx. Respecting the person of Leucius, the most contradictory accounts are given (Trechsel, S. 61). It is highly probable that he is a mythic collective for all heretical histories of the apostles, and that the name was modeled after that of Luke.

16 Βίβλος τῶν μυστηρίων (Syr. in 22 divisions. Fragments ed collage Titus Bostrensis and Epiphani. Huer. lxvi. 14), B. τῶν κεφαλαίων, τὸ ζών εὐαγγέλιον (Oriental. Erteng ?), ὁ θε- σαροῦς τῆς ζωῆς (Fragments in Augustin. de Natura boni, 44, de Act. cum Felice, i. 14, and in Evodii de Fide). These four works Manes is said to have appropriated from the remains of Scythians. Besides these there are several letters of his: Epist. fundamenti (Augustini lib. contra epist. Manichaei, quam vocant fundamenti), Ep. ad filiam Menoch (Fragments in August. Opus imperfect. lib. iii.). Fragments of the letters ad Zebennam, ad Scythinorum, ad Odan, ad Cudarum in Fabricii Bibl. Graeca, vol. v. p. 224; Η. ed. nov. vol. viii. p. 315, also scattered here and there in Ang. Maji Script. vet. nova coll. vii. i. 17, 69, 70, 277, 304.
dominion over the bad soul, by a rigid self-denial. It was divided into the signa eulum oris, sign. manus, and sign. sinus. It imposed on the baptized members (electi, perfecti, τέλειοι) so great privations, that most adherents of the sect remained catechumens (auditores) as long as possible, for the sake of being released from the observance of the most stringent laws. The worship of the Manichaeans was very simple. They celebrated Sunday by fasting; the day of Mani’s death by a yearly festival (Βηθα). Baptism, which was administered with oil, and the Lord’s Supper belonged to the secret worship of the electi.

Mani himself sent out twelve apostles to propagate his doctrine, in like manner afterward electi were constantly dispatched for this purpose. Hence the party remained in very close union. At the head of them was one person, to whom 12 magistri immediately, and next the 72 bishops of the churches, were subordinate. Many followers were attracted by the historical form in which Mani endeavored to explain so much that is incomprehensible, and by the asceticism of his adherents. Accordingly, the Manichaeans spread, soon after the death of their founder, into proconsular Africa, and even further in the Roman dominions, although they were opposed with vehemence, not only by the catholic church, but were also persecuted by heathen emperors, who enacted bloody laws against them as a sect derived from the hostile Persians.


18 Augustinus de Uititate credendi, c. 1. (Opp. ed. Bened. viii. 34): Nos ti enim, Hono- rata, non sibi sed causa nos in tales hostias incidisse, nisi quod se dicerent, terribili auctoritate separata, mira et simplici ratione cos, qui se adire velent, introducere ad Deum, et orare omni liberaturo, etc.

19 Diecolianus edict to Julian, proconsul of Africa, against the Manichaeans, dat. prid. Kal. April. (387?) Alexandria, mentioned also by Ammianus ad. 2 Tim. iii. 7, and preserved in the Lex Del s. Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio (best edition by F. Blume, Bonae. 1833. 8) tit. xv. c. 3, and in the Codices Gregoriani fragmentis (ed. G. Haenel. Bonae. 1837. 4. p. 44);—De quibus Soteria tua Serenitati nostrae retulit Mani- chaeis, audivimus eos supererime, veluti nova inopinata prodigia, in hunc mundum de Persi- sina, adversaria nobis gente, progressa vel orta esse, et multa fidehors ibi committere: populos namque quietes turbare, nec non et civitatem maxima detrimenta inserere: et verendum est, ne forte, ut fieri adsolet, accedent tempore conuentur (per) execcrandas con- sectudines et scaevas leges Persarum immaci torios naturae homines, Romanam gentem modestam atque tranquillum, et universam orbem nostrum veluti venonis suis malevolis inficere.—Jubemus namque, auctores quidem ac principes sua cum abominandis scriptoris eorum severioris poenae subjeci, ita ut stantmeis ignibus exunatur; consentientes vero et usque adeo contentiones capite puniri praecipians, et eorum bona fieso nostro vindicati sanins. Si qui sane etiam honorari, aut cupidibus dignitatis, vel majoris, personae ad hunc insidiam et turpem atque per omnia infamem sectam, vel ad doctrinam Persarum
THIRD CHAPTER.

THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I. IN THE EAST.

§ 62.

ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL.


In the present period, Christian theology was cultivated especially at Alexandria, at that time the seat of all the sciences, where the catholic teachers, even by their external relations to the heathen and Gnostics, were compelled to enter philosophically into the doctrines of Christianity. Here began to be very soon felt the necessity of an instruction beyond the usual one given to catechumens, as well for the philosophical proselytes as for those who were to become teachers. After many persons thirsting for knowledge had been in this way collected about some distinguished man, the institution of the Alexandrian catechetical school attached itself to those prior individual efforts.

se transiturum, eorum patrimonio fisco nostro asocaeris facies, ipsos quoque soconusibus vel proconsulis metulis dari. Ut igitur stirpitis amputari mala haec nequitas de saculis beatissimo nostro possit, Deyse tua jusis ac statutis Tranquililitatis Nostrae matutias, obscurandum (fustigat). Explanation of this passage may be found in Bynkershoek de Relig. peregrina, diss. ii. (Opusc. ii. 207.) Casmeister ad Fragm. vet. jurisprud. c. 24.

1 Origenes ap. Eusebium, vi. 19, 5.

2 Euseb. v. 10 (speaking of the time of Commodus): 'Hégéita de ténnakító tís tôn peistóv autós (kata' Alexándroíán) dúmatrís hēmē kata' paideían éndoéostatos, ónomà autó Párra-tanov. Ἐκ ἀρχαιὸν ἔνδος διδασκαλεῖαν τῶν ἑρων λόγων παρ' αὐτῶν συνετούσι καὶ εἰς ἥμισυ παρατείνεται, καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ θεῖα στοιχεῖα γνωστών συγκροτῶν παρελθοῦμεν. This account is given more fully by Jerome, in Catal. 36: Pantaes, stoica sectae philosophos, juxta quodam veterem in Alexandria consuetudinem, ubi a Marco Evangelista semper ecclesiasticum fuerit doctores, tantae praeclariæ et eruditionis tam in Scripturis divinis, quam in sacellari literatura fact, ut in Indian quoque—mittere-
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shortly before the present period. The height of its prosperity falls under this very time, and its distinguished teachers (κατηχήσεως magistri, Hieron. Cat. c. 38), Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Heraclis, Dionysius,3 (Pierius and Theoepustos) are the only persons by whom Christian theology was now advanced. The Alexandrian school took its peculiar direction from its very first teachers. Pantaenus, a Stoic philosopher, is otherwise unknown; and we can only judge of him by his pupil Titus Flavius Clemens. The peculiarity of the Alexandrian school is already stamped on the writings of the latter, who was president of the catechetical institution from about 191 till 202, then fled in the persecution raised by Severus, and probably returned to Alexandria († about 220).4 But the characteristics of the school were completely developed and matured by the great Origen (ὁ χαλκέντερος, ὁ ἀδιαμάντιος) the son of the martyr Leonides, who died in 202. When a youth of eighteen he was a catechist at Alexandria,5 and procured for

ter. Names: τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖν (Euseb. H. E. vi. 3, 1, vi. 26) τὸ ἱερὸν διδασκαλεῖν τῶν ἱερῶν μαθηματῶν (Sozomen. H. E. iii. 15), ecclesiastica schola (Hieron. Cat. c. 38), schola κατηχήσεως (ibid. c. 69).

3 This is the order according to Eusebius and others. On the other hand, Philippus Sidet. (about 420) fragm. in Hunr. Dodwelli dissert. in Irenaeum. Oxon. 1689. 8. p. 499, ss.: Athenagoras, Pantaenus, Origenes, Heraclis, Dionysius, Clemens, Pierius, Theognostus, Serafion, Petrus Martyr, Maximus pol. p. ibid., ibidem. Even Socrates Hist. eccl. vi. c. 57, finds fault with the Christian history of Philip ἃ εἰς τῶν χρόνων τῆς Ἰστο- rίας αὐξάνει.

4 Writings: λόγος προφητικὸς τός Ἐλληνας—πανδαγωγός 3 books—στρώματα or στροματικά libb. viii. (cf. Photius. Cod. ex. λόγος, τῆς ὁ σωματικοῦ σκλασμοῦ (c. comment. C. Sagner, Trag. ad 1816. 8). With others of his writings have been also unfortunately lost the ἐπιστολάρια in 8 books, in which later orthodoxy found many ἀποτλέσεις καὶ μεθοδεῖς λόγων (See Photius Cod. 109). The fragments of it have been collected by Potter in his edition of Clement, vol. ii. p. 1066, ss. A small portion of it, Remarks on the Catholic epistles, has been preserved in a Latin translation under the title of Adambraeens Clem. Alex. (best ed. Potter, l. c.) probably the same of which Cassiodorus de. Institut. div. lit. c. 8, says, that he had prepared it ut exclusis quibusdam offensibus purificata doctrina eum securior posset hauriri. Comp. Lübeck's Comm. über die Schriften Johannis, 2te Auflage, iii. 77. Perhaps also the ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν (prophetic interpretations) ἔλογοι apud Potter, p. 889, are remains of the Hypotyposeis.—Opp. omn. ed. J. Potter. Oxon. 1715. 2 voll. fol. R. Klotz. Lips. 1831–34. 4 voll. 8.—P. Hofstedte De Groot Disp. de Clemente Alex. Graugingae. 1826, 8. v. Cölln's article on Clemens in Ersch and Grüber's Encyclop. Th. 18. S. 4, ff. A. F. Dusche de γνώσεωi Clementis Alex. Lips. 1831. 8. Bedeutung des Alex. Clemens f. d. Entstehung d. christl. Theologie, by D. Kühl, in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1841, iv. 8. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philos. l. 491. Redepening's Origines, i. 70. [See the article on Clement in Smith's Dict. of Biography and Mythology.]

5 His self-abnegation, related by Eusebius, vi. 2, is questioned by Schnitzer (Origines über die Grundlehren, Einleit. S. xxxvi.). On the other side see Engelhardt in the theolog. Stud. u. Kritik. for 1838, i. 157, and Redepening's Origines, i. 299.—According to Porphyry Origen was also a heater of Ammonius Saccas (Euseb. vi. 19), which appears to be con
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himself a great reputation even in other places. But he displeased his bishop, Demetrius, by being consecrated presbyter at Caesarea (228), went thither in 231, and was then excluded from communion with the church by Demetrius on account of his peculiar opinions. The churches in Palestine, Arabia, and Achaia, paid no regard, however, to this excommunication; and Origen not only continued to fill the office of presbyter in Caesarea, but likewise gave instruction in the sciences. Besides this, the revision of the corrupted Septuagint (τὰ ἑξαπλαθή) occupied him for twenty-eight years. During this time he was twice invited to synods which were held in Arabia against heretics; and both times he succeeded in convincing them of their errors (Beryllus of Bostra, 244—Arabici, 248). So distinguished a teacher of Christianity could not be overlooked in persecutions. He escaped from Maximin the Thracian by fleeing to his friend Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. But in the Decian persecution he suffered so much ill usage in Tyre, that he died there some years after († 254).⁶

(CONTINUATION).—REPRESENTATION OF THE ALEXANDRIAN THEOLOGY, PARTICULARLY THAT OF ORIGEN.

Guerike de Schola Alex. catech. (s. notice prefixed to § 62). Para posterior: de Scholae Alex. catecheticae theologia. Halis. 1825, and the works relating to the doctrine of Clement and Origen which have been already quoted, § 62 notes 5 and 6. [Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics. Edinburgh. 1843.]

The Alexandrians set a very high value on philosophy, both because it was formerly among the heathen what the law was among the Jews, a preparation for Christianity, and because by it alone a deeper knowledge of Christian doctrine is opened up, (γνώσις, hence γνωστικόν, in Origen σοφία, ἡ θεία σοφία). 1 This γνώσις was certainly different from the ψευδώνομον γνώσις of the errorists; since the received doctrines of the church (πίστις), 2


2 Clem. Strom. vii. p. 864: 'Estin gára, ós epos eitein, h gnōsis tēleúsais tōv anērōspous,
as molded and modified in express opposition to the Gnostics, were adopted as an immutable basis for the orthodox Gnosis. Yet these orthodox Gnostics were led by the connection of certain general philosophical principles and opinions with Christianity, to many speculations which were very like those of their heretical brethren. Like them too, they believed that their Gnosis had been handed down as a mysterious doctrine; and that it should be communicated only to the initiated. Hence Origen writes about such doctrines with visible hesitation, and warns in particular, against bringing them before the people. Toward the uninitiated, the Alexandrians regarded
a certain accommodation as necessary, which might venture even to make use of falsehood for the attainment of a good end, yea, which was obliged to do so; and hence they did not scruple to acknowledge in many ecclesiastical doctrines such an accommodation.

The Alexandrian theology set out with the most elevated idea of God, and strove to keep far away from it all anthropopathic limitations. In like manner it declared the freedom of the rational being to be inalienable; and asserted for the purpose of removing from the Deity every idea of groundless caprice, that the external circumstances of all morally free beings can be conditioned only by their moral state. Since, at the same time, this theology assumed that the world was created only on account of rational beings, and conformably to their moral

fine vel consummatione, he says, de Princ. i. 6, § 1: Quae quidem a nobis etiam cum magno metu et cautela dicuntur, discutientibus magis et pervertantibus quam pro certo se definito statuam, etc.

7 Plato de Republ. iii. had long before allowed untruth in certain cases ev pharisaου εἶδει as useful. So also Philo, who speaks just as the Christian Alexandrians, of a two-fold mode of religious instruction, Quod Deus sit immutabilis, p. 392: "Oi μὲν οὖν εἴμοιροι φώσεις λαυτότες καὶ ἅγιωτέρες ἀνυπατεῖς—άλληλες συνουσιάμως χρώται, ποι' ἡ μυθεντικεῖς τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἒντος ἐνεκείμενα μονότερα, τῶν γενέσεως αὐθεντών προσομολαπήσασης αὐτῷ (τῷ θεῷ). Τότες οἰκεύονται πρόκειται κεράλαιοι εἰς τοὺς ιεροφανείσθες χρησιμοῖς, ὅτι αὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπος ἡ θεός, ἀλλ' αὐθεντικός ἡ σωφροσύνη, ἡθος ὡς κόσμος.—Οἱ δὲ γε ναυτικτήρες μὲν καὶ μυθελίες κεκρυμέναι τῇ φώσει, περὶ δὲ τὰς εἰς παιδί τρώγος πληγεμελήσθησαν, δέδε καθομᾶν ἀνυπατεῖς λατρῶν δένουσι νομοθετον ὁ πρὸς τὸ παρόν πάθως τῶν ὀλεθρίων ἐπιφονόσχεον, θεραπεῖαν.—Μαντακετοναν οὖν πάντες τὰ τοιοῦτο τῇ φώσει, δεν ἐνί θεραπείᾳ, εἰ μὴ δένουσι δε' ἀρχεῖα σωφροσύνης. Cleomenes Al. Strom. vi. p. 892: Οὐ θετοῖ τῷ θεῷ οἱ οὐ συμπεριφερομένοι δε' οἰκονομίας σωφροσύνης—ἀλλ' οἱ εἰς τὰ κυριώτατα παραπτωματες καὶ αἰθιοτέρτες μὲν τῶν Κύριων τὸ ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἀποστραφεῖς δε' τῶν Κυρίων τῇ ἀλήθει ἀδιασκαλαί. Origines Strom. vi. (in Hieronymi Apol. 1. adv. Rufin. c. 18) brings forward that passage of Plato in defense of this kind of accommodation, and adds: Homo autem, cui incumbent necessitas mentendi, diligenter attendat, ut si utatur interdum mendaciæ, quomodo condimento atque medicamine, ut servet mensum ejus. Ex quo perspicuum est, quod nisi ita mentiē fecerimus, ut magnum nobis ex hoc aliquod quereret bonam, judicandi quisque quasi liquefici ejus, qui ait: ‘Ego sum veritas.’ Cf. Historia antiquior seuentiuamae Excl. graecæ de accommodacione Christi inprimit et Apostolis tributa, oss. scripsit P. A. Carus. Lips. 1793. 4.

8 Origins s. Cels. iii. p. 159, in allusion to the Christian eschatology attacked by Celsus: 'Εδώ δὲ τις τοῦτος δεισιδαιμονεῖ τὰλλαν τὴν ποιήσαν της πολλοῖ τῶν πιστευόντων τῷ λόγῳ εἶναι διαφανέν ς καὶ ἡγαλλή ποι ἤθελαλοι πιστεύοντες τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν ἀφίσσιμον πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥσπερ ἤλεγχε τὰς τῶν νομοθετῶν (Solon) πρὸς ἐρωτᾶτα, εἰ τοὺς καλλίστους ἐθέτο τοις πολλαῖς νόμοις, ὥστι ὁ τοὺς καθαρὰς καλλίστος, ἀλλ' ἐνδώτον τοὺς καλλίστους. Οὕτω λέγω δ' καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστιανῶν λόγου, ὅτι, ἐν δόντως οἱ πολλοὶ εἰς βελτίωσιν ἡδονῆς, τῶν καλλίστων ἑθήμεν νόμους καὶ διδασκαλιὰν, πάνως οἱ ζευγῆς ἀπείτως καὶ καλλίστας τῶν ἀμαρτάνοντός, ἀλλ' ἀλήθειας μὲν καὶ ἀναγκαίας, εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν ἀντιπροκείμενων προσομολάπως· οὐ μὲν καὶ πάντως τὸ τοῦ καλλίστου ἀμβλύθη, καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐργον· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ χρήσμου, καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀλήθειας, καὶ μετ' ἐπικρίσεως συμφέροντος λέγεται.
FIRST PERIOD.—DIV. III.—A.D. 193-324.

necessities, the existence of evil in the present world was there-
by explained, and the necessity of a succession of worlds was es-
established, so far as the moral conditions of those beings change.
The most remarkable of their principles which result from these
premises, and appear fully unfolded in Origen, are the following:

1. The Godhead can never be idle. Before the present world
there was an endless series of worlds, and an infinite succession
of them will follow it.\footnote{Still, earlier in the Hypotyposes άλλων σχονον.—Ιτε δε μετεφύσωσις, καὶ
πόλλας προ τοι Άδου κόσμους τερατεύεται (Phot. Cod. 109). Origines de Princ. iii. 5, 3.
In like manner Plato and the Stoics.}

2. All intellectual beings (angels, stars, men, demons) were
originally created alike, but they were never without bodies,
since incorporeality is a peculiar prerogative of Deity. After a
great moral inequality had arisen among them by their difference
of conduct, God created the present world, which affords a
dwelling-place to all classes in correspondence with their moral
condition. The fallen intellectual beings he put into bodies
more or less gross, according to the measure of their sinfulness.\footnote{That Clement also taught this, Strom. iv. p. 640, is asserted by Keil. Opp. vol. ii. p.
653, but denied by Hofstede de Groot Disp. de Clem. Alex. p. 60 : Both accordingly
interpret the word μετεφύσωσις in Photius, note 9, differently. On the other hand,
Origen advances this doctrine plainly, de Princ. ii. 9, § 6. Cf. Keil. p. 654, ss. A similar
doctrine of Basilides, see Neander’s Gnostic. Systeme, S. 41, 50, ff.}

Still they all retain their moral freedom, so that they
may rise again from the degraded circumstances in which they
exist. Even the punishments of the condemned are not eternal,
but only remedial; the devil himself being capable of ameliora-
tion and pardon.\footnote{That Clement. Strom. i. p. 367, s., δι άνθρωπος αυτεκφύσιον ὅλον, καὶ μετανοήσαι
οίον τε ήν καὶ κλέψαντ, did not hold this point, is proved by Hofstede de Groot, p. 71. On
the contrary, Origen de Princip. i. 6. § 3 : Hi vero, qui de statu primae beatitudinis moti
quidem sunt, non tamen irremediabiliter moti, illis, quos supra descripsimus, sanctis
beatisque ordinibus dispensandis subjecti sunt ac regendi: quorum adutorio usi, et insti-
titutionibus seu disciplinis salutaribus reformati, rodire ac resitu lu ad statum suae beatitudinis
possint.—§ 3 : Ex quo, ut opinor, hoc consequentia ipsa videtur ostendere, unamquaeque
rationabilium naturam posse ab uno in alterum ordinem transmutare per singulos in omnes,
et ab omnibus in singulos pervenire, dum accressus profectum defunctumque varios pro
motibus vel causis propriae unusquisque pro libertarii facultate perpetuitar.}

When the world shall have answered its
purpose, as the abode of fallen spirits, it will then be destroyed
by fire; and by this very fire souls will be completely purified
from all stains contracted by intimate union with the body.\footnote{Clemens Strom. vii. c. 6, in fine p. 851. (Cf. Hofstede de Groot Disp. de Clem. Alex.
p. 108, ss.) Origines in Exod. xv. 5 (Hom. vi. in Exod. ed. de la Rue, t. ii. p. 148) : Idecro
igitur qui salvs fit, por ignem salvus fit, ut si quid forte specie plumbi habuerit admixtam,
But as spirits always retain their freedom, they may also sin again, in which case a new world like this will be again necessary.

3. The Alexandrians speak of the Logos, the mediator of all Divine agency, in very exalted, but not always definite expressions. Evidently, however, they place him beneath the supreme God. Their endeavor to remove all ideas unworthy of God


from the generation of the Son, was completed by Origen, his assertion that the Logos did not proceed from the essence of the Father, but as a constant ray of the Divine glory was brought forth, i.e., created, or generated by the will of God, and that from eternity. But he taught that

from the generation of the Son, was completed by Origen, his assertion that the Logos did not proceed from the essence of the Father, but as a constant ray of the Divine glory was brought forth, i.e., created, or generated by the will of God, and that from eternity. But he taught that
the Holy Ghost was a creature created by the Son, as all other things.\footnote{22}

4. The human body assumed by the Logos was a real body, but could not have been a common one. According to Clement, it was united immediately with the Logos, and therefore, as is required by the Divine ἀπάθεια of the latter, without πάθη.\footnote{21} Origen taught expressly a human soul in the person of Christ, with which the Logos united itself directly.\footnote{22} Thus those πάθη were

he would fain regard these passages as spurious. Clemens Strom. v. p. 699 : 'Η σοφία ἡ πρωτόκτιστος τῶν θεών. So also Origines Comm. in Joh. tom. i. 22 : Κτίσας—ζησάξων σοίδάν ο θεός. Contra Celsum, v. p. 357, the Son is πρεσβύτατον πάντων τῶν διοικητῶν. So also Justinian, l. c. accuses Origen of calling the Son κτίσμα, de Princip. lib. iv. These expressions were now generally used by others since in Prov. viii. 22 : Κύριος ἔκτησε με ἀρχήν ἄδον αὐτοῦ was a cardinal passage relating to the Logos. See Münzer’s Dogmengesch. i. 445.—The question whether the Son was of the divine essence was capable of receiving a twofold answer from the standing-point of Origen. De Princip. iv. 36, according to the translation of Jerome (Epist. ad Avitum) : Intellectualem rationabilisemque naturam sentit Deus et unigenitus Filius ejus et Spiritus sanctus; sentiant angeli et potestates, euteneraque virtutes; sancti interior homo qui ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei conditionis est. Ex quo conclusūtur, Deum et hoc quodadmodum unius esse substantiae. Fragn. ex libris in Epist. ad Heb. in the apology of Pampillus : Christians—secondum similitudinem ejus corporis, qui de substantia aliqua corporea procedit, sic etiam ipse ut quidam vapor exucratur de virtute ipsius Dei.—Sic nihilominus et secondum similitudinem corporalis aporboeae esse dicitur aporboeae gloriae Omnipotentis pura quasedam et sinceræ. Quae utraque similitudines manifestissime ostendunt, communione substantiae esse Filiolum Patre. Aporboea enim διοικούσας videtur, i.e., unius substantiae cum illo corpore, ex quo est vel aporboea, vel vapor. Selecta in Psalm 135 : 'Ὁ σωρής οὗ κατὰ μνείαν, ἀλλὰ κατ’ αἰώναι ἐταὶ θεὸς. On the other hand de Orations c. 50 : Ἑτέρος κατ’ αἰώναι καὶ ἐποκείμενος ἐταῖς ο λόγος τοῦ πατρός. Comp. Comm. in Joh. tom. ii. 18. The Son was of the divine essence, but did not partake of the divine essence of the Father.

\footnote{22} Origines in Johann. i. 3. (de la Rue iv. p. 60) : Οἶμαι γὰρ, ὅτι τὸ μὲν φάσκων γενητὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον εἶναι, καὶ προαίειν τὰ ἁγία δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ἀναγκαῖον παραδείσεσθαι, ὅτι τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, προεξόντων μόρῳ τοῦ λόγου τυχόντως.—Ὑμεῖς τρίς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυχόντες, τὸν πάτερα, καὶ τὸν λόγον, καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἄγιον ἑτέρον ἑτέρους τών πατρός εἰς τὸν Χριστόν γεγενημένους. Καὶ τόχα ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ λόγῳ χρηματίζειν τοῦ θεοῦ, μόνον τοῦ μονογενοῦς φύειν πλὴν ἀρχήν τυχόντως, οὗ ὄρθριν ἔκκεν τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, διακοσμοῦσιν αὐτὸ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον ἐστὶν τὸ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφῶς εἶναι, καὶ λογικῶς καὶ δίκαιον κ. τ. ἀ. De Princ. i. 3. 5. : Μείζον ἡ δύναμις τοῦ πατρός παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον. πλείον ἐς ὁ τοῦ υἱοῦ παρὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, καὶ πάλιν διαφέρουσα μάλλον τοῦ ἄγιου πνεύματος ἡ δύναμις παρὰ τὸ ἄλλα ἄγιον.

\footnote{21} Strom. vi. p. 775 : Ἐπι μὲν τοῦ σωτήρος τὸ σῶμα ὑπαιτεῖν ὡς σῶμα τῆς ἀναγκαίας ὑπηρεσίας εἰς διαμονὴν, γέλως ἂν εἶν. ἔφαγεν γὰρ οὐ διὰ τὸ σῶμα, δυνάμεις συνεχύμονας ἀγίας ὑπαίτιας εἰς τὸ σάρκιον, ἡμῖν γὰρ αὐτὸν διαμοίρασθαι, ἐν τῷ φρουρῖν ὑπάλληλον, ὡς οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ διατίθεντος, οὕτω ἔμελένει οὕτω διαφέρειν διαφέρει καί ἑαυτῷ φανερωθῆναι ἐπίλαθον. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπικαταπληθεῖ ἄπαθες ἢ, εἰ ἐν ὅσιον, παραρθηκότα κίνημα παθητικόν, οὕτω ἡδυνή, οὕτω λύπη. Comp. my Comm. qua Clem. Alex. et Origenes doctrinæ de corpore Christi explonuntur. Gottingae. 1837. 4.
no stumbling-block to him, since the soul was affected only through them. On the contrary, in his opinion, the body of Christ, as an appropriate instrument of revelation, was so constituted as, according to the degree of their merit, either to conceal the majesty of the Logos from men, or to allow it to shine through with more or less radiance.  

Clement, as well as Origen, decidedly opposed the docetic views.

5. The Christian sage (ὁ γνωστικός), in the way the Alexandrians represent him as a pattern, is said to be elevated above the simple believer, not merely by higher perception, but also by a higher virtue which is entirely dispassionate.  

The aim of this virtue is likeness to God, its basis, freedom from all the restraints of sensuality, its character the highest disinterestedness.

"Deus homo, illa substantia media existente, cui utique contra naturam non erat corpus assumere."

"In Matth. Comment. series, § 100 : Venit traditio talis ad nos de Jesu, quoniam non solum deus formae in eo fuerunt, una quidem sequum quom omnes eum videbant, altera autem sequum quam transfiguratus est corpus discipulis suis in monte: sed etiam unicaque apparebat sequum quod fuerat dignus. Et non mihi videtur incredibilis esse traditio haec, sive corporaliter propter ipsum Jesum, ut, alio et alio modo videretur hominibus, sive propter ipsum Verbi naturam, quod non similliter cunctis apparat. Contra Celsum, iv. 16: Eta γὰρ διάφοροι οὐσίες τοῦ Λόγου μορφαί, καθὼς ἐκάστῳ τῶν εἰς ἐπιστήμην ἀγομένων φαίνεται ὁ Λόγος, ἀνάλογον τῇ ἔξω τοῦ εἰσαγομένου, ἡ ἐπὶ ἄλλου προκόπτων, ἡ ἐπὶ τελείων, κ. ἐπὶ. My Comm. p. 15.

"Both have often been accused of holding docetic views even in ancient times. Thus according to Photius Cod. 109, Clement in his Hypotyposes is said to have taught directly, μὴ συμπληρωθή τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ δόξαι. Modern writers, too, have discovered doceticism in the words of Clement, Coh. ad Graec. p. 86: ὁ ἀνθρώπου προσπεποίη ἀναλόγων καὶ σαμῖκ αὐτοπλασίωδος τὸ σετίχην ὁξάμας τῆς αὐτοπλασίας ἐπικηρύστη. Σον on the other side my Comm. quoted in note 91.

"Clem. Strom. vi. p. 775: Καὶ γὰρ μετὰ λόγου γινόμενα τὰ προηρμημένα (τὰ δοκοῦστα ἀγάθα τῶν παθητικῶν κυημάτων), οὐνόμαρος, ὑλόν, χαρών, ἐπιθυμιάων ἀγαθὰ τὰ ἐκλέξηται, ἀλλ' ὁν γε ἐπὶ τοῦ τελείου οὐ παράδεικτον. P. 895: Ἔτιππα της της κατὰ των φονον διακατανόησης των γνωστικῶν δεικνυσιν.—Τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρότητα της πίστεως χάρισας, τῆς γνώσεως αὐτῶν ἀκροτάτης ὡμοίως τείχεται τῆς κληρονομίας.


"Clem. Strom. iv. p. 576: Νεῖν δ' οἴραι μὴν διὰ φέβον καλύπτως, ἢ ἢτε διὰ τινα ἐπαγ
6. The Alexandrians could not but be averse to sensual chiliasm. Clement does not allude to it. Origen, however, expressly opposes the chilliastic expectations; and would have all the passages which appear to favor it interpreted allegorically.

7. Since, in the view of the Alexandrians, the body is merely a prison of the true Μόρ, they also assumed that souls, at the time of the resurrection, would not resume the gross material body, but one of fine, incorruptible texture.

To establish this system from the Holy Scriptures the Alexandrians availed themselves of the allegoricalmode of interpretation which had been in use before. But after the interpretation of Scripture had been thus made a mere arbitrary play of fancy till now, Origen gained for himself the merit of reinstating the grammatical interpretation in its rights, by a more accurate distinction between the literal, the moral, and the mystical (mystico-anagogic and mystico-allegorical) sense. In his commentaries he has furnished rich contributions toward the grammatical interpretation, by which means he became the chief source for succeeding commentators.


§ 64.

(CONTINUATION.)—ADHERENTS AND OPPONENTS OF ORIGEN.

Origen’s peculiar opinions met, even in his lifetime, with as many opponents as friends, and excited suspicion in many bishops. He and his disciples, however, succeeded in combating and refuting many sensuous views and expectations which were then current among Christians. Thus some overvalued the importance of the body in the personality of man, so much as to suppose that the soul dies, and is again raised along with it. Origen overthrew this error, when it appeared in Arabia. To his most distinguished disciple Dionysius (president of the catechetical school from 233, from 248 bishop in Alexandria, † 265) belongs the merit of having victoriously continued in the east the opposition to chiliasm begun by his master. An opportunity for this was furnished to him by an Egyptian bishop, Nepos, who, in the Ἐλεγχος Ἀλληγοριστῶν, insisted particularly on the literal acceptation of the Apocalypse, and the description of the millennium contained in it. Doubtless the Decian persecution, which soon followed, contributed to procure many advocates to a view which furnished so strong motives to Christian steadfastness, especially in the province of Arsinoe. But after the persecution, Dionysius succeeded by oral representations and

1 Origenes Hom. xxv. in Lucam: Plerieque dum plus nos diligunt quam meremur, hae jactant et loquentur, sermo nostros doctrinaeque laudantes, quae conscientia nostra non recipit. Alii vero tractatus nostros calumniantes, en sentire nos criminarunt, quas numquam sensisse nos novimus. Sed neque hi qui plus diligunt, neque illi qui odurent, veritatis regulam tenent, et ali per dictationem, ali per odium mentiuntur.


3 So also Tatian (Orat. ad Gr. c. 21). Comp. Daniel’s Tatianus, p. 226.


5 The fragments of his writings are collected by Gallandius Bibl. PP. t. iii. p. 481, 55. Simon de Magistris. Romae. 1786. fol.
his work περὶ ἐπαγγελίων, not only in convincing that party of their error, but also in banishing chilliasm entirely among the theologians of the eastern church.® Similar opposition he presented to Sabellius. It is true, that in trying to develop more precisely the Origenist distinctions as adverse to Sabellius’ doctrine of the Trinity, he gave offense by designating the Logos a creature of the Father,® and was therefore blamed by the Romish Dionysius; but the many-sided views which he had from Origen permitted him to cloak his view of the Logos as a created being without altering it.® This convenient pliability of expression, in which Origen himself had led the way, is also found in other followers. Theognostus simply repeats the Origenist doctrine of the Logos in its different forms of presentation.® On the other hand, as used by the opponent of Paul of Samosata, Gregory (bishop of Neo-caesarea from 244, † about 270), for whom later traditions have procured the surname Thaumaturgus,¹⁰ this doctrine of the Logos appears to

---


7 Omitted by Euseb. vii. 26. On the contrary, Athanasii περὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ ‘Επ. ‘Αλ. liber. In the letter of Dionysius to Amnon bishop of Berenice and to Epiphron, it is said, Athanas. I. c. cap. 4: Ποίησαι καὶ γεννητόν εἶναι τὸν θεὸν τοῦ θεοῦ—μίατε δὲ ψεύτε ἰδον, ἀλλὰ ξένου καὶ ὀφθαλμον εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς· ὅσπερ ἔστιν ὁ γεννητός πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν (cf. Joh. xxv. 1), καὶ ὁ νασηφός πρὸς τὰ σκακία· καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίησαι ἄνω, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννη

8 Fragments of his ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀπολογίας, libb. iv., addressed to the Roman Dionysius, preserved in Athanasius and Basil, are collected by Gallaudus, iii. 495, Routh Reliq. Sacr. iii. 194 (in the second fragment of the first book, the variation in the text from Euthyn. Zygbal. Panoplia apud Gallandius, t. xiv. App. p. 118, is to be compared). Dionysius declares here, lib. i.: Οὐ γὰρ ἢν ὤτε ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἦν πατήρ. Then he asserts it is a fabrication of his opponents that he ever denied, τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοοιοῦν εἶναι τὸ θεόν: εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὅμοιο τὸ τῆς φύσεως μὴ εὐθυκός, μηδὲ ἀνεγνωκέναι παν τῶν ἁγίων γραμμῶν, ἀλλὰ γε τὸ ἐπιχειρηματία μοῦ τὸ εἶξος, ἀλλ’ ἀντωνῆκα, τὸς διανοίᾳ ταύτης οὐκ ἀκηκόα. Comp. § 63, note 19. Martini, S. 293, ff.


oscillate between entirely opposite modes of description. It is highly probable, also, that Ἱεραξ of Leontopolis, at the end of this century, was formed in the school of Origen. His allegorical interpretation, his rejection of the resurrection of the body, and of sensual notions of a future life, as also his disapprobation of marriage and the use of flesh and wine, point rather to a maintenance of Origenian principles carried out to extremes, than to a Manichaean origin, which latter Epiphanes has inferred only from a few external points of resemblance. At the end of this period appeared Methodius, bishop of Olympus (or Patara), afterward of Tyre (martyred 311) as a violent opponent of Origen, defending in a work, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, the doctrine of the resurrection of the present body, and in another, περὶ τῶν γεννητῶν, attacking the notion of an endless succession of worlds. But on the other hand, Origen found warm defenders in Pamphilus (martyred 309) and Eusebius Pamphilus, both presbyters in Caesarea. Among the multitude, report had often distorted already the peculiar principles of Origen, and by that means awakened blind hatred against him; but among have been also attributed to him, although without doubt they are supposititious, a short Symbolum which he is said to have received from the apostle John who appeared to him (Walchii Bibl. symbol. vetus, p. 14. Martini, S. 231), and ἦν κατὰ μέρος πίστις (i. e., ple-nior ac particularis concepts, which was formerly known only in the Latin translation of Turrianus, and published in Greek by Sirmond in not. ad Facundum, x. 6, and in Maji Scriptt. vet. nova coll. vii. i. 170), whose genuineness Salig de Eutychiniano ante Eutych. p. 136, sought in vain to defend. See Martini, S. 233. His life by Gregory Nyssene. Opp. omnia una cum vitis, ed. G. Vossius. Megunt. 1604. 4.

11 Basili M. Epist. 310 (al. 64) § 5: (Sabellian) καθήκαν δὲ τινα πείραν δὲ ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἡμόφυρον ἡμῶν Ἀνθίμον τὸν Τσινοὺν ἐπίσκοπον, ὡς ἀρὰ Γρηγορίου εἰσόνει ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πιστῶς, πατέρα καὶ ὑλὸν ἐπισκόπου μὲν εἰναι δω, ἐπισκόπει δὲ ἐν τούτῳ δὲ, ὅτι ὁν ὁμομοιὸς εἶναι, ἄλλα ἀγωνιστικὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἁλκιάνου διαλέξει, ὡς ἡνομίζως συνιδεῖν.—ὡς δὲ καὶ πολλὰς ἀν εὐφορις ἰκαὶ φωναὶ, τὰς τοῖς αἰστητοῖς μεγίστην ἰάχων παρεχομένας, ὡς τὸ κτίσμα, καὶ τὸ ποίημα, καὶ τι τοιοῦτον. Martini, S. 233, ff.


15 Pamphilus Apologiae præfatio ad Confessores ad metallam Palaestinae damnatos: Nihil mirum, fratres, videmini mihi esse perpessi, quod iva vos Origenis subterfugit intellectus, ut vos quoque ea aæstematis de illo, quae et aliis nonnulli: qui sive per imperitanx sui, quern non valent sensus ejus altitudinem contueri, sive pravitate mentis, qua studium gerunt non
the learned, respect for this great man was pretty general. Particularly in Egypt, he appears to have enjoyed undivided esteem.  
§ 65.

OTHER DISTINGUISHED TEACHERS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.

While at Alexandria Scripture interpretation was made to subserve the purpose of speculation, we find in Syria and the neighboring provinces, favored by the linguistic relations of these lands, the first traces of that more independent historico-grammatical and critical treatment of the Scriptures, by which the east was so much distinguished in the fourth and fifth centuries.  

Of such writers we are acquainted, though very imperfectly, with Julius Africanus in Nicopolis (Eunomus), probably a presbyter (about 230), a friend of Origen, the first Christian chronographer;  

and two presbyters of Antioch, Dorotheus...
(about 290), and Lucian, who suffered martyrdom in Nicomedia, A.D. 311. Because Arius and his most distinguished friends proceeded from the school founded by Lucian at Antioch, the latter has often in later times been considered the father of Arianism. Of the critical merits which belonged to him and his cotemporary Hesychius, in setting the text of the Holy Scriptures, after the example of Origen, it is to be regretted that very imperfect accounts have been preserved.

To this oriental literature appears also to belong most nearly the literary labors of Hippolytus (about 240).

(together with the reply of Origen appended to the Dial. c. Marcionitas, ed. Wetstein)—


Alexander bishop of Alexandria, writes of him (about 320, in theodoret Hist. eccd. i. 3): Οὗ (Παῦλου τὸν Σαμοκατάνδιον ὕπατον Αὐτοκατωτος αὐτοκατωτος) ἀναξίωμας χρυσοῦς, ἱκανοὺς τῶν πάντων πολλοῖς χρόνοις, ὃν τὴν ἀστείαν τῆς τραγά λαμπρόφαινης—Ἀριστοῖς τὰ καὶ Ἀχιλλέῳ, κ. τ. λ. The Eusebius appealed to a confession of faith by Lucian, Sozomen, iii. 5. Still he is considered by Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostom (comp. his panegyric on him, tom. i. Hom. 46), etc., as a holy martyr, and is so regarded by the Romish church at this day.

Probably the Egyptian Bishop Hesychius, who, according to Eusebius, H. E. viii. 13, 4, suffered martyrdom in the year 311.


Concerning him and his numerous writings, among which the treatise περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα, which was first codex of the canon paschalis (see in it Ideeler's Chronologie, ii. 213, was the most important, see Eusebius, vi. 20, 22. Hieronymus in Catal. c. 61. Both call him bishop, but do not know in what place. Jerome also designates him as a martyr, Comm.
II. THEOLOGY IN THE WEST.

§ 66.

The Latin church, which had been hitherto little more than an appendage to the Greek, now attained to more independence and individuality, after it had materially enlarged itself, and since the Latin language had been more adapted, particularly

ad Matth. praef., and so also later writers call him Episcopum et Martyrem. Prudentius περὶ στριφωματος hymn. xi. relates the martyrdom of one Hippolytus. The same person was a presbyter among the Novatians, stood in high repute with his own party (the heathen called out, v. 80: Ipsum Christiculis esse caput populi, but in view of death he repented of his taking part in the schism, and exhort devices, who accompanied him in great numbers, to return to the catholic communion (v. 27, ss.). Thus he became a Catholic martyr at Portus Romanus (probably under Valerian, 258), and his bones were dug up in the vicinity of Rome (v. 151). At the time of Prudentius a splendid martyrium was here dedicated to him (v. 163), and his memory was celebrated on the ides of August (v. 232). In the eighth century Hadrian I. restored this Coemeterium b. Hippolyti Martyris (Liber pontificum in vita Hadr. I.) At the same place the statue of Hippolytus was found, 1531, on whose caphedra the Canon Paschalis and a catalogue of his writings are inscribed. It belongs probably to the sixth century (Beschreibung der Stadt Rom von Platner, Busen Gerhard, u. Rostell, ii. ii. 329), and proves that at that time the ancient writer and the martyr were looked upon as the same person. In the later martyrlogies a fragment of genuine tradition may be preserved concerning him. Usuardus, Ado, Notker, and others, have the following on the 30th January:—Aptud Antiochiam passio b. Hippolyti Martyris, qui Novati schismate aliquantulum deceptus, operante gratia Christi rectius, ad caritatem ecclesiae redit, pro qua et in qua illustre martyrium consummavit. Petrus Damiani lib. i. Epist. 9, ad Nicolaum ii. says: Beatus quoque Nousus Martyr, qui et Hippolytus—postquaen denique nonnullus sanctuarum expositi libros inculcatus explicuit, tandem Episcopatum deseruit, de Antiochiae partibus, unde erat orinundus, abscessit. Romanos fines appetit; and then relates his death and burial in Portus Romanus. The result of our inquiry into the history of Hippolytus may be stated: Novatian found great favor particularly in Antioch. The bishop Fabius, and many others were friendly to him (Euseb. vi. 44, 46, see below, § 72, note 8). One of them, the presbyter Hippolytus, determined to travel in person to Rome. Probably, since he traveled through Alexandria, he is the same Hippolytus who took with him to Rome the ἐκτασία διακονικῆς of Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. vi. 46. Eusebius here names him without any other specifying circumstance, after having spoken before of only one Hippolytus). In Rome he attached himself to the Novatians, and attained to great repute. The separation from the church, however, made him suspicious, until the prospect of immediate death decided him to return to the catholic church. His memory was celebrated at Antioch, his native city, on the 30th January; at Rome on the 13th August. The later martyrlogies have adopted both days, and so made two Hippolytuses out of one. The great reputation which Hippolytus enjoyed as an ecclesiastical writer misled Eusebius, when he represents him to have been a bishop. Jerome followed him in this particular. The cleric who was martyred at Portus Romanus may have been previously a bishop somewhere in the East. Although, however, Prudentius correctly designates Hippolytus a presbyter, yet all later writers call him bishop, and conjecture different places where he was such. The Greeks naturally looked for this place in the part where he had suffered, and regarded him sometimes as a bishop of Rome,
by Tertullian, to the expression of Christian ideas, and had become the usual written language of the western Christians. As the speculative tendency of the Greeks prevailed in the Greek church, so the practical character of the Romans gave expression to itself in the Latin church, in the inclination to cultivate chiefly ecclesiastical government and law. While the Greek language now disappeared from the western church, the lively interest of the latter in the new developments of the theology of the east also ceased. As the Greek theology of the second century had been understood and represented with material grossness in the writings of Tertullian, so was it held fast in the western church, in the third century. Phi-

after the example of Leontius; sometimes as a bishop of Portus Romanus, according to the Paschal Chronicle, Georgius Syncellus, Zonaras, and Nicephorus Callistus. The Roman bishop Gelasius, misled by Rufinus’s translation of Enseb. vi. 20 (Beryllus—episcopus fuit apud Bostram, Arabiae urbem maximum. Erat et vilitissimus Hippolytus, qui et ipse aliquanta scripta dereliquit, Episcopus), thought that he was a metropolitan of Arabia, but maintained at the same time as an indubitable fact that he had come to Rome, and suffered martyrdom there. (The later legend dressed out this with other additions : Petrus Dam. l. c. : Qui, postquam triginta millia Saracenorum ad Christi fidei efficacissima praedicatione convertit, etc.) In order to find a middle way between these different accounts Steph. le Mayne conjectured that he was bishop of Portus Romanus (Aden, in Arabia Felix, and in several of these he followed him; but this attempt to reconcile errors could only be a new error itself, since Christianity came for the first time into Arabia Felix in the fourth century. With the results already given, agrees very well what may be gathered from the writings of Hippolytus. 1. Novatianism is as little found in them as in the works of Novatian himself. They were probably composed earlier. 2. According to Phot. Cod. 121, Hippolytus’s siontyma kata airopēn was an extract from the work of Irenaeus. But Photius infers too much from a passage of that writing, when he makes him a disciple of Irenaeus. 3. Jerome, Cat. c. 61, enumerates among the works of Hippolytus προσμιμέλια de laude Domini Salvatoris, in qua praesepto Origene so loqui in Ecclesia signifcat. (What follows: In hujus summationem Ambrosius—cohortatus est Origene, in scripturis Commentarios scribendo, is founded merely on a misunderstanding of the expression ευελνον seil. χρόνον, which forms a transition in Enseb. vi. c. 22 to chapter 23.) 4. The numerous exegetical writings (see apud Jerome) point to the east. 5. The Απολογία ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ίωάννην εἰφαγελίων καὶ ἱποκαλύφως and περὶ χαρισμάτων, marked upon the cathedra, are either directed against the Alogi in Asia Minor (§ 48, note 15), or against the opponents of the Montanists in Rome (§ 59, note 9). For this last supposition appears to speak the notice of Ebodæus († 318, in Assemni Bibl. orient. t. iii. p. 1), that among the Chaldeans Hippolytus capita nadv. Caïum were in existence. (Comp. Lücke’s Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh. S. 316.) C. Gu. Haseull de Hippolyto comm. Gottingae 1838. 4 (looks upon him a bishop of Bostra). E. J. Kimmel de Hippolyti vita et scriptcis, p. i. Jens. 1839. (according to him, Hippolytus was an oriental, educated in Alexandrian learning (!), and bishop of Portus Romanus at Rome). L. P. W. Seinecke über d. Leben u. d. Schriften des Bisch. Hippolytus, in Ildón’s Zeitachs. f. d. hist. Theol. 1842, iii. 48 (he also supposes him bishop of Portus Romanus). Hipp. Op. ed. J. A. Fabricius. Hamb. 1716, 18. 2 voll. fol.

1 Respecting him see above, § 59. He wrote in Greek, de baptismo (Tert. de Bapc. c. 15), de spectaculis (de Cor. mil. c. 6), and de virgillibus velandia (de Virg. vel. c. 1). None of these works are now extant. M. E. F. Leopold über die Ursachen der verderbten Latinität der Kirchenväter, bes. des Tertullians, in Ildén’s Zeitachs. f. hist. Theol. viii. ii. 12.
losophy was too much hated by the *westerns*, and their interpretation of Scripture, from ignorance of the original languages, was too imperfect to enable them to develop the Greek theology intelligently. Hence there arose in the Occidental church an aversion to all theological speculation, and such a *doctrinal stability* that the influence of the Greek church could produce only negative and unconscious advances. It is true that Montanism, having continued for a long time unmoled in the west, had been condemned, as far as its peculiar doctrines were concerned, in the beginning of this period; but its spirit had found so firm a sympathy in the disposition of the westerns to cultivate external ecclesiastical ordinances, that its continuance may be still recognized in a sensuous acceptance of Christianity, and the high value set upon external discipline. *Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus*, at first a rhetorician in Carthage (converted to Christianity from 245, bishop at Carthage 248, suffered martyrdom 258), left behind several small works, apologetic and admonitory, and many

---


letters which refer for the most part to matters of church go-

government and discipline.⁴ There is still preserved a perfectly
orthodox work de Trinitate,⁵ by his cotemporary Novatian, a
Roman presbyter and founder of a sect. Eighty moral precepts
in verse by the African Commodianus (about 270) are not un-
important in the history of morals.⁶ Arnobius, a rhetorician in
Sicca, formerly an enemy to Christianity, wrote (about 303)
his Disputationes adv. Gentes libb. vii.⁷ His pupil in rhetoric,
L. Caelius Lactantius Firmianus (Cicero Christianus) an Ita-
lian by birth, wrote in Nicomedia, during the Diocletian perse-
cution, his Institutionum Divinarum libb. vii.⁸ He was after-
ward preceptor of Crispus, eldest son of Constantine the Great
(† about 330).

The tendency of the western church to a stable unity could
effect so little in the province of dogmatic theology, that even
gnostic doctrines were still in many instances tolerated as

⁴ Vita et passio Cyriani in Pontium ejus diocesum scripta, in Rainart, and prefixed
Prudentii Marani vita S. Cypr. prefixed to Baluzius's edition. La vie de St. Cyprien (par
Göttingen. 1831. 8. Bähr's christl. römische Theologie. S. 50. Möhrer's Patrologie, i. 869.—
His works: In the year 246; Lib. ad Donatum.—247: de Ido lorum vanitate.—248: Tes-
timonialem ad Quirinum adv. Judaeos, lib. 3; de Habitu virginum.—251: de Unitate
ecclesiae; de Lapsis.—250: de Oratio: dominica; de Mortalitate; Exhort. ad Martyrium.
—253: Lib. ad Demetrianum.—254: de Opere et Eleemosynis.—255: de Bono Patientiae.
39, 8.

of Tertullian. Bähr, S. 47.

12, C. S. Schurzeleisch. Viteberg. 1705.

⁷ Hieron. Cat. 73, in Chronicum ad ann. xx. imperii Constantini. His work ed. cum
recensione viri celeberrimi (Cl. Salmisii et integris omnium commentariis. Logd. Bat.

⁸ Besides this: Epitome div. instit., de opificio Dei, de ira Dei. In a MS. Colbert.
Baluzius found Lucii Cecili liber de Mortibus persecutorum, and first published it in
Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 1 (1679). He correctly pronounced it the book of Lactantius, which
Jerome mentions, Cat. c. 80, as de Persecutione libr. and therefore it has been taken into
all the later editions of Lactantius. Against le Nourry (Lucii Cecili lib. de Mortibus
persec. ad MS. denno emendatus, acc. dissert. de libri auctore. Paris. 1710. 8), who wishes
to distinguish this Lucius Cælius from Lactantius, see particularly N. de Lestocq disquis.
harmless. It is true that *Hermogenes*, when he asserted the eternity of matter too strenuously, found an opponent in Tertullian;\(^9\) but *Arnobius* gave utterance to Platonic and gnostic opinions respecting the soul and evil, without being molested;\(^{10}\) and his disciple *Lactantius* taught a suspicious dualism,\(^{11}\) without being attacked on account of it. As this indicates a certain theological rudeness in the western theology, so is the same peculiarity also exhibited in the sensuous mode of treating the traditional doctrines. Even in definitions of the essence of God, the western writers of this period are not able to disentangle themselves from the forms of a sensuous conception. They thought of the Deity himself as corporeal, and of the soul as literally his breath.\(^{12}\) They also firmly maintained


\(^{10}\) For example, Arnobius, ii. c. 15: Nihil est, quod nos fallat,—quod a novis quibusdam dictur viris,—animas immortales esse, Deo rerum ac principi gradu proximas dignitatis genitore illo ac patre prolatas, etc. Cap. 62: Servare animas suas nisi Deus omnipotens non potest: nec praeterea quies quam est, qui longeaeas facere, perpetuatus possit et spiritum subrogare. (Comp. Platonis Timaeus, ed. Bip. p. 325. Justinus, Tatianus, Theophilus, see Münchser’s Dogmaengesch. Bd. 2, S. 101, &c.)—Cap. 46, it is called immannus et sectatora persussio, ut—Deus—aliqeid fecerit claudam: and hence it is inferred, ut in sacrilege crimen implicitatis incurrat, quisquis ab eo conceperet hominem esse progradum. Cap. 36: Dicebant ab eo, qui novit et potestum in medium, Christo, non esso animas regias maximis filiis, nec ab eo, quemadmodum dicent, generatas coepisse se noesse:—sed alterum quemquam genitorum his esse, dignitatis et potentiae gradibus salus plurimus ab Imperatore disjunctum, ejus tamen ex aula et clementiun nobilium sublimitate natalium (doubless the Logos). Cap. 47: Non culin, si negemus, muscas, scarabaeos, et cimicinas, niteudas, curculiones, et fines omnipotentis esse opus regis, sequaciter postulandum a nobis est, ut quis ea fecerit, institueritque dicamus. Possimus enim nulla sua reprehensione nescire, quis et illis originem dederit, et obtinere, non esse Deo a superiori prolatum tam supervacua, tam vanus, tam ad nullas pertinentia ratione, quinquo aliquando et noxia, et necessariae importantia incassione. Cf. cap. 48, 58, 61, 62. Comp. above, § 44, notes 4, 5. On the theology of Arnobius see Meyer de ratione Apol. Arnob. p. 278.

\(^{11}\) Lactant. Institut. div. ii. 8: Deus—antequam ordinaret hoc opus mundi, produci similem sui spiritum, qui esse virtutibus Dei Patris praeditus. Deinde fecit alterum, in quo indole divinae stirpis non permanit. Itaque suspte invadit tanquam veneno infectus est, et ex bone ad malum transcendit, nusque arbitrio, quod illi a Deo liberam datum fuerat, contrarium sibi nomen ascrivit. Unde apparat, cunctorum malorum fontem esse livorem. Invisibl enim illi antecessor suo, qui Deo Patri perseverando cum probatus, tam aetiam carus est. Hanc ergo ex bone per se malum effectum Graeci *διὰσκεύα* appellant, nos criminalem vocamus, quod criminis, in quae ipsae illicit, ad Deum deferat. God divided the dominion of the world with him, so that there fell to his share occidens, septentrionic, tenebrae, frigus, etc., c. 9. H. J. Alt de Dualismo Lactantiano diss. Vratslav. 1839. 8.

\(^{12}\) Tertull. adv. Prax. 7: Quis enim negavit, deum corpus esse, cujus deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie. Sed et si invisibilia illa, quaequeque sunt, habent apud deum et suam corpus et suam formam, per quae soli deo visibilia sunt: quanto magis quod ex ipsis substantia missum est (namely the *λόγος*), sine substantia non erit? C. 5: Et animal rationale, a ratiocinii scilicet arte non tantum factus, sed etiam ex substantia ipsis animatus. Lactant. de ira Dei, c. 2: Alter de unita illa
the resurrection of the same body, the millennium, which appears here almost in its most sensual form,¹³ the condemnation of all who are not Christians, and the eternity of hell punishments. With regard to the Logos, they retained the old emanistic notions, both as to its origin, which was conceived for the most part in a very coarse form,¹⁴ and also as to its relation to the Father.¹⁵

majestate sentiunt, quam veritas habet, qui aut figuram negant habere ullam Deum, aut nullo affectu commoveri putant (ie holds the doctrine of God's wrath to be a fundamental truth of religion). In this the Stoics had set the example, who regarded everything which had efficiency as body. Comp. Tennemann's Geach. d. Philol. iv. 39, 283. Seneca Epist. 106, 117, quod facti, corpus est. The soul was universally looked upon as corporeal, with the exception of Origen.

¹³ Commodiani Instruct. 43, 44, 80, ex. gr. Instr. 44: De coelo descendit civitas in annasti primum.—Venturi sunt illi quoque sub Antichristo qui vincerent. Robusta martyria, et ipsi teto tempore vivunt,—Et generating ipsi per annos millia nubentes.

Instr. 89:—Digniores, stemmate et generati praeclaro. Nobilesque viri sub Antichristo devicto, Ex praecipto Dei rursum viventes in aero. Mille quidem annis usi serviant sanctae et Alto, Sub iugo servili, ut portare virtutis collo. Ut iterum autem judicentur regno finito.

¹⁴ Cf. Lactant. Instit. divin. iv. 8: Quomodoigiturprocreat? Primam nec sciri et quoqueam possunt, nec narrari opera divina, sed tamen sanctae literae docent, in quibus cautum est, illum Dei filium esse Dei sermone, itemque ceteros angelos Dei spiritum esse. Nam sermo est spiritus cum voce aliquid significa praeclarus. Sed tamen quoniam spiritus et sermo diversis partibus proferuntur, sicut spiritus animi, sed sermo procedit; magni inter hunc Dei filium ceterosque angelos differentiam est. Illi enim ex Deo taciti spiritum exierunt, qui non ad dominam Dei tradendam, sed ad ministerium creabantur. Illa vero quum sit et ipsae spiritus, tamen cum voce aut sono ex Dei ore proceritus, sic ut verbum, &c.—Meritoigitursermo et verbum Dei dictum, quia Deus procedentem de ore suo vocalem spiritum, quem non utero sed mente conceperat, in intellectu, quae proprio sensu ac sapiencia vigeat, comprehenderit, et alios quem spiritus suos in angelis figuravit.

A remarkable stage of development as concerns this dogma, is exhibited by Dionysius, bishop of Rome (259–270) whose education was Grecian, and who unites the Origenist idea of an eternal generation of the Logos with those emanistic notions.¹

FOURTH CHAPTER.

ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE.

§ 67.

The changes in ecclesiastical life originated especially from certain ideas, the germs of which appeared in the second century, though not completely developed till the third. The idea of one catholic church out of which there is no salvation, received its full development from Cyprian,¹ and strove to give


¹ Dionysii Rom. Adv. Sabellianos fragmentum (apud Athanasii de Decretis Nicaen. syn. c. 26: also in Constant. Epist. Rom. Pont. ed. Schoenemann, p. 194, ss. Routh. Relig. Sacr. iii. p. 175, ss.). First of all he rejects tois διαπαράστας καὶ καταστάνοντας,—τὸν μοναρχίαν εἰς τρεῖς δύναμες τινὰς καὶ μεμερισμένας ἐποιεῖτο καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς, and asserts in opposition: Ἡμῶνας γὰρ ἀνύγχα τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τῶν θεῶν λόγων ἐμφαλοχωρεῖν δὲ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ενδιακτάσθαι δι’ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἣν καὶ τὴν θείαν τριάδα εἰς ένα, ἵπτερ εἰς κοινωφόρα τινὰ (τῶν θεῶν τῶν ὅλων τῶν παντοκράτωρο λέγω) συνεκφαλισθεὶσα δε τε καὶ συνέγειθα πάσα ἀνύγχα. Then he census tois τοῖς πόνημα τῶν ὅλων εἶναι δοξάζοντας, καὶ γεγονόντων τὸν κύριον, ὅπερ ἐν τῷ δυναμικῷ, νομίμωτας.—Βλάσφημον οὖν ὁ τὸ πολύν, μεγάλον μὲν οὖν, χειροποίητον τρόπον τω εἴη λέγειν τοῦ Κύριου. Εἰ γὰρ γέγονεν νῦν ἢν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· ἄει δὲ ἦν, ἵπτερ εἰς τῷ πατρὶ δόσιν, ὡς αὐτὸς φθαρίζει καὶ εἰ λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὁ Χριστός,—τοῖς ὅλων δύνασις αὐτῆς τοῦ θεοῦ γνωρίζοντας· εἰ τούτον γέγονεν νῦν ἢν, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν τοῦτα· ὃς ἤμως καρπός, ὃς χρήσει τοῦτον ἢν δὲ τοῦτον· ἀποτύπωσεν δὲ τούτῳ. The expression κύριος ἐκτισε με ἀρχήν ὅλων αὐτοῦ, Prov. viii. 22, means: ἐπέστησεν τοῖς ὅπ’ αὐτοῦ γεννώσαν ἑργαίς, γεγονέει δὲ δι’ αὐτοῦ τω νῦν.—Οἱ μυθικοί διὰ παράγοντος λόγον (Ps. civ. 3), δ’ εἰπὸν ὡς σοφία (Prov. viii. 26): πρὸς τὸ πάντων βοηθόν γεννᾶ με· καὶ πελάγχος δὲ τῶν θείων λόγων γεγονότας, ἰδἐν ὁ γεγονότας τῶν λόγων λογίας τῶν ἑαυτοῦ. We should therefore believe εἰς θεῖον πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἱησοῦν τοῦ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἢν ἐπικατάσθαι δὲ τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τῶν λόγων ἐγὼ γὰρ, φθαρίζομαι καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑλπίζω (Joh. x. 30): καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑμῖν. Οὕτω γὰρ ἐν καὶ ἡ θεία τριάδα, καὶ ἦν τὸ ἄγιον κάρα τῆς μοναρχίας διασώζοντος. Comp. Martini, l. c. S. 227, ff. Baur's Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit, l. 311.

¹ There are certainly found, even in the older fathers, strong passages to the effect that

itself an outward expression in the unity of every thing belonging to the church. Since religious faith was made interchangable with the intelligent expression of it in doctrine, men began also to consider the unity of the latter as necessary to the unity of the church, and to limit freedom of inquiry more and more. How an endeavor was made to carry out an agreement in regard to ecclesiastical usages, with this very view, may be seen from Victor's conduct respecting the celebration of Easter in Asia (§ 59); and after his example, the constant effort to bring about uniformity, even in external usages, is obvious, particularly in the western church. The idea of this unity naturally led still farther, to a closer external union among the separate churches; and since the bishops, as successors of the apostles, were looked upon as the center of ecclesiastical unity, that connection was effected by their more intimate attachment to one another; and the episcopal dignity obtained not a little elevation in consequence. Another idea which exerted much influence on ecclesiastical life was this, that the constitution of the Christian church was a nobler copy of the Jewish temple-worship, and therefore, that the Mosaic laws relative to public worship, particularly the priesthood, were still valid in the church (§ 53). No less fruitful in alterations in the worship of God was finally the idea of a disciplina arcani which began to be current toward the conclusion of the second century. After the Christians had always been compelled to keep their worship

salvation is to be found only in the catholic church. Even Origen Hom. iii. in Josuam, § 5, says: Nemo semetipsam decipiat: extra hanc domorum, i. e., extra ecclesiam nemo salvatur. Nam si quis foras exieris, mortis suae ipse fit reus. See Roth, die Anfänge der christl. Kirche, i. 578. He expresses himself elsewhere, however, more mildly, just as Clement of Alexandria. See Roth, i. 634. Thus, while he does not allow to the virtuous heathen and the Jews vitam aeternam or regnum coelorum, which can be obtained only through faith in Christ, he yet asserts, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. ii. 7: Tamen gloria operum ejus et pax et honor poterit non ser. On the other hand Cyprianus de Unitate ecclesiae: Quasquid ab ecclesia segregatus adulterae jungitur, a promissa ecclesia separatur. Nec pernexit ad Christi præenula, qui relinquuit ecclesiam Christi. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est. Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet materem. Si potest evadere quasquid, qui extra arcam Noé fuit, et qui extra ecclesiam foris, fuerit, evadet.—Tales etiam occis in confessione nominis fuerint, vincula ista nec sanguine abulitur.—Esser martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est. Occidit talis potest, coronati non potest, etc. H. E. Schmieder on Cyprian's treatise respecting the unity of the church in Staudlin's and Tschirner's Archiv, f. Kirchengesch. v. ii. 417. Retberg's Cyprianus, S. 297, 348, 533. Roth, i. 635. Cyprian's Lehre, v. d. Kirche von J. G. Huther. Hamb. a. Gotha. 1833. 8.

2 This appellation of the Christian mysteries is new, and appears to have been first used by G. Th. Meier de Recondita veteris ecclesiae theologiam. Helvetic. 1672. 4.
private, through fear of persecution and profanation; they now began to find a reason for this secrecy in the nature of their holy transactions, by virtue of which they must be kept secret as mysteries from all unbaptized persons (τὰ θεσπ., Orig. c. Cels. iii. p. 147), an idea which arose out of, and was fostered by the preference for mysteries exhibited at this period, and the example of the heathen mysteries (see § 37). The so-called apostolic constitutions may be considered, after deducting later

3 Tertull. de Praescr. haeret. c. 41: Non omittam ipsius etiam conversationis haereticae descriptionem, quam futilis, quam terrera, quam humana sit, sine gravitate, sine auctitate, sine disciplina, ut idem suae congregae. In primis, quae catechumenos quos fideis, incertum est: pariter adeunt, pariter orant, etiam ethnici, si supervenerint: sanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras jactantur. Cf. Apol. c. 7. But this secrecy was still limited to the non-admission of the unbaptized to holy ordinances. The fathers of the third century speak without reserve as yet of these transactions, as of all the doctrines of Christianity, and Tertullian even reproaches the Valentinians in the following language, adv. Val. 1: Nulli magis curavit quam occultura, quod praedicit. It was not till the fourth century when this mysterious tendency became general, that even the positive doctrines of Christianity began to be treated as mysteries. Catholic writers have been inclined to explain the non-appearance of their peculiar institutions and dogmas in antiquity by the aid of this disciplina arcana. This is done particularly by Em. a. Schelstrate de Disciplina arcana. Rom. 1383. vi. Of late works see Th. Liebhart de Antiquis liturgiis et de Discipl. arcana. Argentor. 1839. J. A. Toklo de Arcani disciplina, quae antiqua in ecclesia fuit in usum. Colon. 1836. 8. Comp. on the other side, G. E. Tantzal Diss. de disciplina arcana in his Exeix. select. Lips. 1692. 4. G. C. L. Th. Frommann de Disciplina arcana, quae in vetere Ecclesia christ. obtinuisse fortior. Jenae. 1833. 8. R. Rothe de Disciplinae arcana, quae dicitur, in Ecc. christ. origine. Heidelberg. 1841. 4. Besides this disciplina arcana excluded only the unbaptized, and is, therefore, of a different nature from that disciplina agreeable to which, Clement of Alexandria and Origen wished to withhold their gnostic even from Christians. (§ 63, note 4, ff)

4 The Apostolic Constitutions and Canons (the best edition of them is in Cotelerii Patr. apostolicis, vol. i.) are records of the ecclesiastical customs regarded as apostolic, in the form of apostolic prescriptions (cf. Hieron. Epist. 52 ad Lucium; Unaquesque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et praecepta majorum leges apostolicas arbitraret. Augustin. contra Donatist. iv. 24: Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliii institutum, sed semper retentum est, id nonsi apostolica auctoritate traditum certissime credatur). The apostolic constitutions, διατάξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, consist of eight books, and probably belong to Syria. The first six books presenting instructions embracing the entire range of Christian life, were written toward the end of the third century, and are probably the books which Eusebius, H. E. iii. c. 25, quoted as διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, Athenasius in Ep. fastali; and in Synopsis sacrae Script. as διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. The seventh book is an independent shorter manual of the same kind. Hence it generally treats of the subjects as the first six books, and probably belongs to the beginning of the fourth century. The eighth book refers solely to the holy transactions (τὰ μυστηρία), contains agendas in addition to the appropriate canonical prescriptions, and was put together in the middle of the fourth century as a pontifical book for the use of the clergy. This book had the title διατάξεως, which, after the work had been soon after put along with the other books, was transferred to the whole. Epiphanius often quotes it as διάταξις εἰς διατάξεως τῶν Ἀποστόλων. After Epiphanius there must, however, have been some interpolations, the most important of which are those by which the prescriptions respecting the festival of Christ’s birth (v. 13), and the easter festival (v. 17, cf. Epiphan. Haer. xxx. 10), have been altered agreeably to the later form of observance. Krabbe assumes that after Epiphanius
interpolations, as an evidence of the constitution of the church at the present time. The apostolic canons belong to the fifth and sixth centuries.\textsuperscript{5}

§ 68.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

After the number of the Christians had greatly increased in the country, separate churches in the country were now frequently formed which attached themselves either to the district (παρυκία) of the nearest town-bishop, and received from him a presbyter or deacon;\textsuperscript{1} or chose their own bishops (χωρεπισκόπωι) who, however, soon came, in part, to be in a certain state of dependence on the nearest town-bishop.\textsuperscript{2} The power of the many interpolations were made, even doctrinal ones, favorable to the Arians and the Macedonians, and that the eighth book was first appended after the time of that father; but in opposition to his opinion see Drey, p. 154, 177. Comp. Dr. O. Krabbe über den Ursprung u. den Inhalt d. apost. Constitutionen des Clemens Romanus. Hamburg. 1829; especially Dr. J. S. v. Drey's neue Untersuchungen über die Constitutionen und Kanones d. Apost. Tübingen. 1832. 8. According to Baur (über den Ursprung des Episcopats, S. 125, ff. 131, f.), the constitutions are of Ebionitish origin and anti-Pauline tendency, and originated in Rome (p. 134.)

\textsuperscript{5} Canones Apostolorum, κανόνες ευκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἀγών Ἀποστόλων among the Greeks 85, among the Latins 50. Every ecclesiastical fundamental law, whether recorded or not, was at first called κανών ἀποστολικὸς (Alexander Ep. Alex., about 318, in Theodoret. H. E. i. 3), κανών (Conc. Nicaen. Can. 5, 9), κανῶν εὐκλησιαστικὸς (ibid. Can. 2, 10); in this sense the expression of ἀποστολικῶν κανώνες was also used at the Council of Constantinople, ann. 394, without, however, supposing that our present collection is meant. (Drey, p. 396.) The first fifty canons were gathered soon after the middle of the fifth century, under the name of Clement (who, known as the organ of the apostles, by means of the Clementines and Recognitions (§ 58), appeared the most suitable person for this purpose), from the apostolic constitutions, and from the canons of several synods of the fourth century (in particular the Synod of Antioch, 341). Dionysius Exiguus translated them, and the Latin church holds fast by them alone. But after the commencement of the sixth century, 35 were added among the Greeks, the canons were appended to the constitutions, and the name of Clement transferred to these also. Drey, p. 293, 8. M. E. Regenbrecht de Canonibus Apostolorum et codice Ecclesiae Hispanicae diss. Vratislaw. 1828. 8. O. Krabbe Diss. de codice Canonicum qui Apostolorum nomine circumcontinent. Gotting. 1829. 4.

\textsuperscript{1} Thus mention is made by Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. H. E. vii. 34, 4, of πρεσβυτέρου καὶ διδασκάλωυ τῶν ἐν ταῖς κώμαις ἥλιοις: by the Conc. Illiberitana, ann. 305, can. 77, of Diaconum regentem plobem sine Episcopo et Presbytero: Conc. Neocasar. ann. 315, can. 13. of ἐπιγρώμος πρεσβυτέρους.

bishops was enlarged, not only by this enlargement of their districts, but also by an institution which now arose, in consequence of which the bishops came into a closer and more regular union among themselves. We allude to Provincial Synods, which were always becoming more frequent since the end of the second century, and were held in several provinces once or twice in the year. As they were for the most part convened in the principal city of the province, under the presidency of the bishop of that city; and since the latter was, as it were, the medium in relation to the other smaller bishops, by which alone they stood in connection with the rest of the church, the bishops of the principal cities (μετροπολίτης, Metropolitanus) came gradually to obtain a kind of superintendence over the other bishops of their province (ἐπαρχία). As yet, however, this metropolitan constitution was general only in the east. In the west, it is true, Rome was elevated to be the ecclesiastical

Planck's Gesellschaftsverf. i. S. 73, ff. In Africa, where the country bishops were particularly numerous, they were not at all distinguished from others, not even by a peculiar name. Cf. St. A. Morelli Africa christiana (Partes iii. Brixia. 1816. 4). P. I. p. 43.

3 Firminian Epist. ad Cyprian. (in Epist. Cyprian. 75): Qua ex causa necessario apud nos sit, ut per singulos amos seniores et praesidentis in unum conveniant ad dispencea ea, quae curae nostrae commissa sunt, ut si qua graviora sunt comuni consilio dirigatur. What had hitherto been usual only in some provinces, was made a universal regulation by the Council of Nice, Can. 5: Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν, ἐκάστον ἐκαστὸν καθ᾽ ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἔδωκεν τῶν ἑπάρχων συνόρας κύριον. On the origin of Synods see above, § 53, note 6. The regular provincial Synods had, in most of the provinces, their natural type in the κοινῶν. Commune, i.e., the union of the civitates of the provinces which met from time to time, by deputies, in the metropolis, and gave advice in common matters. So we find frequently on coins Ἀρσιαχ. K. Bethoviai, etc., see Eckel Doctrinum tumorium vett. t. iv. p. 428, ss. Such assemblies were also called concilium, provinciale concilium, see Cod. Theodos. lib. xii. tit. 12, and Gothofred. paralitton prefixed to this title. Dirksen's civilistica Abhandl. Bd. 2, S. 16. And vice versa the ecclesiastical provincial synod is called, Can. Nic. 5, τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἐπισκόπων.

The principle which gradually arose by custom was afterward expressed in the Conc. Antiocheni (341) can. 9: Τοὺς καθ’ ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰλικρινῶς χρη, τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προσέτατο ἐπισκόπου καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει παντρεύοντο νυντάν τοὺς πράγματα ἐγχώρια. "Οὖθεν ἐδοξεῖ καὶ τῇ τιμῇ προσγιασθαι αὐτῶν, μηδὲν τε πράττειν περιττόν των λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων ἄνεν αὐτῶν, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα κρατύνοντα τῶν πατέρων ἥμων κανώνα φαντάται μόνα ὡσα τῇ ἐκάστον ἐπιβάλλει παροχία. καὶ ταῦτα ύπ᾽ αὐτῶν χάριας ἐκαστὸν ἐπισκόπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῆς ἐκαστοῦ παροχίας διοικεῖν τας κατὰ τὴν ἐκάστην ἐπιβάλλοντας εὐδαιμίαν, καὶ πράσσειν τηρεῖν τῆς ὁρός τῆς ἱεροῦ την ἑκαστοῦ πάλιν, ὡς καὶ χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ μετὰ κρίσεως ἐκαστὰ διαλαμβανόμενον περιστρέφει δε μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δύνα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνεν τῆς τῶν λωτικῶν γνώσεως. Baechiul. libb. iii. de Origine hierarchias ecclesiasticas. Matiniae. 1704.

First period.—Div. III.—A.D. 193-334.

Metropolis of a great part of Italy; and even in Africa a somewhat similar, though peculiar, provincial constitution had been adopted; but in the remaining parts of the west, the Christians had not yet reached such hierarchical associations, on account of the small number of Christian churches.

By this establishment of large ecclesiastical bodies, the entire organization of the church became more compact and united. Through the medium of the metropolitans the testimonials and papers of the separate churches were better attested and more safely forwarded; accounts of all important ecclesiastical events and resolutions were more expeditiously and generally circulated; and thus each community was always acquainted with the state of the whole church.

The bishops of the three great cities of the Roman empire, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, had, at the same time, the largest provinces. Hence they were regarded as the principal bishops of Christendom; and their assent in all general affairs was looked upon as of special importance. Still, however, at this time, great stress was laid on the fact that all bishops were perfectly alike in dignity and power; and that each in his own diocese was answerable only to God for his conduct.

---

6 Every African province had a primate at the head of it, who, in Mauritania and Numidia was usually the oldest bishop (not always the oldest, see Hülmann's Ursprünge d. Kirchenverfassung des Mittelalters, Bonn. 1851, p. 101), (hence senex see Bingham, vol. i. p. 914, Hülmann, p. 196), and in proconsular Africa was the bishop of Carthage. This last was at the same time the head of all the provinces, and could summon general councils. Cf. Cypriani Epíst. 45: Latius fusa est nostra provincia; habet eum Namibiavum et Mauritianum sibi cohaerentes. Ziegler in Heuken's Neues Magazin, i. 172, ff. Münter Primordia Eccl. Afr. p. 43, ss. This regulation was copied from the political one, because all these provinces were under the proconsul in Carthage, under whom the two Mauritianas were managed by procurators. See Mannert's Geographie d. Griech. u. Röm. x. ii. 23, 391.


---

8 Cyprian. de Unitate ecclesiae: Quam unitatem firmiter tenere et indicare debeat, maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesiis praesidiosus, ut Episcopatum quoque ipsum umum atque
could the less believe in the superior authority of the Romish bishop, because the idea of his being Peter’s successor just began to be developed; and besides, no higher power was attributed to Peter than to the other apostles. In the west, indeed,

individuals promonum.—Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ej. Epist. 52: Episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordi concursu numerositate diffusus. EJ. Allocutio in Conc. Carthag. in the year 256: Superest, ut de hac ipsa re quia singuli sentiamenta, proferantur, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communitatis eligunt, si diversorum sermonem amoventur. Necque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrere ad obsequendi necessitatem collegarum suas adigit, quando habet omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis sua arbitrium proprium, tandem judicari ab aliis non possit, cum nec ipsa possit alterum judicare. Sed spectemus univeri judicium dominui nostri Iesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et praeponendae nos in ecclesiis suae gubernatione, et de acta nostro judicandii. Comp. his letters to two Roman bishops, ad Cornelium (Ep. 55, see below, note 11), ad Stephanum (Ep. 72); Caeterum scimus, quodsem omium interdum molem deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegarum pacis et concordiae vinculo quasdam propriam, quae aequo se semel eint usuporta, retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cujquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habent in ecclesiis administratio voluntatis suae arbitrium librum unusquisque praepositus, rationem actu sui Domino reddiurum.

9 The fiction of Peter being first bishop of Rome proceeded from the Clementines § 58, note 9), and was propagated in the Catholic Church by the Recognitions. Cyprian is the first who designates the Romish chair the locum Petri (Ep. 52 ad Antonianum) and Petri cathedram; but at the same time he takes all bishops to be successors of Peter (see note 10). Thus he was of the same opinion as Eusebius, Rufinus, and Epiphanius (§ 27, note 6), that Peter during his stay at Rome, had the supreme direction of the church there, without having been connected with it as bishop. In Rome itself, however, many went farther, as may be seen from Firmilianus Ep. ad Cyprinum (Ep. Cypr. 75): Stephanus qui sic de Episcopatis sui loco gloriam, et suæ successionem Petri tenere contendit.

10 Comp. Clemens. Alex. above, § 26, note 4. Origines ad Matth. xvi. 18 (Comment. in Matth. t. xii. § 10): Petrus dyo tov Δριστος μαθητης—και ενα πασα την ταυτην πετραν εκδιιηθησοτατ εικκλησιατες πας λογος, και ει δη αυτην την πολεμον. § 11: Ει δε εκ των ένα και την Πετρον και της μαθητης των Πατριωτων, των εκ των οικειων των Πατριωτων, των των του Πετρος και των της διακονος των Πατριωτων, εαυτης της του Πετρος και της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος. Ει δε της συναγωγης των Πετρος, και της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακονος του Πετρος, και της της διακο

a certain superior honor was paid to the Church of Rome as the largest and only apostolic church; but actual rights over the other churches were by no means conceded to it. Still less, of course, was this the case in the east.

11 Cypriani Epist. 55, ad Cornelium Episc. Romanum, who had received the excommunicated Felicissimus as ambassador of the Cathaginian archbishop Fortunatus:—Satis miratus sum, cum animadvertem, te minis atque terroribus eorum, qui venerate, alicuam esse commotum, cum te, secundum quod scripsi, agressi essent, cum summa desperatione comminatorum, quod si litteras quas attulerant non accipisset, publice essent recitaret, et multa turpis ac probrosa et ore suo digna proferret. Quod si etsi res est, frater carissime, ut nequissimorum timetur audacia—actus est de episcopatus vigore, etc. Quibus etiam satis non fuit ab evangelio recessisse—foris sibi extra ecclesiam et contra ecclesiam constituisse conventicum perdita factionis. Post ista adhuc insuper pseudoepiscopo sibi ab haereticis constituente navigare audeat et ad Petri cathedram, atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis litterars forte, nec cogitare, quae esset Romanus, quorum siles apostolo praedicante landata est (Rom. i. 8), ad quos peridia habere non passit accessum. Quae autem causa veniendi et pseudoepiscoporum contra episcopos factum nuntiandi? Aut enim plant illas quod fecerunt: et in suo acclere perseverant: aut si displicet et recedat, seint quo revertantur. Cum nam statutum sit ab omnibus nobis, et nequum sit parit in justum, ut uniuscujusque causa ilic auditur, ubi est crimen admissum et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscriptum, quae regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditorum: oportet utique eos quibus praemissus non circumcursus, nec episcoporum concordiam cohaerentem suae subdola et facili temeritate collaborere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi et accusatorem habere et testes sui criminis possint; nisi si paucis desperatis et perditi minor videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicaverunt. Jam causa eorum cognititia est, iam de etsi dicta sententia est: nec censure congruit sacerdotum mobilis atque inconstans animi levitate reprehendi, cum Dominus deest et dicit: Sit sermo vester, est etsi, non non (Matth. v. 37). Cyprian, in his letters, constantly calls the Roman bishops frater and collega. What gave the latter the greater prominence in the west is evident from Synodi Arelatensis (in the year 314) Epist. ii. ad Sulpicii trum Papam: Placuit etiam ante scribit ad te, qui maiiores diocesesentes, et per te potissimum omnium insinuari. Quid autem sit, quod sanaerimus, scripto nostrae mediocratis subjunximus.

12 Firmilian Ep. ad Cypr. (l. c.): Eos autem, qui Romanis sunt, non ea in omnibus observavro, qua sint ab origine tradita, et frustra Apostolorum auctoritatem praetendere, scire quis etiam inde potest, quod circa celebrando dies Paschae et circa multa alia
As all bishops were supposed to be perfectly alike in dignity and power, so also they believed that they had the same general duties toward the whole church in addition to those peculiar duties they owed to their respective churches. Accordingly they all asserted equally the right of interfering, in cases where other bishops had departed from the fundamental rules of the church, by admonitions, reprimands, and even ecclesiastical punishment. This common right was of course principally exercised by the most distinguished and powerful bishops.

divinae rei sacraeotas videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitates, nec observari illae omnia

13 See especially Cypriani Epist. 67, below, note 14.

For example the condemnation of Paul of Samosata (§ 60, cf. du Pin, p. 134). Reprimand of Diosysius of Alexandria (§ 64, note 8, du Pin, p. 133.) With reference to Marcian, bishop of Arles, who had gone over to the Novatians, Cyprian. Ep. 67, ad Stephan. Ep. Rom. writes: Cui rei nostrum est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime. Quapropter facere at operat plenissimas litteras ad coepiscopos nostros in Galilis constitutos, ne ultra Marcianum perviecamus—collegio nostro insultare potiamur, quod neque videamus a nobis absteners.—Dirigatur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistenter a te litteras, quibus absteuisti Marciano alias in locum ejus substituatur, et gregem Christi, qui in hodiernum ab illo dissipatus et vulneratus congregat, colligatur. Sufficit multus illie ex fratibus nostris annis istis superioribus excessisse sine pace. Vel ceteris subveniatur qui super-

sunt. Iecrico enim, frater carissime, copiae servorum est sacerdotum concordiae mutuae glutina atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro inerescim facere et gregem Christi læcere et vastare tentaverit, subveniatur caeteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes oves dominicas in gregem colligant. Quod enim si in mari portus aliquis muni tionibus suis raptus infestus et periculosus esse navibus cooperet, nonne navigantes ad illos proximis portus naves suas dirigant, ubi sit tutus accessus et salutaris introitus et statio secura? Quod nunc esse apud nos debet, frater carissime, ut fratres nostros, qui jactati Marciani scopulis petunt ecclesiae portus salutares, suscipimus ad nos prompta et benigna humanitate. Nam etis pastores multi sumus, unam tamen gregem paciunam, et oves universas, quas Christus saugunge suo et passione quasiavit, colligere et fovere debemus, etc. In the matter of the Spanish bishops Basildes and Martini (in the year 236), Cyprian, called upon to interfere, declares the interposition of Stephen, bishop of Rome, in favor of those deposed bishops to be exceptionable, Epist. 65, ad clerum et plebes in Hispania consistentes: Nec resindere ordinationem (Sabini) jure perfectum potest, quod Basildes post criminis sua detecta et conscientiam etiam propria confessione uvultum, Romanam per gens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestae rei ac veritatis ignorum sofollis, ut exibirem reponi se injustae in episcopatum, de quo fuerat jure depositus. Etsi aliqui de collegia nostris existeriuit (namely, Stephanus), fratres diligentissimi, qui defecum disciplinae neglegendum putant, et cum Basilde et Martiale temere communicant, conturbare fidem nostram res ista non debet, etc. Cf. du Pin, p. 150.
§ 69.

(CONTINUATION) HIERARCHY IN THE SEPARATE CHURCHES.

After the idea of the Mosaic priesthood had been adopted in the Christian church, the clergy, as was natural, elevated themselves far above the laity. A peculiar mystic influence was ascribed to the old rite of consecration, when considered as an ordinatio; and they now appeared in the character of persons appointed by God himself to be the medium of communication between Him and the Christian world.1

For the inferior services of the church particular offices were appointed, different, however, in the Greek and Latin churches. In the former, ὑπηρέται (or ὑποδιάκονοι), ψαλτροῖ (or ψαλται), ἀναγινώσται and πνευμονι.:2 in the latter, Subdiaconi, Acoluthi,

---

1 Cypriani Epist. 55: Nam cum scriptum sit: Qui dixierit fratris, suo, fatue, etc. (Matth. v. 23), quomodo possunt censuram Domini ulterior evadere, qui talia ingerunt, non solum fratribus, sed et sacerdotibus, quibus honor tantus de Dei dignatione conceditur, ut quisquis sacerdotes ejus et ad tempus hico judicanti non obtemperaret, statim necaretur. Neque enim aliunde haerescas obortae sunt, nut nata sunt quisquis Dei non obtemperaret, nec una in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdotes et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitaret. Epist. 60, ad Florent. Papinum: Animadvert te—in moror nostros diligenter inquireo, et post Deum judicem, qui sacerdotes facit, te velle, non dicam de me (quantus enim ego sum?) sed de Dei et Christi judicio judicato. Hoc est in Deum non credere, hoc est rebellem adversum Christum et adversum evangelium ejus existere, ut—tu existimes, sacerdotes Dei sine conscientia ejus in ecclesia ordinari.—Quamobrem, frater, si majestatem Dei, qui sacerdotes ordinat, cogitaveris, si Christum, qui arbitrato et nutu ac praesentia sua et praebitis ipso et ecclesiis cum praebita coactus, aliquam quod ingerent, si temeritatis—tuque agere vel sero pomeniam coepis, si Deo et Christo ejus—pleniissime satisfaceris; communicabatis tuque poterimus habere rationem: manent tamen apud nos divinae cunctae respecte et nutu, ut prius Domino messas consistis, ut iubeas eum in modum et ut tua ad communicationem ecclesiae suae admitti suam ostensione et aduminitio permittatur. Memini eum, quid jam mittit ostensum, immo quid sit servus obsequenti et timente de dominica et divina auctoritate praeceptum: qui uter cetera quae ostendere et revelare dignatus est, et hoc addidit: Itaque qui Christo non credit sacerdotem facienti, et postea credere incipit sacerdotem vindicant. Cf. Epist. 45, 52, 65. On the dignity of the priests, and particularly of the bishops, see Const. Ap. ii. 26, ss. As spiritual fathers, they are to be regarded as higher than earthly parents, c. 33, higher than kings and princes, c. 34: Τούτους ἥρων καὶ βασιλέα ἤγεισκε ναοίζετε, καὶ δαμαίος ἃς βασιλείαν προσφέρετε. 'Oσιοί τούν ψυχή σώματος κρεῖτων, τουσίρθη διακόνη βασιλείας: δειμαίζει γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ δέης τοὺς τιμωρίας ἢ ὧοςεος ἀλέους· διὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον στέργειν ὑόλειτε ὡς πατέρα, φοιείναι ἃς βασιλεία, τιμήν ὡς κόρουν.

2 So Constitut. Apost. iii. 11, vi. 17. Those who are called in the first six books ὑπηρέται are denominated ὑποδιάκονοι in viii. 23 (ὑπηρέται γὰρ εἰς δικαίων): a ὑποδιάκονος is also named by Athanasius in Epist. ad solitariam vitam agentes. Many
Exorcistae, Lectores, and Ostiarii\(^3\) (afterward called ordines minores). All oppressed and helpless persons, especially widows, orphans, and virgins,\(^4\) were referred to the clergy for assistance. The bishop (\(\text{papa}, \text{Tert. de Pudic. 13. Πάπα ἰερώτατος, Gregor. Thaum. Epist. can. i., Praepositus, Cyprian, note 1}\) exercised this support, as well as the administration of the entire wealth of the church, by the deacons.\(^5\) In like manner, supported by his clergy, he was umpire in all disputes between the members of his church.\(^6\) The bishops greatly increased in reputation and revenues, both by the enlargement of their dioceses and the clergy subject to them, and by the operation of synods. But in this very way many were now led astray unto pride, ambition, and avarice;\(^7\) sometimes even into an immoderate ostenta-

\(^3\) First the Lectores mentioned in Tertullian de Praescr. 41. The others are found first in Cyprian and in Epist. Corneli (bishop of Rome, 250) ap. Euseb. vi. 43, according to whose account there were in Rome, 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acoulthi, and 42 exorcists, lectores, and ostiarii.


\(^6\) As the Jews were accustomed to decide their disputes by umpires chosen from among the people, agreeably to the Mosaic law (Jos. Antt. xiv. 10, 17, xvi. 6), so from the beginning the Christians also, according to 1 Cor. vi. 1, ff., in order to establish the relations subsisting among them by the gospel, not by a heathen tribunal. The Roman jurisprudence favored generally procedure by arbitration, as Digest. lib. iv. tit. 8: De receptis, qui arbitrium reciperent, ut sententiam dicerent, and in order to make the arbitration sentence secure, prescribed a penal clause to be inserted in the compromise. The Christians were accustomed to choose their bishops as umpires. Their decisions required no such safeguard, but were sufficiently protected by religious awe. Respecting this point, see Const. App. ii. 45-53.

\(^7\) Origines in Exod. Hom. xi. § 6: Quis autem hodie corem, qui populis praebent, non
tion. Still, however, their power continued to be restricted in many ways. Although the provincial bishops exercised a decided influence on the choice of a bishop, yet the election depended in a great degree on the church. The bishop himself, it is true, nominated the inferior clergy, but the presbyters had


dico si jam aliqua ei a Deo revelata sunt, sed in legis scientia aliquid merit habet, consilium dignatur inferioris saeculorum accipere? nedaum dixerim laici vel gentilium.

Idem in Matthaeum, tom. xvi. § 8 (on Luke xxii. 25, 26): 'Mei "to ouk ou sto eamen, ws i tis, kai tov ton kai kai xorwnv en tis eumevnoin upereballein tivo, kai mounouzov egevov ws oi bapheis doffeevov, kai philei eis dievov kai thevriazov kai tis senvov kai tis penvov katakevnavov, toon to eamen prws autes eumen eumevnoin katakevnavov, kai per tivoi xorwnv egevov, ws ois ton xorwnv.

Kai eis tote gidei en pollois nymenias exeklousias, kai moulumata tis xeiropoion poloion, tois hgevovn tous ton kai ton kai ton ekloioi eumevnoi, kai tote tois kallistov tis ton Ievoi, kai tote tois.

Ce ejam. in Matth. Commentariorum sermon. § 9: Sic autem super cathedram Moysi—sic et super cathedram ecclesiasticam sedent quidam dicentes, quae facere oporteat unumqueque, non autem facientes, et alligantes onera gravia et imponunt super bumeros bominum, ipsi nec digito volantes ea movere (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3).

Ibid. § 10, 12, 14, 61, in Num. Hom. ii. 1, in Esaiae Hom. vii. 3. Cyprian. de Lapsis: Episcopi plumbi, quos et hortamentum eosse oportet caeteris et exemplo, divina procuratione contenta, procuratores rerum sacrorum fieri; derelicta cathedra, plebe deserta, per alienas provincias orbatae, negotiationis quaeestuose mundiis auxiocii; parientibus in ecclesia fratribus, habere argentum largior vel, fundos inadivos fraudibus rapere, usuris multiplicantibus fenum augere.

a Compare the objections which were made to Paul of Samosata, in the writing of the synod at Antioch, which had been assembled against him, ap. Euseb. vii. 30. He drew from his episcopal jurisdiction unlawful gain, in the exercise of it imitated civil rulers, by causing to be erected for himself a bema kai thevov exhorov, by having a semevromos, like worldly judges, and frequently giving himself up to the greatest violence. In the church he caused appliance to be dealt out to him by the waving of handkerchiefs and clapping of hands. This was justly condemned; but since the clapping of hands, by way of appliance, was universal in the fourth century, it may be assumed that Paul was not the only bishop of his time who willingly put up with it.

first to be approved by the church. In the discharge of his duties the bishop had not only to consult his presbyters, but even in certain cases to ask the opinion of the whole church. There were even yet cases in which laymen learned in the Scriptures publicly taught in the church with permission of the bishops.


11 In Cyprian often, consulere presbyterium, consilio communi res tractare, etc. Comp. Conc. Carthagini. gener. iv. v. J. 398, can. 23 (Mansi, iii. p. 533): Episcopus nullus causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum: aliquo irrita erit sententia Episcopi, nisi clericorum sententia confirmetur. Concerning the right of voting at synods, see Ziegler in Henko’s Neues Magazin, Bd. 1, S. 165, ff.


DIVINE SERVICE.

In the third century the traces of buildings devoted exclusively to Christian worship become more frequent and obvious; and as early as the peaceful times between the Valerian and Diocletian persecutions, splendid edifices had been erected for this purpose. These were called προσευκτήρια, κυριακῶν, dominicum, οἶκος ἐκκλησίας and simply ἐκκλησία. From the time of Constantine they were also styled ναὸς, templum, but never fanum and delubrum. In imitation of the temple of Jerusalem, a part of the interior was inaccessible to the people (انخفاض, βῆμα, chorus), where the wooden table for the Lord’s Supper τράπεζα, mensa sacra) stood beside the seats of the clergy (καθόδρα, θρόνοι). Though the Christians were fond of certain religious symbols on many of their household utensils, yet nothing of this kind was allowed in the churches.

At the time of Origen, the Christians had no other general festivals besides Sunday, than the παρασκευή (preparation) the passover, and the feast of pentecost. Soon, after, however, there appears to have been added to them the feast of the ascension (ἡ ἑορτή τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ Κυρίου). So also in Egypt,

1 Under Severus Alexander (§ 56, note 6) then in Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, etc. Comp. above, § 53, note 10.
2 Euseb. H. E. viii. 1, 2: Μνημονίῳ ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ οἰκοδομήματι ἅρκομενοι, εἴρεται ἐς πλάτος ἑωχ θάνατος τῆς πόλεως ἐκ θυμελίων ἱεράς ἐκκλησίας.
3 A prescription respecting the planning of churches is found in Constit. Apost. ii. 57.
4 A description of the church at Tyre by Euseb. x. 4, 15, 8.
5 So on the seal-rings, a dove, a ship, a lyre, an anchor, a fish, etc. Clem. Alex. Paedag. iii. p. 399. Tertullianus de Pudic. c. 7, mentions the picturas calicis representing the ovis perdita a Domino requisita, et humeris ejus revecta, but does not seem (cap. 10), to approve of it. Münter’s Sимвilder der alten Christen. Heft 1, S. 7, f.
6 Can. Illiberit. 36: Placuit, picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne qualis colitur et adoratur, in pariitibus depingatur. The older Catholic theologians, for example Baronius, Bellarmin, Perronius, etc., tried many ways of evading the force of this canon; on the contrary, the true meaning of it, with its historical consequences, has been acknowledged by Petavius Dogm. theol. lib. xiv. c. 13, no. 3. Pagus Crit. ad ann. 55, no. 4, 18, especially Natalis Alexander ad Hist. eccl. sac. iii. Diss. 21, Art. 2.
7 Origen. contra Cels. viii. p. 392.
toward the end of the third century, they began to observe, after
the example of Basilides' followers,\(^9\) the *epiphany* (τὰ ἐπιφάνεια) on
the sixth of January, but according to the orthodox view of
the appearance of the Logos on earth (ἡ ἐπιφάνεια) not simply
as the festival of his baptism, but also as that of his birth.
The arrangement of Divine worship at this time is found in the
Constitt. Apost. ii. 57. At the agapeae, the clergy and poor
were particularly remembered (I. c. ii. 28).

The respect paid to martyrs still maintains the same charac-
ter as in the second century, differing only in degree, not in
kind, from the honor shown to other esteemed dead. As the
churches held the yearly festivals of their martyrs by the graves
of the latter,\(^6\) so they willingly assembled frequently in the
burial places of their deceased friends,\(^10\) for which they used in
many places even caves (cryptae, catacumbae).\(^11\) At the cele-

---

\(^9\) Comp. § 45, note 9. So also Jablonski de Orig. festi nativ. Christi diss. i. § 7. (Oppusc. ed. to Water, iii. p. 398, ss.) Differently Neander gent. Systeme, S. 49, 81, and Kirchen-
gesch. i. i. S. 519. On the other side see Hallische A. L. Z. April, 1823, S. 836.

\(^6\) Comp. § 53, note 46. A remarkable accomplishment of Gregory Thaumaturgus, see
σωματικαῖς θημασίᾳ τῇ περὶ τὰ ἐδώλα πάντῃ παραμένει τὸ θνῄσκει τῶν πάλικων καὶ
ἀπαίδευτον. Ὁ γὰρ τὸ προφητεύματι τέως ἐν αὐτοῖς μέλιστα κατερθείει τὸ πρὸς τὸν
θεὸν ὄντι τῶν ματαιών σεβασμῶν βλέπειν, ἐφόδους αὐτοῖς τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων
ἐμφασιονοῦσα μνήμας καὶ εὐπαθείας καὶ ἀγάλλησαί.

\(^10\) Constitt. Apost. v. c. 8: Συναθροίζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις, τὴν ἁμάςκων τῶν
ἰερῶν βιβλίων ποιούμενα, καὶ ψάλλοντες ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων μαρτύρων καὶ πάντων
τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἁγίων, καὶ τῶν ἀδέλφων ἤμων τῶν ἐν κυρίῳ κεκοιμημένων: καὶ τὴν
ἀντίτυπον τοῦ βασιλείου σώματος Χριστοῦ δεκτὴν εὐχαριστοῦν προσφέρετε ἐν τῇ τοῖς
ἐκκλησίας ἱμένα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις. Hence Aemilius, governor of Egypt, said
to the Christians brought before him in the Decian persecution (Dioscor. Alex. ap. Euseb.
vii. 11, 4): Οὐδεμιῶς δὲ ἐξίστατο ἡμῖν—ἡ συνόδος ποιεῖται, ἡ ἐς τὰ καλύπταυ κοιμητήρια
ἐλθεῖν. So also the proconsul of Africa (Acta proconsularia S. Cypriani, c. 1). Gallienus
removed this prohibitory rule (see above, § 56, note 14); but Maximinus afterward renewed
it (Euseb. ix. c. 2). These burial-places were called κοιμητήρια, dormitorium.

\(^11\) Christian catacombs are found in Rome, Naples, Syracuse, and Malta. In the year
1844 they were also discovered on the island Melos. Respecting the Roman catacombs,
Hieronymus in Ezechiel. c. 49: Dum esses Romae pauper, et liberalibus studiis erudieris,
solebant cum easteris o tümen metatis et propositi dicibus dominici sepultura Apostolorum
et Martyrum circuere: crebroque cryptas ingredi, quae in terrarum profunda deesseae, ex
utraque parte ingrediendum per parietes habent corpora sepulturarum, et ís obscure sunt
omnia, ut prospodium illud propheticum compleatur: descendent ad infernum viventes,
etc. Cf. Prudentius peri stef. hymn. x. Passio Hippolyti, v. 153, ss.—Modern descriptions
of the catacombs in Rome, Paul Ariberti Roma subterranea novissima. Paris. 1659. 2
voll. fol. M. A. Boldetti Osservazioni sopra i Cimiteri de SS. Martiri, ed anticli Cristiani
di Rom. 1720. 2 t. fol. See further the works of Bottari, Ciampini, etc. (see Mánté's
Italien. (Leipz. 3 Bde. 1777), iii. 67. A description of the city of Rome by Plutarch,
Bunsen, Gerhard, and Rösell (Stuttgart and Tübingen. 1830. i. 359). Respecting these
bration of the Lord's Supper, both the living who brought oblations, as well as the dead, and the martyrs for whom offerings were presented, especially on the anniversary of their death, were included by name in the prayer of the church. Inasmuch as the re-admission of a sinner into the church was thought to stand in close connection with the forgiveness of sin, an opinion was associated with the older custom of restoring to church communion the lapsed who had been again received by the martyrs, that the martyrs could also be serviceable in obtaining the forgiveness of sins. In doing so they set out in part with the idea, which is very natural, that the dead prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the dead, but that the intercession of martyrs abiding in the society of the Lord, would be of peculiar efficacy on behalf of their brethren: while they partly thought that the martyrs, as assessors in the last decisive judgment, were particularly active (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3).}

in Naples: Pellicia de Christ. eccl. politia. tom. iii. P. ii. Diss. 5. Chr. P. Bollermann: über die ältesten christl. Begräbnisstätten, u. bes. die Katakomben zu Neapel mit ihrem Wandgemälde. Hamburg. 1839. 4: Respecting those in Sicily, see Bartel's Briefe über Calabrien u. Sicilien. (Götting. 3 Th. 1787-91), iii. 203. Münter's Nachrichten v. Neapel und Sicilien, S. 344. — By the "Congregation of Relics and Indulgences," the symbol of the palm and the pretended blood-vessels (which were more probably used in the celebration of the eucharist) have been established as marks of the graves of martyrs; but that they are not sufficient marks is shown by Eusebius Romanus (Mabillon) de cultu Sanctorum ignotum. Paris. 1688. 4. In the second edition, however, he was obliged to yield. 1705. (The church in the Catacombs, by Dr. C. Müntland. London, 1846. 8vo).

12 These registers of names, since they were not always the same, were inscribed for each occasion on the writing-tables then used (diptycha, διπτύχα), and afterward erased. Hence the appellation diptycha was used of the lists of names of persons to be mentioned at the communion service, though these lists afterward assumed a more permanent character after all the offerentes were no longer called by name. This, and the peculiar names dipitycha episcoporum, dipt. vivorum, dipt. mortuorum, first occur in the fifth century. Chr. A. Salig, de Diptychis veterum tam profanis quam sacris. Halsae. 1731. 4.

13 Against this notion great zeal is shown by Tertull. de Pudicitia, c. 29: In ipso securoitate et possessione martyrii quis permittit homini donare quae Deo reservanda sunt?—Sufficit martyri proprin delicta purgasse. Ingrati vel superbi est in aliis quoque apargere, quod pro magno futur consecutus. On the other hand, even Cyprin. Ep. 12 and 13, admits, Christianos auxilio Martyrum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis posse.

14 Cypriani Epist. 57 ad Cornelium: Memores nostri invicem simus,—urobiqve pro nobis semper oramus,—et si quis istinc nostrum prior divinae dignationis celeritate praecesserit, perseveret apud Dominum nostra dilectio, pro fratribus et sororibus nostris apud misericordiam patris non cessat oratio.

15 Cyprian writes to confessors, Ep. 15: Vox illa purificazione confessionis illustris—impatrat de domini lauditate quod postulat; and Ep. 77: Nunc volis in precibus efficacior sermo est, et ad impetrandum quod in pressuris petitur facilior oratio est.

16 Cyripians de Lapis: Cum animam quidem posset apud judicem plurimum Martyrum merita et opera justorum: sed cum judicii dies veniret, cum post occasum saeculi hujus et mundi ante tribunal Christi populos ejus adstetetur. Martyrs are, according to Dionysius.
Origen attributed very great value to that intercession, in expecting from it great help toward sanctification; but he went beyond the ideas hitherto entertained in attributing to martyrdom an importance and efficacy similar to the death of Christ. Hence he feared the cessation of persecution as a misfortune. The more the opinion that value belonging to the intercession of martyrs was established, the oftener it may have happened that persons recommended themselves to the martyrs yet living for intercession, i.e. after their death. On the other hand, no trace is found of in-
vocation of the dead, since the idea was not yet entertained of the living being able to make known their requests to them.

§ 71.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Memorials of the ecclesiastical discipline of this period exist in the Epitolae canonicae of Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, of Gregory Thaumaturgus (both about 260), and Peter, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 306; the canons of the council of Illerus (305 ?), Arles (314), Ancyra (315), and Neo-Caesarea (315). All these are found in collections of the councils, and in Routh’s Heliquiae Sacrae.

After the holiest transactions of public worship began to be treated as mysteries, the mode of admission to Christianity naturally assumed another form. A preparatory course preceded it, in which the catechumens (κατηχούμενοι) were instructed by suitable teachers (catechistae, doctor audientium)¹ and prepared for baptism through different classes (ἀπρόωμενοι, audientes, γονυκλίνωτες, genuflexentes, βαπτιζόμενοι, baptizομενοι, competentes).²

The condition of catechumen usually continued several years; but the catechumens often deferred even baptism as long as possible, on account of the remission of sins by which it was to be accompanied.³ Hence it was often necessary to baptize the sick; and for them the rite of sprinkling was introduced (baptismus clinicorum, τῶν κλίνωκών).⁴ The baptism of children was more common.⁵ The exorcism of those about to be baptized is

¹ At this time the positive doctrines had not yet been kept secret from the catechumens. See the rule respecting their instructions in Const. Apost. vii. 39.
³ Disapproved, Constit. Apost. vi. 15: ‘Ο δὲ λέγων, δι’ ὦταν οἰκετοῦ, βαπτίζωμι, έπι μη ἐμαρτησον και ὑποτάσσω τό βαπτισμα, οὐτος ἁγιοιαν ἔχει Θεον, καὶ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ φύσεως ἐπιλέξισιν τοῦχαινε.
⁴ Cf. Cyprian Ep. 76. ad Magnum, that the baptism of them ought not to be regarded as invalid, co quod aqua salutari non iusti sunt, sed perfusi.
⁵ Comp. § 53, note 20. Origen found the baptism of children already existing in his circle, and defended it. Wallis Hist. Baptism. Infant. P. i. p. 72. ss.—Florus, an African bishop, believed, considerandum esse legem circumcisionis antiquae, ut intra octavum dieum eum, qui natus est, baptizandum et sanctificandum non putaret. On the other hand, Cyprian,
now distinctly mentioned; and all baptized persons, even children, received the eucharist. When the congregations became larger presbyters and deacons baptized in addition to the bishop. In the west, however, the baptized had to receive from the bishop the imposition of hands. In the east the baptizing presbyters performed this ceremony.

As those who were excommunicated were universally supposed to be under the dominion of the devil, as much as the unbaptized, they had to undergo, as poenitentes, a similar though more severe probation-period than the catechumens, before they could be again received (pacem dare, reconciliare). The No-

with his provincial synod (Epist. 64 ad Fidum), a baptismo atque a gratia Dei, qui omnibus et misericors, et benignus, et plus est, nomenem per nos debere prohiberi. Wall. L c. p. 94, 88.


7 Cyprianus Ep. 73. ad Jugabanum: Nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia baptismatur praepositis Ecclesiis offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur et signaculo dominico consummuntur. Conc. Ililib. can. 38, 67.

8 Consistit. Apost. vii. 43, 44.


10 In what relation this admission was supposed to stand to the forgiveness of sins may be seen from Firmilianus Ep. ad Cypr. (Ep. Cypr. 75): Per singulos annos seniores et praepositi in unum conveniretur,—ut si quae graviores sunt, communi consilio dirigantur, lapidem quoque fratibus et post levemem salutare a diabolo vulneratis per poenitentiam modera quae ratur: non quasi a nobis remissione pecatorum consequatur, sed ut per nos ad intellegi tidiam delictorum suorum convertantur, et Dominus pleniis satisfacere cogantur. Cyprian. de Lapidis: Nemo se fallat, nemo se decipiat. Solus Dominus misereri potest: veniam peccatis, quae in ipsum commissa sunt, solus potest ille largiri, qui pecunia nostra porta vit.—Homo Deo esse non potest major; nec remittere aut donare indulgentia sua servus potest quod in Dominum delicto graviori commissum est, Dominus orandum est, Dominus nostra satisfactione placatus est, quem negantem negare se dixit, qui omne judicium de patre solus accipit.—Constatque singuli, quaeos vos, fratres dilectissimi, delictum suum, dum adhibit qui deliquit in saeculo est, dum adhibent confessionem eis potest, dum satisfacito et remissa facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est.—Rogamus vos, ut pro vobis Deum rogare possimur. Preces ipsas ad vos prius vertimus, quibus Deus pro vobis ut miseretur, oramus. (Later, Leo I. about 450, Ep. 89: Sic divinæ bonitatis praesidia ordinata, ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtinere). Further Cyprianus Ep. 52: Pignus vitae in data pace percipiant: —accepta pace commecatus a Deo datur. Comp. above, § 67, note 1. The reconciliation was no actus ordinis, but jurisdictionis, and could therefore be transferred from the bishop himself to a deacon. Cypr. Ep. 12, directs, ut qui libelli a martyris accipierant, et praecogitativa eorum apud Deum adjuvari possint (Ep. 13, et auxilio eorum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis possint), sic incommode aliquo et infirmitate persecuto occupati fuerint, non expectata praesentia nostra, apud presbyterum quomunque praesentem, vel si presbyter reperto non fuerit, et urgeret exitus coercerit, apud diaconum quoque exomologesan facere delicti sui possint: ut mans eis in poenitentiam imposita veniant ad Dominum cum pace, quam dari martyres litteris ad nos factis desideraverunt.
vatican disputes occasioned the orientals to appoint a πρεσβύτερος ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας in the separate churches; and this seems to have had an influence in bringing about that public penance, even at the end of the third century, had a succession of grades similar to the probation-period of the catechumens. The four gradus or stationes poenitentiae were πρόσκλαπας, ἀκρόας, ύποπτωσις, σύστασις (προσκλαίνεται, χειμάζεται, flentes, hiemantes, ἀκρόμενοι, audientes, γονυκλίνοντες, ὑποπτῶντος, genuflectentes, substrati, συνιστάμενοι, consistentes). Excommunication fell only on public, gross offenses. Other sinners were referred to the admonition of the more experienced brethren.


12 Cyprian knows nothing of these grades. He sets forth the arrangement to be pursued with the penitent, Epist. 11: Nam cum in minoribus delictis, quae non in Deum committuntur, poenitentia agatur justo tempore, et exomologesis fiat inspecta vita eius qui agit poenitentiam, nec ad communicationem venire quis possit, nisi prius illi ab episcopo et clericis manus fuerit imposita: quanto magis in his gravissimis et extremis delictis caute omnia—observari oportet: In like manner they are not found in the course prescribed for penitents in Const. Apost. ii. 16. The grades are first mentioned in (since Gregor. Thaumatur. Epist. canonica, can. ii., as Morinus de Poen. lib. vi. c. 1, § 9, has shown, is spurious, and arose from Basilii Epist. 217, or Canonica, iii. c. 75, see Routh Relig. Sacr. ii. p. 458, &c.) Conc. Ancyrr. c. 4. Conc. Nicaea. c. 11. J. Maurus de Disciplina in administratione sacramenti poenitentiae. Paris 1651. fol. J. Dallaeus de Sacramentis a. auriculis Latinnorum confessiones. Genev. 1661. 8. Sam. Basnagii Annales politico-ecceles. t. ii. p. 475. Bingham, lib. xviii. in vol. viii.

13 Origenes in Psalm. xxxvii. Hom. ii. § 6: Oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecum. Fortassit enim sicut illi, qui habent intus incipientescam indignitatem, aut humoris vel phlegmatis stomacho graviter et moleste immanentibus, si vomuerint, relevarentur: ita etiam hi qui peccaverunt, si quidem occultant, et retinent intra se peccatum, inextricabilis urgentur et propemodum suffocantur a phlegmate vel humore peccati: si autem ipsi suspicantur, illi accusat semet ipsum et confitebantur, simul eum et delictum, et quum omnem morbi digerent causam. Tantummodo circumspice diligentias, cui debes confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum cui debeat causam languir exponere, qui scias inframisin firmam, feroque cum flete, qui condenandum et communi notari delictum—ut ita denuo, si quid ille dixerit, qui se prius et eruditum medicum ostendisset et misericordem, si quid consilli dederit, facias, et sequaris, si intellecritis et praevidis, talum esse languorem tuum, qui in conventu totius Ecclesiae exponi debent et curari, ex quo fortassit et ceteri se diligaverint potuerunt, et tu ipse facile sanari: multa hoc deliberatione, et satia perito medici illius consilio procurandum est. Of course application was especially made to the clergy: hence Origenes in Levit. Hom. ii. § 4: Est—per poenitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lachrymis stratum suum,—et cum non erubesceit accipit Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quernque medicam. In Levit. Hom. v. § 4: Discat sacerdotes Domini, qui Ecclesiis praebent, quis pars sit data est cum his, quorum delicta repromptuaverint. Quid autem est repromptiare delictum? Si assumeris peccatum, et momento, hortando, docendo, instituendo adduxeris eum ad poenitentiam ab errore correcere, a vitius emendaveris, et effeceris cum talum, ut ei converso propitius fiat Deus pro delicto, repromptiisse dicere.
The time of penance usually continued several years—sometimes even to the hour of death. In Africa and Spain, re-admission was forever forbidden in case of certain offenses. This strictness was relaxed only when confessors interceded on behalf of the lapsed. But during the Decian persecution, the martyrs in Africa abused this privilege granted them by custom, so much that Cyprian was obliged to oppose them. Yet this
dispute, as well as the great number of the lapsed, occasioned a
renunciation of the principle, of always refusing reconciliation
with the church to the lapsed, immediately after the Decian
persecution, in Africa. 18 On the other hand, this Montanistic
rigor continued in its greatest extent beyond this period, in
Spain. 19

18 Respecting the Synod held at Carthage on this account, 351, and in justification of it,
see Cyprian Ep. 53 ad Antonianum: Et quidem primum, quasdam de meo quoque acta
motus videaris, man apud te et persona et causa purianda est, ne me aliquid existinmet a
proposito meo leviter recessisse, et cum evangelicam vigorem primo et inter initia defen-
derim, postmodum videar numquam meam a disciplina et censura priore flexisse, ut his,
qui libeller conscientiam suum maculaverint, vel nefanda sacrificia commiserint, laxan-
dam pacem putaverint. Quod utrunque non sine libera diu et ponderata ratione a me
factum est. Nam cerni—proelium gloriosi certaminis in persecutione ferveret, tota horatia
et pleuo impetu militum vires fuerant excitandae, et maxime laporum mentes—fortiter
animandae, ut poenitentiis viam non solum praeclusa et lamentationibus sequentur, sed
ad confessionis potius arderem et martyri gloriis nostris inrepsi vocibus provocaren-
tur. Secundum quod tamen ante fuerat destinatum, persecutione sophia, copiosos Epis-
coporum numeros—in unum convenientem, et scripturis divinis ex utraque parte prolatis,
temperamentum salubri moderatione libravimus, ut nec in totum spec communications
et pacis lapsis denegaretur, ne plus desperatione defecerent, nec tamen rursus censura
evangelica salvaretur, ut ad communicationem temere prospelirent; sed traheretur din
poenitentiis, et rogaretur dolenter paterna clementia, et examinarentur causae et volun-
tates et necessitates singulorum.—Ac si minus sufficientes Episcoporum in Africa numeros
videbatur, etiam Romanum super haec re scripsimus ad Cornelium collegam nostrum; qui et
ipsa cum plurimis coepiscopis habi concilio in comed nobisum sententiain pri gravi-
tate et salubri moderatione consensit.—Nec putes, frater carissime, hinc aut virtutem
fratrum minui aut martyria deficere, quod lapsis laxata sit poenitentia, et quod poeniten-
tibus spec pacis oblata.—Nam et moechis a nobis poenitentiae tempus conceditur et pax
datur (comp. § 33, note 38, § 59, note 4). Non tamen icircor virginitas in ecclesia deficit,
etc.—Miro autem quasdam sic obstinatos esse, ut dandam non potent lapsis poenitentiis,
aut poenitentibus existinmet veniam denegandum, cum scriptum sit: Memento unde
cecideris, et age poenitentiam, et fac prora opera (Apoc. ii. 5). After quoting many
similar passages: Quod legentes scilicet et tenentes neminem putamus a facto satisfac-
tionsis et spec pacis arcaem, cum sequamurius scripturam divinarum sidon, sancte,
et horatorem Ipso Deo, et ad agendum poenitentiam peccatorum redigti, et veniam atque
inulgentiam poenitentiis non denegari. In this sense it was even made a general
church law by the Conc. Nicaen. c. 13: "Ωστε, ει τις εξεδειν, τοι τελευταίον και ἀνα-
καιτότον ενέπλουν ρητώςερεῖσαι."

19 Comp. Concil. Illiberit. above § 59, note 19. So says Pacian, bishop of Barcelona,
about 370, in his book of capital sins: Paraeneticum ad poenitentiam (Bibl. PP. max. t. iv.)
peccata capitulis: Reliqua peccata melliorum operum compensacione curantur. Haeque
quinque post fidem fecerit, Dei faciems non videbit. Cf. Innocentii I. Epist. 6, ad Exsu-
perium Episc. Tolosanum (in the year 405) c. 2: Et hoc quiescit est, quid de his observ-
ati opus est, quid post baptismum omnem tempore incontinentiae volubilis dediit, in ex-
tremo fine vitae suae poenitentiis simul et reconciliationem communionei expositum,
De his observatio prior durior, posterior interviemia miserericordia inclination. Nam
consuetudo prior tarnen, ut concederetur poenitentia, sed communi negaretur.
§ 72.

(CONTINUATION.) CONTROVERSY CONCERNING MATTERS OF CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

1. The schism of Felicissimus in Carthage. A party already dissatisfied with the selection of Cyprian as bishop, afterward continued in a divided and hostile relation to the bishop, who was extremely jealous of his dignity. The Decian persecution put an end to the dispute arising between Cyprian and the presbyter Novatus. But during that trying time, some presbyters readmitted the lapsed (Cypriani Ep. 9) solely on the strength of the libelli pacis of the martyrs, which were too freely granted, without regard to the bishop of Carthage, who had been obliged to leave his church. Cyprian found fault with this. But the party of the dissatisfied increased in consequence, at whose head the deacon Felicissimus appeared, and to which several confessors also were now added. This party now refused to obey the commands of the bishop, who had fled from persecution, and went on adding to its numbers by the reception of the lapsed. After Cyprian's return (251) they were excommunicated, and chose Fortunatus for their bishop, but do not appear to have long survived.


2 At the time of the Novatian controversy Cyprian says of him, Ep. 49: Idem est Novatus, qui apud nos primum discordiae et schismatis incendium seminavit, qui quodam istic ex fratibus ab Episcopo segregavit, qui in ipsa persecutione ad vertendas fraternitates alia quodam persecutione nostris fuit. Ipse est, qui Felicissimum satellitem suam, Diaconom, nec permittente me, nec sciente, sua factione et ambizione constituit.—Urgentibus fratibus imminebat cognitionis dies, quae apud nos causa eisu ageretur, nisi persecutio antevenisset.

3 In particular, Felicissimus withstood a commission sent by Cyprian to inquire about the condition of the poor. Cypr. Ep. 38.

4 Cypriani Epist. 40 ad Piebem: Conjuracionis suae memoria, et antiqua illa contra Episcopatum meum, ino contra saffragium vestrum et Dei judicium venena retinentes, instaurant veterem contra nos impugnationem suam, et sacrilegas machinationes insidiis solitis denno revocant. Hi fomenta olim quibusdam confessuribus et hortamenta tribuerebat, ne concurrerent cum episcopo suo, ne ecclesiasticam disciplinam cum fide et quie pacea domicina continentur, etc.—nunc se ad lapsorum perniciem venenata sua deceptione verterunt, ut negros et naucios—a medesa vulneris sui evocent, et internissimae pretibus et crationibus, quibus Dominus longa et continua satisfactissime placundus est, ad exitiosam temeritatem mendacio captiosae pacis invitant.
2. Novatian schism. The presbyter Novatian (in Eusebius Νοβάτιος) was dissatisfied with the choice of the bishop Cornelius at Rome (251) because Cornelius, in his opinion, had conducted himself with too great lenity toward the lapsed. In the controversy that now ensued, in which the Carthaginian presbyter Novatus proved particularly active in favor of Novatian, the latter returned to the old principle that none of the lapsed ought to be admitted to church communion. Hence arose a division in the church. Novatian was chosen bishop by his party at Rome. Though the other bishops, particularly Cyprian at Carthage, and Dionysius at Alexandria, stood on the side of Cornelius, yet many in different countries joined the strict party. At first the Novatians (καδαροι) declared themselves only against the re-admission of the lapsed, but afterward they fully returned to the old African notion, that all who had defiled themselves by gross sins after baptism should be forever excluded from the church because the church itself would be tainted if they were received again. In accordance with

---


6 Although he had formerly ordained Felicissimus deacon (note 2), it does not thence follow that he afterward was of the same opinion with him regarding the readmission of the lapsed, and still later that he came over to the opposite view at Rome. See Mosheim de rebus Christ. n. C. M. p. 518. Perhaps it was even dissatisfaction with his party that urged him to go from Carthage to Rome.


8 Even Fabius, bishop of Antioch, was ὑποκατακλινόμενος τῷ σχῆματι (Euseb. vi. 41), and at a Synod in Antioch τὸν Νοβάτιον κρατέρας τῶν ἐπεξείρων τὸ σχῆμα (l. c. 40).


9 So Novatian, in a circular-letter, required all the churches (Socrates, iv. 28), μὴ δέχεσθαι τῶν ἐπιθυμόντων ἡς τὴν μνήμης· ἀλλὰ προτέρους μὲν αὐτοὺς ἐς μετάνοιαν, τὴν δὲ συγχωρήσεως ἐπιτρέπειν θερ., τὸ δυσμόν καὶ ἐξονταί ἔχοντι συγχωρεῖν ἀμαρτήματα. Hence Cyprian, Ep. 52, accuses Novatian of inconsistency: Αυτὸς τὸν καιρὸν καὶ μὲν ἐν τῷ σερινὶ, καὶ μὲν τοῖς τέκνοις τοῦ εἰρήνης, ὡς καὶ μὲν τοῖς τεθνητοῖς, τοῦ δυσμοῦ καὶ ἐξονταί ἔχοντος συγχωρείν ἀμαρτήματα.

10 Acesius, a Novatian bishop, at the Council of Nice, says (Socrates, i. 10): Ὡς χρῆ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἁμαρτηκτόν ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα τοὺς βάπτισαν καυτοὺς ἀλλ' ἁμαρτίαν, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν βαπτισμάτων ἀξιοῦσιν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν μὲν αὐτοὺς προτέρους, ἐκτὸς δὲ τῆς ἁμαρτίας μὲν παρά τῶν ἱερῶν, ἀλλὰ παρά τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδέχεσθαι, τοῦ δυσμοῦ καὶ ἐξονταί ἐχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἀμαρτήματα.
this view they declared all other churches to have forfeited the rights of a Christian church; and baptized anew those who came over to them. This party was widely extended, and continued for a long time. In Phrygia they united with the remnant of the Montanists.

3. Controversy concerning the baptism of heretics. The custom prevalent in Africa, Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, of regarding reclaimed heretics as unbaptized, was considered objectionable at Rome, where they were prepared for re-admission without baptism, by passing through the gradus poenitentiae; especially since the time the Novatians began to re-baptize the Christians who had joined them. In Africa, too, there arose doubts regarding it; but two Carthaginian councils (255, 256) confirmed the old practice. When the second council informed Stephen, bishop of Rome (253–257) of its decisions, in a synodical letter (Ep. Cypr. 72), it received from him a haughty reply, disapproving of them. This led to an interchange of violent letters between Stephen and Cyprian. The

11 Such also was the practice of the African church. So Tertullian de Baptismo, 15, de Praesc. 19, de Pudicitia 19, and a council in Carthage under Agrippinus, about 200 (Cypr. Ep. 71, 73). Cf. Münzer primordia Eccl. Afr. p. 150, ss.

12 Constantine's forbearance toward them, Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 5, l. 9: Novatianos non adeo comperimus praedamnos, ut iis, quae petiverunt, crederemus minime largiendae. Itaque ecclesias sanu domos, et loca sepulchris apta sine inquietudine eos firmiter posside praeceptis, etc. (A.D. 326). The mildness of the Nicene council toward them, Can. Nic. 8: Καθαρώς χειροθετομένους μένειν οὖτος ἐν τῷ κλάρῳ.

13 Comp. especially Socrates, iv. 28. The Phrygian Novatians forbade second marriage (ibid. v. 22), and celebrated the passover with the Quartodecimani (iv. 28, v. 21).

14 Walch's Ketzerhist. ii. 310. Hetzberg's Cyprianius, S. 156.

15 The testimonies for Africa, see note 11. For Egypt Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 375: Το βάπτισμα το αφρικανικ εις ολοκληρωμα και γυνης γενος ὁδιρ. Comp. Dionysius Alex., below, note 29. For Syria, Constit. Apost. vi. 15. For Asia Minor, the two councils in Iconium (in the year 235, see Firmilian, in Epist. Cypr. 75), and Synumda, cf. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 7, 3.

16 Cyprian's principle was (Ep. 70): Neminem foris baptizari extra Ecclesiam posse, cum sit baptismum unum in sancta Ecclesia constitutum. On the other hand Stephen (Ep. 74): Si quis ergo a quaecunque haeresi venerit ad eam, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut minus illi imponatur in poenitentiam.—Qui in nomine Jesu Christi ubi consecutur et quomodo consecutus baptizetur, innovati et sanctificati judiciunt. Cyprian adds: In tantum Stephanii fratris nostri obstinatio dabatur prorsus, ut etiam de Marcionia baptismo, item Valentini et Apelletis, et caeterorum blasphemantium in Deum patrem contendat filios Deo nasci.

17 The earlier letters of Cyprian on this affair are Ep. 70–73. Notices of the controversial writings between him and Stephen are found in Cypr. Epist. 74, ad Pompeianum et Firmiliani Ep. ad Cypr. (Ep. Cypr. 75). Cyprian says of Stephen's letter (Ep. 74): Caetera vel superba vel ad rem non pertinentia, vel sibi ipsi contraria, quae imperito atque improvide scripta, etc.—Quae ista obstinatio est, queve praesumto, humanum traditionem divinum dispositioni antepone, nec animadvertere, indignari et irasci Deum,
former broke off all communion with the Africans; but notwithstanding this they repeated in the most emphatic terms their opinions at a third council at Carthage (1st Sept. 256). 13 *Fir-
milian, bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, assured them (Epist. Cypr. 75) with bitter observations on Stephen, 19 of the full as-
sent of the churches in his province; and Dionysius also, bishop of Alexandria, decidedly condemned the conduct of Stephen. 20 After Stephen’s death, peace was immediately restored to the
quotes divina praecepta solvit et praeceptor humana traditio. Nec comnexitudo, quae apud quosdam obcrepascat, impedire debit, quominus veritas praevaleat et vincent. Nam con-
suetae sine veritate vestas erroris est. On the other hand (Ep. 75): Non padet Ste-
phanum—Cyriamum pseudochristum et pseudopostum et dolosum operarium diece. The consequences to be deduced from this controversy respecting the papal supremacy afterward asserted, may be seen in J. In Placae Observat et historico-ecc., quibus eruitur veteris ecclesiae sensus circa Pontif. Rom. potestatum in deficiendi fidem rebus. Amserl. 1695. 8. p. 102, ss.
19 Ex. gr. gratiam referro Stephano in isto possimun, quod per illius inhumanitatem name effectum sit, ut fidei et sapientiae vestrae experimentum caperemus. Sed hanc interim, quae a Stephano gesta sunt, praetercurtun, ne duum audacias et insulitiae ejus meminimus, de rebus ab eo improbe gestis longiorum moestitiam nobis inferamus. Atque ego in hac parte juste indigner ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de Episcopatus ulcus loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesiae collocata sunt, много alias patres indicat.—Lites et dissensiones quantus parastis (Stephanus) per ecclesias totias mundi? Pecctam vero quam magnam tribi exaugerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scisisti? Exosteri enim temet ius: noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est vero schismaticus, qui se a communione Ecclesiasticae unitatis apostatam fecerit (consequently not from a Roman centrum unitatis). Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinerae posse, solum te ab omnibus abstineisti, etc. This letter, so unpleasant to the Romish see (extant in 26 cod.), was purposely omitted in the edition of Cyprian. Romae ap. Paul. Manutium. 1663, and first printed in that of Guil. Morelli. Paris, 1854, who is bitterly censured for it by Latinius and Paunciui. Christ. Lupus (ad Tertull. libr. de Praescr. Bruxell. 1675. 4) first denied the authenticity of the letter. A Franciscan Raimund Messori (in duas celeberr. epist. Firm. et Cypr. disspt. crit. Venet. 1733. 4), the Jesuit R. J. Tourneine (Memoires de Trevoux de 1734, p. 2946, ss), the Franciscan Marcellinus Molkenbuhr (in two dissertations. Münster. 1739 and 1739. 4), and A. Ant. Morcelli Africae christianae, ii. 138, declare, moreover, that Cyprian’s letters respecting the baptism of heretics are forged. These arbitrary assumptions, which none else has thought fit to repeat, have been refuted by J. H. Sbaraela germana S. Cypr. et Aforum necon Firmliani opinio de haereticorum baptism. Bonon. 1741. 4, and in Academic dissertations by G. G. Preu. Jeness. 1738, and D. Cotta. Tübl. 1740.
20 Dina. Ep. ad Sixtum II. (successor of Stephen, 257) ap. Euseb. vili. 5: 'Epistolake (Στέφανος) μεν ουν πρότερον καὶ περὶ Ἑλένου καὶ περὶ Φρυμίλλου καὶ πάντων τῶν τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Κληρικοῦ καὶ Καππαδοκίας καὶ Γαλατίας, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἔξω ομομοίων ἡμῶν, ὡς ἄλλο εἰκόνος κοινωνίαν ὧν τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην αἰτίαν, ἐπείδη τῆς οἰκετίκου ὑπομονῆς, ἀναβαστίζει. Καὶ σαῦτα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ πράγματος. Ὁ υἱὸς γὰρ διάκονος περὶ τοῦ-
ch. 21 although difference of opinion on the disputed point continued for a long time. 22 In the mean time, even now, an intermediate opinion had arisen in the western church, 23 which afterward became the prevailing one.

4. Meletian schism. During the Diocletian persecution, Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais, maintained that the lapsed should not be admitted to penance before peace should have been restored. On this ground he withdrew from his metropolitan Peter of Alexandria (306), and began to assume the duties of the metropolitan's office among the churches of his party. 24 This schism continued more than a century.

5. Donatist schism. 25 As early as the Diocletian persecution there arose at Carthage a fanatical party in opposition to the bishop Mensurius and his archdeacon Caccitamus, because they had contended against the perverseness with which many Christians sought for martyrdom partly from fanaticism, and partly from still more impure motives. 26 When, therefore, after

21 Pontius in Vita Cypriani, where he speaks of his martyrdom: Jan de Xisto (successor of Stephen), bono et pacifico Sacerdote, ac propterea beatissimo Martyre, ab Urbe munere venerat.

22 Accordingly, the Greek fathers, even of the fourth century, reject the baptism of heretics. See below, § 101, note 10.

23 Can. Arelat. 8: De Afris, quod prorsa lege sua utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit, ut si ad ecclesiam aliquid de haeresi veniret, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint, eum in Patro, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus et tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatur non responderit hanc trinitatem, baptizetur.

24 Some original documents relating to this controversy, especially a letter from four Egyptian bishops to Meletius, have been communicated to the public by Scipio Maffeii Osservazioni letterarie, t. iii. p. 11, ss. (Verona. 1738). The account of Epiphanius Haer. 68, which is favorable to Meletius, agrees best with this letter. Different, but partial against Meletius, is the representation of Athanasius Apologia contra Arianos, § 59, which Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret for the most part follow. Walch, iv. 355. Neander, ii. i. 403.


26 Comp. the contents of a letter addressed by Mensurius to Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, in Augustin. brev. collat. d. iii. c. 33, note 25: Nos, qui se offerunt persecutionibus non comprehesi, et ultra dicere, se habere scripturas, quas non traderemus, a quibus hoc nemo quaseret, disputasse Mensurius, et ab eis honorandis eum prohibuisse Christianos. Quintum etiam in eadem epistola facinorosi arguabantur et faci debitores, qui vol. 1.—17
Mensurius's death (311), Caecilianus was chosen his successor, this party set up in opposition to him Majorinus, who was soon succeeded by Donatus the great (313). In this proceeding they were supported by the Numidian bishops, particularly Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, and Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae. The pretext was, that Caecilianus had been consecrated by a "traditor;" Felix, bishop of Aptungra. This pars Majorini, afterward called pars Donati, Donatistae, who gained many adherents in Africa, on account of their attaching great value to purity in the church, brought their complaint against Caecilian before Constantine: the first example of spiritual affairs being laid before a civil ruler for his decision. Constantine at first intrusted Miltiades, bishop of Rome, along with three Gallic bishops (313) with an inquiry into the affair; and afterward a council was assembled at Arles for the purpose of investigating it (314). Both decisions, as well as the judgment of the emperor himself (316) occasioned by a new appeal, proved unfavorable to the Donatists. But though severe laws also had been passed against them, yet they persisted in their opposition, and continued full of enmity toward the catholic church, for more than a century in Africa.

§ 73.

ASCETICISM.

In this division of time, we still find in the church a living consciousness of Christian freedom, which was manifested, espe-
cally at the beginning of the period, in opposition to the ascetic precepts of the Montanists. 1 Fasting continued to be left to the free choice of each; except that ecclesiastical custom had determined certain days as especially appropriate for that purpose, which were very different in different churches. 2 Besides, on particular occasions the churches were summoned by their bishops to a general fast; 3 and in like manner certain fasts were imposed on the penitents. 4 External asceticism generally

1 Tertull. de Jœnibus, c. 2: Certe in evangelio illos dies jejunis determinatos putant (Psyclch.), in quibus abstutas est sponsus, et hos esse jam solos legimus jejuniorum Christianorum, abditis legalibus et propheticos vetustatibus. In quo de caetero indifferenter jejunandum, ex arbitrio, non ex imperio novae disciplinae, pro temperibus et caussi uniuscujusque. Sic et Apostolos observasse, nullo aliud impomentes jugum cœrorum et in commune omnibus obeendorum jejuniorum: prouide nec stationum, quae et ipsae suas quibus dies habeant, quarum ferae et sextae, passive tamen currant, neque sub lege praecepi—cum fides libera in Christo ne Judaismo quidem legi abstinentiam quorumdam ciborum debeat, semel in totum macellum ab Apostolo admissa, detestatorem eorum, qui sicut nabore prohibebant, ita jubeant cibis abstinerse a Deo conditis: et ideo nos (the Montanists) esse jam tune praenotatos in novissimis temporibus abscondentes a fiâ, intendentes spiritus mundi seductoribus, doctrinis mendacilloquorum insanam habentes conscientiam (1 Tim. iv. 1, 2). Sit et cum Galatis nos quoque percuti ait observatores dierum et mensium et annorum (Gal. iv. 10, cf. c. 14: Galactum plane). Jaculantia interea et Esiam pronunciasser: non tale jejunium Dominus elegit, id est, non abstinentiam cibi, sed opera justitiae, quae subtextit (Ps. lvii. 5, 6). Et ipsum Dominum in Evangelio ad omneum circa victum scrupulositateem compendio respondisse, non his coinquinari hominem, quae in os inferuntur, sed quae ex orbe professionat, cum et ipsa manducaret et biberet usque in nationem: Ecco homo vorator et potator (Matt. xii. 19). Sic et Apostolum docere, quod esca nos Deo non commendet: neque abundantes, si edamus, neque deficientes, si non edamus (1 Cor. viii. 8). Comp. Neander's Antiquissimic, S. 273, ff.


3 Tertull. de Jejun., c. 13, comp. § 53, note 33. The bishops sometimes showed themselves ambitious even here. Origines in Matth. Commentariusorum series, § 10: Qui docent etiam abstiner se cibus, et alia hejummodi, ad quae non omnino oportet cogere homines fideles, alligant per verbam expositionis sive osera gravis, citra voluntatem Christi decintis: Jugum neus summe est, et unus meum leve est: et imponentea, quan tum ad verbam sumum, super homeros hominum, curvantes eos et cadere facientes sub pendentes graviam mandatorem eos, qui bejulare et non suferent. Et frequentem videre est, eos qui tali docent, contraria agere sacraminibus suis, etc.

4 Even it would seem, of forty days, in imitation of Jesus. Petri Alex. can. 1.
was progressively and increasingly valued; and there were very many ascetics of both sexes, although they were bound by no irrevocable vow. The Alexandrian distinction of a higher and lower virtue had a special influence in recommending this asceticism. It is true that the renunciation of sensual enjoyments (ἐγκαταλέλειφα), according to Clement of Alexandria, was only the means for attaining to that higher virtue, i.e., to that passionless state (ἀπάθεια) whereby man is made like to God and united to Him; so that whoever has reached this point has no more need of that renunciation of sensual gratification; but afterward, the opinion that the higher virtue must manifest itself especially in external asceticism obtained currency, after the example of Origen, in the Christian school at Alexandria, as well as among the new Platonists. To the high

5 Cf. Cyprianus de Habitu virginitatis; Methodii convivium decem virginitum (in Comenfusa Auctarium novissimum biblioth. Graecorum Patrum. P. i. p. 64, ss.), and the two supposititious letters to virgins that pass under the name of Clement of Rome, which probably appeared about this time, and were first communicated to the public in the Syriac language by Westein N. T. tom. ii. (Mochler, Patrologie, i. 67, declares them genuine.)

6 Cypriani Epist. 62: Quod si (virgines) ex fide se Christo dicerantur, pudicae et castae sine uilia fabula perseverent, et ita postea et stabiles praemium virginitatis exspectarent. Si autem perseverare nolent, vel non possunt melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant. Certe nullum fratrum aut sororum scandalum faciant, etc. Concil. Hilberic. can. 15, is directed against the lustful excesses of the virgins, quas se Deo dicaverant, and consequently does not belong to our present purpose. On the other hand, Conc. Anagyan. can. 19: "Ocous parthenian ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, ἑθεταρν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, τῶν δύμων ὑγρῶν ἐκπληρωτάσσων. Bignamists according to Basili. Ep. can. iv. were subjected to the penance of a year.


10 Tschirner's Fall des Heidentums, i. 435, ff.

11 Origenes in Ep. ad. Rom. lib. iii. (ed. de la Rue, iv. p. 507: Donec quis hoc faciat tantum quo debet, i.e., en quae praecepta sunt, inutilis servus est (according to Luc. xvii. 10). Si autem addas aliquud praeceptum, tunc non iam inutilis servus cris, sed dictatur ad te: Euge serve bone et fidelis (Matt. xxvii. 21). Quid autem sit quod addatur praecepta, et supra debita, filius, Paulus Apostolus dicit: De virginitatem autem praeceptum Domini non habeo: consilium autem do, tamquam misericordiam consecutus a Domino (1 Cor. vii. 25). Hoc opus super praeceptum est. Qui ergo completis praeceptis addiderit etiam hoc, ut virginitatem custodiat, non iam inutilis servus, sed servus bonus et fidelis vocatur. Et itum praeceptum est, ut hic qui Evangelium annuntiare, de Evangelio vivant. Paulus tamen dicit, quia nullo horum usus sum; et ideo non inutilis erat servus,
estimation of celibacy, increased by the cause just mentioned, which sometimes bordered almost upon contempt of the married state,\textsuperscript{12} was attached very naturally the notion of its being especially becoming in priests to renounce the marriage intercourse.\textsuperscript{13} And though no general ecclesiastical law was yet enacted on the subject,\textsuperscript{14} yet as the priests had already been forbidden to marry a second time (§ 53, note 28), a regulation was now made in addition, that they should only keep the woman whom they had married before ordination; while in office itself, they should not marry;\textsuperscript{15} and that the person whom they sededicis et prudens. Euseb. Demonstrat. evang. i. c. 8: Οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ — ὅσα μὲν ἦν τὴν εξίν διαβεβηκάρα πρὸς τὸ τελείον διδασκάλου παράγγελτο, ταῦτα τοὺς ὁλοὺς τε χωρεῖν παρεδόναν — ὅσα δὲ τοῖς ἐπὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐμπλήθα, καὶ θεραπεῖας δεομένοις ἰαμάζεσίν ὑπέλαβασι, ταῦτα συγκατάςες τῇ τῶν πλειώνων οἰκείων — φολάστας παρεδόναν — ὅστε ἐκ τῇ Χριστῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ δόμοι βιῶν ἰενυμοθετηθῆναι τρόποις τῶν μὲν ὑπερηφανίᾳ, καὶ τῆς κοινῆς καὶ ἀνθρώπων πολιτείας ἐπέκειναι, ὁ γάμος, οἱ παιδοφαίοι, οὐδὲ κτῆσιν, οὐδὲ περιοίκες ἐπαρχεῖν παραδεχόμενοι, ὅλος δὲ ὅλον τῆς κοινῆς καὶ συνήθως ἀπαύτων ἄνθρωπος ἀγωγὴς παραλλάγησιν, καὶ μνή τοῦ τούτῳ θεοῦ θεραπείας προσφευκομένων καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἔρωτος σύμακρον. Οἱ δὲ τάδε μετανόης τῶν τρόπων, τῶν ὑπὸτῶν βίων τεθνάναι δοκοῦντες, καὶ αὐτῶν μόνον τὸ σῶμα φέροντες ἐπὶ γῆς, φρονήσασι δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς ὁμούς μετενημενούς, αἱ τίνες θεοί, τῶν τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐρωτευόσι βίων, υπὲρ τῶν παντῶν γένους ἔρωμένοι τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ, οἱ βουλεύησις καὶ ἀίματα,— δύραμα δὲ δρῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐσκέψειας, ψυχῆς τοῦ διαθέσιν καταπελτημένης, καὶ προσέποι τοῦ καθ' ἀρετὴν ἔργος τε καὶ λόγος: οὕς τῷ θεοῖς ἐξελλομένης, τὴν ὑπὲρ σώμα αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν σώματος ἀμαθίας ἀποτελθεὶς ἤρωτισθή. Τούτῳ μὲν οὖν καθηκόντως ὁ ἐνελθὼν τῆς κατὰ τὸν χριστιανὸν πολιτικόν τρόπον. ὁ Θ' ὑπεξιδομένως ἀνθρωπομίστερος, οἶος καὶ γάμους ἐνεπαθοῦντο σῶφροι καὶ παιδοφαίοις. κ. τ. λ.—Καὶ ταῖς τούτῳ δεδομέναις εὐφημίαις ἐπίτευχθη βαθμός, κ. τ. λ.  
\textsuperscript{12} Origens in Num. Hom. vi. (ed. de la Rue, t. ii. p. 388): Ego, licet non usquequaque prounciarem, puto tamen quod sint nonnulla etiam communio hominum gesta, quae quamvis peccato careant, non tamen digna videantur, quibus interesse putemos Spiritum sanctum. Ut verbi gratia dixerim, communist quidem legitima carent quidem peccato, nec tamen tempore illo, quae conjugales notae geruntur, praesentia sancti Spiritus dabitur, etiamsi propheta videatur, qui officio generationis obsecutur: namely, Comm. in Matth. t. xvii. (t. iii. p. 827), εν μολοσίᾳ ποιών ὅτων καὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ των των χριστιανών ἀφορμας.  
\textsuperscript{13} Euseb. Demonstr. evang. i. c. 9: Χρήμα γὰρ, φρονίν τὸν λόγον, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον γεγονόθη μῖας γονικὸς ἀνδρα. πλὴν ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐρωμένων, καὶ περὶ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείαν ἀναγκαίους ἐμφανίσας λοιπον σώμα αὐτῶς προσβλέπει τῆς γαμήξις ὑμείς.  
\textsuperscript{14} It was only the rigid council at Illiberis that ordained, Can. 33: Plurict in toton prohibere episcopios, presbiteros et diaconibus vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinecre se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios: quia, quoniam vero feceritis, ab honore clericatus exterminetur. The meaning is ambiguous, but the true sense is probably this, that conjugal interdict is forbidden bishops, presbyters, and deacons wholly (in toton), and to the inferior clergy as long as they are engaged in the active service of the church. These latter might live together with their wives, can. 65: Si cuxus clericui utor fuerit moechata, et—maritus—non cam statim procebrit, nec in finem accipiat communiones. Examples of married bishops and presbyters, belonging to this period, may be found in Galitius de Conjugio clericorum, ed. Heunke, p. 91.  
\textsuperscript{15} Const. Ap. vi. 17, Canon Aneg. x.: Διάκονοι, ὅσοι καθίστανται, παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν κατάστασιν εἰ ἐκμετάτηντο καὶ ἔφασαν χρισάν χρυσάν, μὴ δύναμαινο ὅσως μέμειν'
had married must have been a virgin. Among ascetics, the dangerous practice arose of taking to themselves virgins for the purpose of living with them in pure spiritual communion, vanquishing all temptations. They called them ἀδελφαί, soresores. Others gave them the appellations συνεσάκτωρ, subintroductae, ἁγαπηταί, extraneae. Against this practice, which prevailed principally among the unmarried clergy, Cyprian first declared himself, and after him several synods.

Hitherto the ascetics had lived scattered among other Christians without external distinction; but the Decian persecution was the cause of some Egyptian Christians fleeing into the desert, and those in solitude giving themselves up to an asceticism in the highest degree extravagant (ἐρημίται, μοναχοί). This new asceticism began to make greater noise when, during Maximin's persecution (311), the hermit Anthony appeared in a wild procession at Alexandria. But a season of persecution was on its way. 


17 So previously among the Gnostics. Irenaeus, i. 1, § 12, says of some Valentinians: 'We met them as in the desert, in secret places, where the sun never shines, in caves, in burial ghettos, in the night, virgin. Perhaps also in the case of Marcion. See Hall. A. L. Z. April, 1832, S. 830. Epiphanius, Haer. 47, c. 3, accuses the Encratites of the same thing. The first trace of it among the Catholics is in Hermas, Pastor, lib. iii. sim. ix. § 11, where the virgins say of Hermes: Nothius dormies ut frater, non ut maritus: frater enim noster es, et de castero tecum habitare parates sumus: valide enim carum te habemus, &c. Tertullian also, de Jejunis, c. 17, appears to blame the catholics for the same reason: Apud te agape in cæsibus fervet, fileas in cælis eact, speas in forculas jacet. Sed major his est agape, quia per hunc adolescentes tuum sororibus dormient (an allusion to 1 Cor. xiii. 13). From the time of Cyprian the thing occurs more frequently. See below, note 19. Those ascetics appealed to the example of Jesus, John, and the apostles (Lib. de Singularitar. cleric. c. 29; Epiph. Haer. 78, c. 11), and named the young women, after 1 Cor. ix. 5, Soresores (Conc. Ancyrt. c. 19, Cod. Theodosi. xvi. 2, 44). Comp. Observationum selectarum, tom. vi. (Halle 1709) p. 230, ss. Dodwell Diss. Cyprian. iii. L. A. Muratori Anecdota graeca, p. 218, ss. Heinichen ad Euseb. H. E. excurs. xiii. t. iii. p. 418, ss.

18 Euseb. vii. 30, 6: Τῶν συνεσάκτων γυναικῶν, ὦ Ἀντιοχεῖ τῷ θυμόνι. Perhaps the pericope, 1 Cor. ix. 5, gave rise to that appellation proceeding from Antonian wit. Perhaps, too, it originated from John xiv. 27; ἔλησεν αὐτῷ εἰς τὰ ἄδια ὑμωμόζω. 19 Cyprian. Epist. 3, 6, especially 64. Can. Ilub. 27, Ancyrt. 19, Nicean. 3. The two Syriac letters falsely attributed to Clement also conserve this abuse (note 5). The latter work, de Singularitate clericorum, in Opp. Cyprian, is directed entirely against the practice.


21 He lived on a rock in the mountain desert at the Red Sea, a day's journey from it. See vita S. Hilarionis by Jerome, Et. Quattuorémère Mémoires géographiques et historiques sur l'Egypte. (Paris, 2 tomes, 1811) i. 152.
cution, which so readily engenders fanaticism, in addition to enthusiasm, was peculiarly adapted to procure approbation even for such oddities. Hence, Antony found imitators; and, since the following time favored such undertakings, in another point of view, he was in the sequel regarded as the father of Monachism. 22

§ 74.

MORAL CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY IN THIS PERIOD.

Though Christian freedom at this time had been fettered only by a few ecclesiastical laws, and the teachers, for the most part, were still able rightly to distinguish the essence of Christian virtue from its forms, yet it can not but be perceived, that germs were already developed in the church, from which its moral corruption afterward arose. The notion of the church's external unity, with its consequences, led men to set too high a value on orthodoxy of the letter, 1 and on external connection with the church. Heretics were universally hated as men wholly corrupt and lost. 2 On the contrary, even an Origen was of opinion that, in the communion and at the intercession of the church, even gross sinners might be accepted of God. 3 To

22 Sozomenus H. E. i. 19, 13. Vita Antonii by Athanasius (either spurious or greatly interpolated, see Ouldini Comm. de scriptor. eccles. ant. vol. i. p. 338).

1 Origenes in Matth. Commentari. series § 33: Et malum quidem est, inuenire aliquem secundum mores vitae errantium, multo autem pejus arbitrare esse in dogmatibus aberrare et non secundum verissimam regulam scripturarum sentire. Quoniam sicut in peccatis mortalibus, puniendi sumus amplius propter dogmata falsa peccantes.

2 Orig. Selecta in Job. ed. de la Rue, p. 301: Καὶ ὁ ἀδερτικὸς ὅταν εὐδοκήσῃ—ὅταν δοξὴ καταστρέψῃ, τότε εἰς τέλος ἀπολείται: ἡ γὰρ εὐχὴ αὐτοῦ λογίζεται αὐτῷ εἰς ἁμαρτίαν. Cyprian. de Unit. eccles.: Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuissent, macula ista nec sanguine abitur. Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est. Comp. the vote at the council of Carthage in the year 236 (in Cypriani Opp. ed Baluz. p. 394, ss.): Lucius a Thebeste: Haereticos blasphematos atque iniquos—exceperas ceense. Vincentius a Thibari: Haereticos scimus esse peores quam ethnicos. Lucius a Rufus: Si potest luci et tenebris convenire, potest nobis et haereticis aliquid esse commune. Heretics are called, Const. Apost. vi. 13: Πένθος ἀγαθὸν, καὶ ψευδοπροφήται, καὶ ψευδοπροφήται, καὶ πάλιν καὶ φθορεῖς, ἀλωτικὴς μερίδις καὶ τιμίων ἀμνών, ὑπερουίας. C. 18: Οἱ διαθέβαντες τὸ ποίμνον, καὶ μαλάνωντες τὴν κληρονομίαν, οἱ δοξολογοῦν καὶ σαμπόλαιροι. Hence it was thought that heretics must have only the worst motives, and be guilty of the worst deeds. This was the source of so many distorted descriptions and fabrications respecting them.

3 Origenes in libr. Jesu Navo, Hom. x. 1, on the narrative of the Gibeonites, Jos. 9:
this was added the error of estimating many virtues as well as errors too much according to external circumstances, since the temptation was easy to confound the ecclesiastical estimate of them, which could only proceed upon the external form of the transactions, with the moral standard. The distinction between a higher and lower virtue did not, indeed, develop for a long time all the germs of corruption which it bore within itself; yet it must even already have perplexed the ideas of morality, since men began to place the higher virtue chiefly in certain external asceticism. As too great value was attributed to this external asceticism, so also the steadfast endurance of persecution for the sake of Christianity was overvalued. Although it is certain that many had worked themselves up to undergo martyrdom, from motives not wholly pure, and although the confessors also were not always morally good men, yet it was a general opinion that by the external fact of suffering, they not only blotted out

Isti ergo veniunt ad Jesum cum omnibus velutatibus suis, et orant ab eo hoc tantum ut salventur. In quorum figura talis aliquis videtur ostendiri. Sunt quidam in Ecclesia credentes quidem et habentes fidem in Deum, et æqueaequentes in omnibus divinis praecipitis: quique etiam erga servos Dei religiosi sunt, et servire iis cupiunt, sed et ad oratum Ecclesiae, vel ministeriorum suis promt praratum sunt, in actibus vero suis et conversatione propria obscenitatis et vitii involuti, nec omnino deponentes veterem hominem cum actibus suis—praeter hoc, quod in Deum credunt, et erga servos Dei, vel Ecclesiae cultum videntur esse devoti, nihil adhibent emendationis vel innovationis in moribus. Iste igitur Jesus Dominus noster salutem quidem concedit, sed quodammodo salus ipsa eorum notam non evadit infamiae. Cf. c. 3. In Matthaeum commentariumseris, c. 129 (ad Matth. xxvii. 15): Illud quaeramus, si tale aliquid fiat et in judicio Dei, ut omnis Ecclesiae petere possit aliquam peccatorum, ut solvatur a condemnatione peccati, maxime autem si quando habeat perditionis caetera opera, ad benefaciendum autem Ecclesiae impiger sit. Tules enim invenies saepe in potentiis constitutos, alias quidem peccatores, tamen pro Christiisuis, quantum possibile ipsis est, multa agentes. Hoc si violentur alieni dignum requisitum, require. Quod autem manifestum est, omnes curare tentemus, ut ex potentiis inventum esse, et in ordine eorum, qui bene vixerunt, magis quam ex illis, pro quibus petitur, quasi pro hominibus mali. Nam etsi concedatur aliquis peccatorum ad preces Ecclesiae, non tamen justam est gloriam et beatitudinem consequi eum, qui hujusmodi est: sufficit enim quod a poena dimittatur.

4 Comp. especially the Canones Illiberitani, de Wette's Geschichte der christl. Sittenlehre. Erste Hâlfte, S. 176, ff.

5 See § 73, note 11.

6 De Wette, l. c. S. 184, ff.


8 Cyprin. de Unk. ecl. : Caeterum namquam in confessoribus fruendas et stupra et adulteria postmodum viderimus, quae nume in quibusdam videntes ingegniciumus et dolemus. Epist. 7, ad Rogatianum precb. et caeteros confessores: Cum quanto enim nonia vestri pudore delinquatur, quando aliquis temulantus et lascivians demoratur, alius in eam patrion ; unde extorius factus est, regreditur, ut apprehensus non jam quasi Christianus sed quasi nocens peraret. Cf. Epist. 6, ad Clerum suum.
their own sins before God, but were likewise able to atone for the sins of others.⁹ Hence, the fanatical self-devotion to martyrdom (proferi) always found admirers,¹⁰ although it was dis-approved by most.¹¹ On the other hand, in times of peace, many attached themselves to the church,¹² allured in part by external advantages, who were internally at a distance from it,¹³ both regarding their relation to it as a thing simply external, and showing themselves lukewarm and indifferent.¹⁴

While we can not overlook these moral defects, we still find

⁹ See above, § 70, note 15, f.
¹² Origines c. Cels. i. p. 53: «To ónome tov Íageo— Hampton thw闻言iaw oivó prwstigma, kai katastolhpov tov Íesou, kai philaðaimwion, kai xurpóstigma, kai Íamefta, en tov μu díw tais biowikó h tina xretia dhnwpomiká ékopoímenos, álall paraçelwménoi nýmayn tivn peri Íeou kai Xrístov kai tis èsámis kréses lýgon.
¹⁴ On the peaceful times before the Diocletian persecution, Eusebius H. E. vii. 1: Ἀλλὰς ἐν' ἄλλοις προστεθέσθηκαν καίγοντας.

⁴ Origenes in Gen. Hom. x. 1: Ubi vel quando vestrum tempus inventam (ad distribuendum in tempore tritici mensuram Luc. xii. 42) ? Plurimum ex hoc, exa paene totam tempus mundanum occupationibus teritis in foro, aliud in negotiatione consumitis: alias agro, alias lascivias vacat, et ad audiendo Dei verbum nemo, aut pauci admodum vacat. Sed quid vos de occupationibus calpo ? Quid de absentibus conqueror ? Presentes etiam et in Ecclesia positi non estis intenti, sed communes ex usu fabulas teritis, verba Dei vellectionibus divinis torga convertit.—Sine intermissione orandum Apostolus praecipit. Vos, qui ad orationes non convenitis, quomodo imploités sine intermissione, quod semper omittitis ?—quid factiunt hi, qui diebus tantum solemnibus ad Ecclesiam conveniunt ? In Num. Hom. xii. 2: Aliquando vestrum ut recti verum audierint, quae leguntur, statim discendunt.—Alii hoc non ipsum quidem patienter expectant, usque quo lectiones in Ecclesia rectentur. Alii vero nec si rectentur, sciant, sed in remotioribus domumque domus locis sacralibus fabulis occupantur. — Hom. xiii. 3: Qua te modo hic praesentes sumus, et sermo Dei tractatur ? Sunt, qui concepient corde, quae lecta sunt, sunt, qui omnino non concepient, quae dicuntur, sed est mens eorum et cor aut in negotiis, aut in actibus saeculis, aut supputationibus luci : et praecipue mulieres quomodo, putas, corde concepient, quae tantum garriunt, quae tantum fabulis obtrectant, ut non simant esse silentium ? Jam quid de mente eorum, quid de corde discussiam, si de infantibus suis, aut de lana cogitent, aut de necessariis domus ?
in the church a living Christianity prevailing, and in consequence thereof, fine moral phenomena which are sought for in vain out of its pale at this period. In particular, that philanthropy which Christianity awakened in its professors, deserves so much the more honorable mention, as it was not confined

15 Origines c. Colsum, i, p. 21: Εἰ δὲ οἱ εὐγενεῖς τοῦτα κατανόηται τῷ, μηδὲν κρείττον ἐν ἁθωμάσιο γενόντως ἀπειθεί· πάορ πλέω τὸ τεκνόν περί τοῦ Ἱεροῦ θαλάσσην ἀποφαίνεται, συνεπετῶς τοίνυν πολλῶν προερχόμενων ἀυτοῦ τῷ λόγῳ ἀφαιτοῦτος βίους μεταγενεστέρως, καὶ κατανόη, ἐν ὄσις μὲν ἀκολογίας, ὄσις δὲ ἀδίκιας καὶ πλεονεκίας ἐκατοτὸν τόντο ἔν, πρίν, ἡ ἐπί Κήλος,—ἀπαντήθησα—ἐξ οὖ ὃ δὲ παρελθόσα τῶν λόγων, τίνα πρόπον γεγονός ἐπιεικέστερον καὶ εὐστάθεστερον; P. 50: Οἱ κατήγοροι τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ οὐδὲ δρούσι, δοῦν πάθε, καὶ δοιν χώροι καταστελλόμεν, καὶ δοσιν ἐφίσι ἡ ἡμερότητα προφάσει τοῦ λόγου.

Arnobius adv. Gentes, i, 4: Nonne vel haec saltam sidem vobis faunat argumenta crescendi, quod jam per omnes terras in tam brevi temporis spatio immensissimi hujus sacramentum diffusa sunt? quod nulla jam natio est tam barbari moris, et musctovidinum neciens, quae non ejus amore verses molliverit aspexitam suum, et in plubicos sensus assumpta tranquillitate mitigaverit? 16

Thus the Roman church, in the middle of the third century, had (Cornelius Ep. Rom. ap. Euseb. vi, 43, 5) χάρις σιν χλημάζομεν ύπὸ τῆς χάλας πεντοκοσάς, εἰς παντοτετουρ αὐτῆς καὶ φιλανθρωπία διατρέξει, and sent help besides even to the churches in Syria, Arabia (see Dionys. Alex. b. Euseb. vii, 5, 1), and Cappadocia (Basil. M. Ep. 70). Comp. above, § 53, note 9. Cyprian in exilie, Ep. 36, ad Clerum: Viduarum inimorum et omnium pauperum curam peto diligenter habeas. Sed et peregrinis, si qui indigentes fuerint, sumptus suggeras de quantitate mea propria, quam sapud Rogaianum compreshyterum nostrum dimisi. Quae quantitas ne forte jam universalis erogata sit, nisi eidem—alia in eundem, ut largiis et promptius circa laborantes fiat operatio. Epist. 60. He sends to the Numidian bishops to ransom the captive brethren from the barbarians, restetia centum milia nummorum, which he had collected in his church. Et optamus quidem nihil tale de caetero fieri:—si tamen—tale aliquid acciderit, soleto cunctari nondum habe nobis litteris vestris, pro certo habentes, ecclesiam nostram et fraternitatem istam universam ne habe ultra fiunt precibus orare, si facta fuerint, libenter et largiter subsidia praestare. Epist. 61, ad Eucharitium, bishop of Thebus, in reference to a converted actor who had been obliged to give up his employment: Quod si illice ecclesia non sufficit ut laborantibus praestet alimenta, paterit se ad nos transferre, et hic quod sibi ad victum atque ad vestitum necessarium fuerit accipere.

17 Comp. Vita S. Cypriani per Pontium Diaec. c. 9, on the conduct of Cyriacus and his church on occasion of a desolating plague: Agregatam primo in loco uno plebeam de misericordia boni institutis. Docem divinae lectionis exemplum, quantum ad promerendam Deum próxim officia pietatis. Tene deinde subjungit, non esse mirabile, si nostris tantum debito caritatis obsequium soferemus: cum perfectum posse ficeri, qui plus aliud publicans vel etiam faceret: qui malum bona vince, et divinae clementiae instar exercerem inimicos quoque dilexerit: qui pro perseverantium se salute, sicuti, Dominus moneret et horatur, oraret. Oriri Deum facit jugiter solem suum, et pluvias subinde nutrienis seminis impetrit, exhibens cuncta ista non sua tantum, sed etiam alios: et qui se Dei etiam flumin esse profectar, cur non exemplum patris miraculatur? Respondere, inquit, nos dect natalibus nostris, et ques reatus per Deum constat, degeneres esse non congruit; sed probare potius in sobole traducem boni patris assumelione bonitate. Cap. 10: Multa alia, et quidem magna praestare. —Quod si illa gentiles pro rostris audire possissent, forsan statim crederent. Quod christianus plebs facet, cui de sde nomen est? Distributa sunt ergo continuo pro qualitate hominum atque ordinum ministeria. Multi qui angustia paupertatis beneficia sumunt exhibere non poterant, plus summis exhibebant, compensantes proprio labore mercedem dividit omnibus cariorem.—Fiebat itaque exuberantium operum
merely to the Christian brethren, but manifested itself in noble traits toward the heathen.

largitate, quod bonum est ad omnes, non ad solos domesticos fidei, etc. Dionysius Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. c. 22, gives a similar account of the conduct of the Alexandrian Christians at the time of a pestilence. Among other things, oi γοῦν πλεῖστοι τῶν ὑδαλφών ἡμῶν δὲ ἀπερβάλλουσαν ἀγάπην καὶ φιλαδελφίαν ύπερθυμίας ἐαντόν καὶ ἄλλων ἐχόμενοι, ἑπεισοδοῦντες ὑπολάκτος τοὺς νοσοῦσας, λεπτοὶς ἐπηρετοῦμενοι, θεραπεύοντες ἐν Χριστῷ, συναπηλάπτοντο ἐκείνοις ὑμενέστατα τοὺ παρ’ ἐτέρων ἀναπιμπλάμαινοι τάθεας, καὶ τὴν νόσου εἰς ἐαντός ἐλκοῦντες ἀπὸ τῶν πλησίων, καὶ ἐκόντες ἀναμασσόμενοι τὰς ἁγγείας.—Τὰ δὲ γε ἐθνῆ πάν τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς καὶ νοσεῖν ἀρχωμένους ἀπεθοῦντο, καὶ ἀπέφευγον τοὺς φιλήτορος, καὶ τὰς ὅδοις ἔβρησσον ἥμεθήτος· καὶ νεκρόις ἀτάφοις ἀπαισοῦβαλάμενοι, τὴν τῶν θανάτου διάδοσαν καὶ κοινωνιὰν ἐκτρεπόμενοι.
SECOND PERIOD.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE BEGINNING OF THE CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING IMAGE WORSHIP. A.D. 324-726.


FIRST DIVISION.


SOURCES.


Farther continuators: Theodorus Lector in Constantinople made extracts from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in two books, and continued the history in two books more till A.D. 518. (Fragments of the continuation have been pre-

Chronicon Paschale (falsely called Alexandrinum) from the creation of the world to 628, ed. Car. du Fresne, Dom. du Cange. Paris, 1688. fol. ad exemplar Vatic. rec. L. Dindor- 


3 According to the opinion which originated with Luc. Holstenius (ed. Bonn. ii. 16), the proper Chron. Pasch. reaches only to 314, while the following part belongs to a later continuator. But even in that first part we find very many allusions to later persons and things, so that it must have suffered a thorough interpolation. For example, the festival of the annunciation is mentioned, i. 373; Chrysostom, and under this very name too, 437; Euthyches, 445; Cyrilinus, 450, etc.
Hieronymi de Viris Illustribus lib. (written 392) and the continuation under the same title by Gennadius (about 495), both in J. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica. Hamb. 1718. fol.

3. Latin chronicles: Jerome translated the Chronicon of Eusebius into Latin, and continued it to 379 (in Eusebii Chron ed. Jos. Scaliger. Ludg. Bat. 1606, and Amstelod. 1658. fol.). After him we have in succession the chronicles of Prosper of Aquitania to 455 (444?), of the Spanish bishop Idatius, to 469, and of Marcellinus Comes, to 534. The contents of these chronicles are arranged according to years, from 379 till 455, and published in Chronica medii aevi post Eusebium atque Hieron. res saec. iv. v. et vi. exponentia, ed. Chr. F. Roessler. t. 1. Tubingae. 1798. 8.


* There are different opinions concerning the historical value of Zosimus’s history. It is very favorably judged by Jo. Lenuclavius (Apologia pro Zosimo in his Romanæ hist. scriptt. minores. Franzof. 1590. fol., reprinted in the edition of Cellarius) and Reitemeier.
FIRST CHAPTER.

STRUGGLE BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM.


§ 75.

THE FAVORS SHOWN TO CHRISTIANITY UNDER CONSTANTINE AND HIS SONS.


Although Constantine, after his victory over Licinius, gave full toleration to all religions,¹ protected the heathen priests in their prerogatives,² reserved to himself the dignity of a pontifex maximus,³ and not till shortly before his death († 337) received the rite of baptism from Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia;⁴ yet he openly professed Christianity immediately after that victory,⁵ seeking to make it more acceptable to his subjects by recommendation and persuasion,⁶ and attractive toward the Christians (disquis. de Zosimo prefixed to his edition): quite unfavorable is the judgment of the older church historians, and of Guil. de Sainte-Croix Observations sur Zosime in his Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, t. 49 (1808), p. 466, ss.

¹ Eusebius de vit. Const. ii. 36, 60.
² Cod. Theod. xii. i. 51, a.d. 335, and xii. v. 2, a.d. 337.
³ See below, § 78, note 2. Constantine appears on many coins with the insignia of the pontifex maximus, see Mionnet de la rarité et du prix des médailles romaines (Paris. 1827. 2 vol. 8.), ii. 236.
⁴ Eusebius de vita Const. iv. c. 61, 62.
⁵ When later heathen asserted (Juliani Caesarea, at the conclusion, Zosimus, ii. 29, Sozomen, i. 5) that a conscience, troubled on account of the murder of his son Crispus, and his wife Fausta, impelled the emperor to Christianity, which was the only religion that promised full forgiveness of sin, even chronology is against the assertion. Comp. MSA's Leben Constantinus d. G. Breslau. 1817. 8. S. 119. Hug's Denkschrift zur Ehrenrettung Constantin d. G. in d. Zeitschrift d. d. Geistlichkeit des Erzbisth. Freiburg. Heft 3, S. 75, ff.
⁶ See his descripts to the oriental provinces in Euseb. de vita Const. ii. 42-43, 48-60. Respecting his speeches in recommendation of Christianity, cf. iv. 29, 32, 55. The one which he wrote, ἄν ἔγραψε τῷ τῶν ἔγγυων συλλόγῳ, is appended to Eusebius's life of him. In it he lays peculiar stress on the prophecies of the Sybil, and the fourth eclogue of Virgil, which he also refers to Christ.
by favors; by engaging with zeal in the erection of many, and in part, splendid churches, and in furnishing them with revenues out of the common fund of the cities. Since paganism continued to prevail in Rome, he transferred the seat of his government to Byzantium, and changed this city into a chiefly Christian New-Rome (afterward Constantinople).

But yet the

Euseb. de vita Const. iv. 28: Ταῦτα δὲ ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καθ' ἐπιρρήχην ἐξαίρετον πλεῖον δεὶς παρεῖχεν· ὅδε μὲν ἄγνως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτοδοσίᾳ, ἐπὶ χορωθῇ πενήντων ἀνδρῶν, παίδων τ' ἥραμαν, κ. τ. λ. Comp. the emperor's direction to the bishops, how they should use the new means put into their hands for the conversion of the heathen, l. c. iii. c. 21: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὡς πρὸς προφῆτα χαρακτικὰ ἐπικαιρότερα· οἱ δὲ τῆς προστασίας ἐπιστρέψειν εἰδὼς· ἀλλὰ τοὺς διαζώονις φιλοσοφομομένους ἀσπαζόμεθα· καὶ ξινοὶς τιμωμένοι ἀγαπῶν ξέροντες· βραχείς δὲ οἱ λόγοι ἰλαφθεὶς ἐρασταί, καὶ σπάνιοι αὐτὸ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἀλοί. Ὑδε πρὸς πάντας ἀρμόστηται δει, λατρεύς ἐκπαίνεν τὸ οἰκεῖον πρὸς σωτηρίαν πειραζόμενον· ὅταν εἰς ἀπαντος τῆς σωτηρίας παρα μας πᾶς δοξάζεται διδασκαλίας.

In this way he himself converted the pagan inhabitants of Heliodoris in Phocaedia, l. c. iii. 58: Προσώπω—ὅπως ἂν πλεῖον προφῆτα τ' λόγον, τὰ πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν τῶν πενήντων ἐκπληκτὰ παρέξει, καὶ ταύτη προφῆτες ἐπὶ τῆς σωτηρίας πειραζόμενος· ἔτειν' εἰς ἀπαντος τῆς σωτηρίας παρα μας πᾶς δοξάζεται διδασκαλίας. Rewards bestowed on the places which declared in favor of Christianity, l. c. iv. 38 and 39.

See his letter to all bishops, Euseb. de vit. Const. ii. 46, in which he directs them, σπουδάζων περὶ τὰ έργα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· καὶ ἐπαρναθοῦσατο τὰ άντα, της μείζων αξίως, ἢ ἐναὶν ψυχικά ἀντα, κανών πολείων. Ἀντικεῖσι δὲ· ἀναμνήσατε παρὰ τὸν ἅγιον σώμα, καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας θάρσεως· τούτοις γὰρ ἐπεστάλθη, πίσε προφήμια ἐξουσιαστεῖσθαι τούτο τῆς θείας ἅμαρτης λεγόμενος. On the receipts to the Præsidivs Prov. see ii. 45.—Churches which Constantine himself caused to be built: one at the holy sepulcher in Jerusalem (τὸ Μαρτέρων· ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναστασιάς, built from 305-335. Euseb. l. c. iii. 25-40; iv. 43-45. Comp. E. F. Wernsdorff Hist. templi Constantinopolitan et propter resurrectiones Christi locum eeluctrum, and de Templi Constantinopolitani in Hebraico, l. c. ii. 50-51, many churches in Constantinople (l. c. 48), especially the church of the Apostles (iv. 58-60). Ci Jo. Chianus de Sacris aedificationibus a Constant. M. ecelctur. Romae. 1693. fol.

Sozomenus, l. c. 8: Ἐκ δὲ τῆς οὔσης ὑποθέσεως γὰρ καθ' ἐκάστης πόλιν ἐξελέαν τῆς ἡμεροςιοῦ βαθινὸν τέλος, τοῖς κατ' ἄριν κακον καὶ λαμπρὸν ἀπενεκόμει, καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν εἰς τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνων κυρίων εἶναι ἐνομοθέτως. v. c. 5: Ἐκ τῶν ἐκάστης πόλεως φόροι τὰ ἁρκότα (shortly before it is called τὰ σημεία, ep. Theodore hist. iv. 4: συναίνετε σίτοι) πρὸς παρακεντὴν ἐπιτηδείᾳ ἀπενέκιν τῶν παραδοχῶν κλάρως. The unfortunate consequences of these measures and the exemption of the clergy, on the state of municipal affairs, are shown by F. Roth de re municipalis Romanorum, lib. ii. Stuttgart. 1801, p. 32, ss. Hegewisch hist. Versuch über d. röm. Finanznen. Allona. 1804. S. 324, ff.

In the year 331 the temple of Concordia was restored by the senate. The erection, also, of several altars happened at this time. Comp. Bougenot Hist. de la destruction du Paganisme, i. 106.

11 Euseb. de vita Const. iii. 48: Τὸν πόλιν· καθαρευθέντοις εἰσωδολατρικὴς ἀτάσης λιθοῦ ὡς μέρος μᾶθε αὐτὴ ἐν αὐτῇ τῶν νομομενῶν θεάς ἀγάλματα ἐν ἱεροὶ χριστοκόμων, ἀλλ' ὡθεὶ βοήμοι λέβας αἰμάτων μαίνομενος, οὐ θυσίας ἀλκαυνεμένων πυρὶ, οὐ δαιμονικῇς εὐρίς, οὐδ' ετερῶν τὶ τῶν συνάξων τοὺς δεινανδρόμειν. Constantine besides beautified his new city with works of art, even with statues of the gods, which were everywhere pillaged and brought together here. The ναός δ' οὗ, with the images of
greater number of the principal families of the kingdom remained pagan still, and hence he was obliged to have many heathen about his person, and in the higher offices of state, although he most readily advanced Christians to posts of honor. The more violent measures of Constantine against paganism were confined to his confiscating in the east many less frequented temples, whose revenues he converted to the use of Christian churches, or the building of Constantinople, and his prohibiting the rites of worship connected with immoralities. The law by which he is said to have interdicted all sacrifices was not at least carried out into operation. After his death he was, according to custom, placed by the senate among the gods.

After the death of Constantine II. († 340) Constantius ruled
the east, and Constans the west. Both declared themselves decided opponents to paganism.\textsuperscript{18} Constans, however, could not proceed very strictly in opposition to it in the west, but had to act with some respect toward Rome in particular, still addicted as it was to the sanctuaries of the ancient religion.\textsuperscript{19} But under these emperors the Christians sometimes forgot the principles of religious toleration on which they had so loudly insisted during former persecutions,\textsuperscript{20} and fanatical voices calling for the violent extinction of paganism were raised among them.\textsuperscript{21} When the whole empire devolved on Constantius after Constans' death († 350), all sacrifices were prohibited for the first time on pain of death.\textsuperscript{22} This law could not, however, be fully

\textsuperscript{18} Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 10, l. 2 (A.D. 341): Cesset superstition, sacrificialorum abolenda in sanitatem. Nam quicumque contra legem divi principis parentis nostri, et hanc nostrae sanctudinis jussuem ausus fuerit sacrificia celebrare, competens in eam vindicta et praesens sententia evideos.

\textsuperscript{19} Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 3, ad Catullium Praef. Urbi (A.D. 349): Quocumque omnis superstitione penitus eremuta sit, tamen volumus, ut sedes templorum, quae extra muros sunt positae, intactae incorruptaque consistant. Nam cum ex nonnullis vel ladorum, vel circensem, vel agnum orbis fuerit exorta, non convenit ca convelli, ex quibus populono Romano praebentur priscarum solenidae volupiam. Abaut 347 an unknown traveler (Vetus Orbis description), ed. J. Gothofredi. 1628, p. 35) found in Rome not only seven Vestal virgins, but the worship of Jupiter, Sol, and the Mater Deum still entire. Comp. Gothofredi, note p. 40, 55. Testimonies respecting the Pagan worship at this time may be derived from inscriptions in Beugnot Hist. de la destruction du Paganisme, i. 154.

\textsuperscript{20} For example Justin. Apol. maj. c. 2, 4, 12. Tertull. ad Scapulam, c. 2. So also as yet even under Constantine, Lactant. Instit. v. 19: Religio cogi non potest: verbis potius quam verberibus res aganda est, ut sit voluntas.Nil est tarn voluntarium, quam religio. C. 20: Non non expectavimus, ut Deum nostrum, qui est omnium, velint nolint, colat aliquid invitas: nec, si non coluerit, irascimur. Epitome, c. 24: Religio sola est, in qua libertas domicilium collucavit. Res est enim praeclarum caeteras voluntaria, nec impion quoque necessitas potest, ut colat-qual quod non vult. Potest aliquid forsitan simulare, non potest vellic.

\textsuperscript{21} Julius Firmicus Maternus lib. de errore profanarum religionum, dedicated to the two emperors, between 340 and 350 (ed. F. Münster. Havn. 1826. 8. p. 118). Among other things it is said: Vobis, sacrificiis Imperatores, ad vindicandum et puniendum hoc malum necessitas imperator, et hoc vobis Dei summi lege praeceperit, ut severitas vestra idololatriae facinus omnium persequatur. Audite et commendate sanctis sensibus vestris, quid de isto facinore Deus juhbet. (Here follows: Deut. xiii. 6-10. Then it is added:) Nec filio jabet parci, nec fratric, et per anamam conjugen gladium vindiciem ducit. Amicum quoque sublimi severitate persequatur, et ad discipenda sacrilegorum corporum omnium populis armatur. Integris etiam civitatis, si in isto fuerint facinore deprehensiae, decernuntur excidia: et ut hoc Providentia Vesta manifestus discent, constitutae legis sententiam proferam, etc.

\textsuperscript{22} Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 4, (A.D. 333): Placuit, omnibus locis atque urbis universis claudi pristinæ tempæ, et accessu vetitis omnibus, licentiam delinquendi perditia abnegari. Volumus etiam, cunctos sacrificia abstinerem. Quodsi quis aliquid forte huynusmodi perpetuaret, gradio ulore sternatur. Facultates etiam perempi fisco decernimus vindicari, et simulitter affilii rectores provinciarum, si facinora vindicare neglexerint. Comp. L. 5, (A.D. 353,)and L. 6, (A.D. 356). However the heathen priesthood were restored in cases of vacancy, xii. 1, 46, (A.D. 358).—A prohibition of the adoption of Judaism, Cod. Th. xvi. 8,
carried out in Rome and Alexandria. Every where else heathenism from this time forward was obliged to conceal itself in the country, in remote corners (hence Pagani. Paganismus). Constantius died in 361.

These violent measures had certainly the effect of opening the eyes of the heathen people to the impotency of their gods and the fraud of their priests; but with nobler patriotic spirits they tended rather to increase the prejudices against Christianity, so partisan as it appeared to be, and favored by measures so unjust. Whatever truth they discovered in it appeared to them to have been already taught by the ancient philosophers. They regarded the positive doctrines of it as barbarian superstitions, while the theological controversies concerning these doctrines brought suspicion on Christianity, and turned its professors into

7, (A.D. 357) : Si quis, leges venerabilis constituta, ex Christiano Judaeus effectus sacrilegis coetibus aggregetur, cum accusatio fuerit comprobata, facultates ejus dominio faci jussumus vindicare.

22 The prefects of the city at this time were heathen. See Rödiger p. 31, s.—Symmachus, lib. x. Ep. 61, (also in Opp. S. Ambrosii, ed. Benedict. t. iii. p. 572. Comp. the remarks of the Benedictine editor) says with reference to the presence of Constantius in Rome in the year 357: Nihil decerpset sacrarum virginum privilegios, decravit nobilissima sacerdotia, Romanis canonicis non negavit impensa, et per omnes vias eternae urbis lactum secutus senatum, vidit placido et dehasto, legit inscripta fastigia deum nominem, percontatus est templarum origines, miratus est conditores. Cumque alias religiones ipsa sequeretur, has servavit imperio. A calendar of the year 354 (in Graevii Thes. antiqua. Rom. viii. 95) gives all the heathen festivals as constantly observed.

28 Especially on account of the spies which now appeared, curiosi, see Valerius ad Ammian. Marc. xv. 3, 8.

The expression is first found in a law of Valentinian, A.D. 368, (Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 2, l. 15,) and about the same time in Marius Victorinus de hæresibus recipiendo (Graeci, quos 'Ελληνας vel Paganos vocant, multos Deos dicunt), and in his comm. in Ep. ad Galatas in A. Majl Script. vett. nova collectio, t. iii. P. ii. p. 29. Under Theodosius this name is the usual one. For the explanation of it see Paulus Orosius (about 416) histor. prael. qui ex locorum agestrism compitibus et pagis pagani vocantur. Prudentius (about 405) has for it: Peristeph. x. 396: pago dediti; in Symmachum, i. 629: pago impliciti, cf. Severii Sancti Endechii (about 400) Carmen de mortibus hominum, v. 105: Signum, quod perhibet esse crucis Dei, magnis qui cotitut solus in aribus. See T. Flav. Clementis Hymn. in Christi sacramentum. Sev. Sancti Rodel. Carmen bacul. de mortibus hominum, ed. F. Piper (Gottingae. 183. 8), p. 83.

26 Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 57: Πάντες δ' οἱ πρὶν δεσδαιμονες, τὸν ἐλέγχον τῆς αὐτῶν πλήθυς αὕτας ὡμιλεῖν ὑμῖν, τῶν θ' ἀπανταχόν νεόν τε καὶ ἱδρυμάτων ἔργω θεσμοί τὰν ἡρμήν, οἱ μὲν τῷ σωτηρίῳ προσέφευγον λόγῳ οἱ δ', εἰ καὶ τούτῳ μὴ ἐπηρτο- τον, τῆς γοννὶ πατρίδος κατεγίνοντον μεταφύτος, ἐγκλήν τε καὶ κατεγέλων τῶν πάλαι νομιζόμενων αὐτοῖς θεῶν.

27 Augustinii Ep. 34 mentions libros beatissimi Papae Ambrosii,—quos adversus nonnullos imperitiissimos et superbissimos, qui de Platonis libris Dominum profiscit contendunt, (de Doctr. christ. ii. 43: qui diceru auft sunt, omnes Domini nostri J. Chr. sententias, quas mirati et praedicare coguntur, de Platonis libris cum didicisse) diligentissime et copiosissime scriptit.
ridicule. On the other hand, paganism gained in this respect, that the ancient classic culture and literature, containing a religious doctrine at once pure and national, seemed chiefly to belong to it and to be intrusted to its keeping. The most celebrated schools of rhetoric and philosophy in Alexandria, Athens, etc., had heathen preceptors. The new platonie philosophy was silently working in favor of paganism, Jamblichus († 333), the great orators Libanius († 395), Himeriuss († 390), and Themistius († 390), were heathen; while there were few Christian scholars who could rival them, like the two Apollinaris in Laodicea in Syria; and these had to struggle with the prejudices against all heathen learning, which were increased by monachism. Thus the most distinguished philosophical orators among the Christians were obliged to receive their education in heathen schools.

Under these circumstances it can not appear strange that we should find most attachment to paganism in the higher ranks; 


29 Libanius in his Apologeticus, ed. Reiske, vol. iii. p. 437, dates from the persecution of heathenism by Constantine τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν λεηρῶν ἐπὶ τόνος λόγους ὑπημίαν.—οἰκεία γὰρ, ὅμως, καὶ συγγενεῖ ταῦτα ἁμόστερα, ἑκτὰ καὶ λόγοι.


21 Euparius in vita Aedesii (in the beginning): Κωνσταντίνος ἐβασιέλει, τα τε τῶν λεηρῶν ἐπιφανεστάτα καταστρέφων, καὶ τὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἄνεγερα, αἰκάματα· τα δὲ ἀματον καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐμπεπτών ἀματον πρὸς μιστηρίωδες τῶν σωτήρων ἀγαθον καὶ εὐθυμον ἐξεμπλήθην ἐπιφάνεις ἔφοιτα καὶ συνεκκλήθη.

22 See an account of them in Dr. A. Westermann's Gesch. d. grie. Beredsamkeit. (Leipzig. 1833,) S. 239.

23 They were for some time excommunicated because they kept up intercourse with the heathen sooths Epphanus, and had been present when he read a hymn to Bacchus. (Socrates, ii. 46. Sozom. vi. 25.)

24 Comp. the steadfastness of Aristophanes in heathenism, Libani Orat. pro Arist. ed. Reiske, vol. i. p. 447, s. Hence the rhetorician Victorinus did not venture at first to make his conversion public: Augustini Confess. viii. 3: Idolis sacrisque sacrilegis tum publica nobilitas inflata inspirabat populos. 4: Amicos suos reverebatur offendere superhos daemonicos, quorum ex culmine babylonicae dignitatis, quasi ex eedris.
or that we should hear even from Christian writers, that among the great numbers which certainly passed over to Christianity at this time, the majority were unfortunately led to that step merely by external considerations. Others, on the contrary, waved between the old and new religion, hoping to find the truth between. From this tendency even new sects sprang up, of which the Massalians (Euchites, Euphemites, theosebeis) in Phoenicia and Palestine, and the Hypsistarii in Cappadocia, Libani, quas nondum contriverat Dominas, gravitor rurituras in se inimicitias arbitrar.
of nearly the same sentiments, appeared in the first half of the fourth century. Toward the end of the same century, the Caecilolae in Africa arose. None of these parties, however, attained to much importance or continued long.

§ 76.

JULIAN THE APOSTATE.


The injustice which Julian had to endure from the first Christian emperors, the strict education by which Christianity was attempted to be forced upon him, and his early private acquaintance with new-platonic philosophers, especially Maximus, had early disposed him toward heathenism, whose dead forms he saw animated with so much life by the new-platonists. When he attained to the imperial dignity (361), he declared himself


28 There are two laws of Honorius against them, Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 5, l. 13, a.d. 408 (Caecilolae, qui nescio cajus dogmatis novi conventus habent), and lib. xvi. tit. 8, l. 19, a.d. 409. Comp. Gothofredus on the last law, and J. A. Schmid Hist. Caecilolorum. Helmst. 1704.

1 Henke de theologis Juliani diss. 1777 (reprinted in his Opusc. academ. Lips. 1803, p. 353, sqq.).
openly in favor of the ancient national religion, to which he endeavored to impart a more liberal and religious form, even by introducing many practices borrowed from Christianity,\(^2\) while he himself thought that he was only restoring the worship of the gods to its original purity, and practiced it with greater zeal.\(^3\) He took away their privileges from the Christians,\(^4\) and forbade them to appear as public teachers of the national literature;\(^5\) but he promised them full toleration in other respects. He was guilty, however, of many acts of injustice toward them, often, it is true, provoked by their intemperate zeal.\(^6\) But they

---


\(^3\) In a manner too zealous even for cultivated heathens, Ammianus Marcellin. xxv. 4: Præsagitorum seclitiatione nimiae deditis—superstitiosus magis, quam sacrum legitimus observator, multo minor associationes pecudes maestas, ut sustinacetur, si revertisset de Parthis, series jacta desaturas.

\(^4\) The law concerning the restoration of possessions held in the cities has strangely enough found its way into the Cod. Theol. lib. x. tit. 3, 1, 1. Cf. Sozom. v. 55.

\(^5\) Juliani Epist. 49: Ἀτοντος εἰναι μοι φανεῖται ὀδολοῦχον, ἐπὶ μού νομολόγημι εἰ ἔχων ἀνθρώπον, ὅσον μοι φανεῖται ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὅσον μοι νομολόγημι εἰ ἐνενθάδε οὐ πάντας, οὐ δὲ ἐνενθάδε οὐκ ἔφθασεν, καὶ ἐν ὅσαρ προσηλθὲν καθότερον, ἵπποιστον αὐτῶν πρώτων τῶν ἄλλων ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐν τῷ τούτῳ ἐκπεπλησθέντων. ἐν τῆς τοις κακοῖς ὑπολειμμάσιν πετυμένης, πεπλησθέντων ἐν τῶν τῶν ἐπικρατεῖς ἔκκρισεις, ἐγερθομένοις Ματθαίῳ καὶ Δοκήν, κ. τ. λ. Sozomen. ix. 12, 16. Sozomenus, v. 18. Ammianus Marcellin. xxv. 10: Illud autem erat indecum, absque modera perennis silentio, quod acerbat docere magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos, pulchrum ciuitati curuerat. (cf. xxv. 4). The sacred national literature appeared to him to be profaned by the contradictory and scolding Christian interpretation. But there is no ground in this to attribute to him the design of degrading the Christians into a state of ignorance, as has been frequently done by writers. For there were so few Christian grammarians, on account of the prejudices with which they had to contend among their brethren of the same faith (see § 75, note 57), that Christians had almost their only opportunity of studying the ancient literature under heathen preceptors, a thing which they might yet do without prohibition. In the meantime, however, some Christian authors, especially the two Apollinaris, and Gregory of Nazianzum, were led by that prohibition to attempt imitations of heathen works in poetry and eloquence with biblical materials, Socrat. iii. 16. Sozom. v. 18.

\(^6\) Juliani Ep. 53, ad Bostrenos, concerning the Christian bishops: Ὅτι μὴ τυπανεῖν
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had still more to suffer from the heathen governors and people. Hence it was natural that many who had hitherto been Christian professors for the sake of external advantages, should now go back to heathenism from the same motives. The Jewish religion was respected by Julian as an ancient national faith; and on his march against the Persians, he even gave permission for the temple at Jerusalem to be rebuilt, though it was soon after destroyed. On this same expedition he composed in Antioch, where he bore the scoffs of the Christian populace with philosophical indifference, his work against Christianity. Soon after this he was killed in a battle with the Persians (363).

έξεστιν αὐτοῖς—παροσχένοιμοι πάντα κινοῦσι λίθον, καὶ συνταράτσιν τῷ μόνῳ τῷ πλήθε, καὶ σταυρίζεις.—Οὗτοι γὰρ αὐτῶν ἄκοντα πρὸς βιωμὸς ἔκεισεν ἐκεῖνοι διὰ βρόχον ἃ αὐτοίς προσαγορεύομεν, εἶ τις ἐκών χρυσίῳς καὶ σπανίων ἡμῖν ἔθελε καυσώνει, καθερίσας προσφέρεσθαι πρῶτον, καὶ τοὺς ἀπονεκρούσις ἵετεῖ εἰς θεόν.—Τὰ γὰρ πλῆθη τῷ παρὰ τῶν λεγομένων Κλεομένον ζηγωταμένα πρόβλον ὧν ταύτης ὁμοφράξεις σταυρίζει τῆς ἱδέας. Οἱ γὰρ εἰς τὸ τοῦτο τετωμαχηκότες—παθόντες δὲ τὴν προτέραν δυναστείαν, ὦτα διὰ καταλύουσάν τις καὶ καὶ ἀντίστοις ὀφθαλμῶις κλήρους, καὶ τῷ πάντα ἑαυτοῖς προσνέμει, πάντα κίνωσι ἀκρομᾶς κάλλως—εἰς δυστατος ἱδέας τῷ πλῆθε.


The reign of Jovian († 364) was in so critical times that he found it advisable to allow full freedom to all religions, although he himself was a zealous Christian. But this very disposition of the emperor encouraged the Christians in many places not only to demand restitution for injuries actually suffered under the preceding reign, but also to exhibit their hatred against the pagans, which had been increased by Julian’s measures. The legal toleration of all religions also continued under the following emperors, Valentinian I. (in the west † 375), and Valens (in the east † 378), although they forbade bloody sacrifices; in like manner, in the first years of the emperors Gratian and Valentinian II. in the west, and Theodosius in the east, till the year 381; while the continued irritations of barbarous nations and internal commotions compelled them to avoid every thing by which disturbances might have been increased still more.

1 Themistii Oratio consularis ad Jovianum, ed. Petav. p. 278; Tá te ἄλλα αὐτοκράτωρ ἐν ταῖς καὶ εἰς τάς ἐκκάσιας μέρος ἀπαντός εἶναι νομοθετεῖς: καὶ τούτῳ ξηλών τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τὸ μὲν ἔχειν πρὸς εὐσεβείαν ἐπιτηδεύω, τῆς ψέεις δὲ κοινῶν ἔκαθε τῆς ἄνθρωπος: τὸν τρόπον δὲ τῆς θεραπείας ἐξῆκε τῆς ἐν κάστῳ βουλήσεως.

2 He restored all rights to the churches and clergy, Saxon. vi. 3, also the εὔφαντος τοῦ σιταν (comp. § 63, note 9, § 76, note 4), but by way of preliminary only the third part, on account of a famine. Theodor. iv. 4.

3 To this refers Libanius Epitaph. in Julianum ed. Reiske, vol. i. p. 619. The shutting up of the temples, and the withdrawal of the priests and philosophers, of which Socrates, iii. 24, speaks, was the consequence of fear.


5 Themistii Oratio ad Valentinum de religiis, known only in the Latin translation of Andreas Dunlothius (ed. Petav. p. 499), with the similar contents of the Orat. ad Jovian. (note 1).

§ 78.

SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM BY THEODOSIUS.

After Theodosius had secured the east against the Goths, he directed his greatest energies to the suppression of paganism. In the same year in which he summoned the second ecumenical synod at Constantinople (381), he forbade apostasy to paganism, but still allowed the other rites of heathen worship to be practiced except sacrifice. The two emperors of the west followed his example. Gratian laid aside the dignity of pontifex maximus, commanded the altar of Victoria to be removed from the senate-house, and took away all privileges from the pagan worship, although he was obliged to allow in Rome the sacrifices elsewhere forbidden, as Theodosius had to do at Alexan-

1 Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 7. l. 1: His, qui ex Christianis Pagani facti sunt, eripiatur facultas iuxta testandi. Omne defuncti, si quid est, testamentum, submotis conditione, resedatur. Gratian and Valentinian made the same regulation in the west. L. 3 (382).

-Lib. xvi. tit. 10. l. 1 (381): Si qui vetus sacrificiis, diurna noxturnaque, velut vesanus se sacrilagas incertorum consultor (animum) imiserit, haecumque abit aut templum ad hujusmodi sceleris excusationem assumendum crediderit, vel putaverit ademandum, prescriptio se noverit subjugandum, cum nos justa institutione monamus, castis Deum precibus excolendum, non diris carminibus profanandum.

2 According to Zosimus, iv. c. 36, who alone speaks of the circumstance, he might have refused it as soon as it fell to him, that is, after the death of Valens (for only the first Augustus was pontifex maximus). This supposition, however, is contradicted by the fact that Gratian bore the same title for some time. See Autonius Gratianum actio pro consalatu, and the inscriptions in Orelli Inscriptionum Latinarum amplissima collectio, vol. i. p. 245. The usual assumption that Gratian merely declined the priestly dress offered to him, but yet bore the title, is arbitrary; for Zosimus speaks in express terms of the refusal of the dress and of the title. Hence, it must be maintained that Gratian wore that dignity for some years, and then laid it aside. J. A. Bosius de pontificatu maximo Immp. praecipue christianorum, in Graevi Theessar. antiquit. Rom. t. v. p. 271, ss. De la Bastie du souverain pontifcat des empereurs Romains in the Mémoires de l’Acad. des Insr. t. xv. p. 72, ss. Jos. Eckhel Doctr. numer. vett. P. ii. vol. 8. p. 386, ss. Birger Thorlacius de Imp. Rom., qui religioni Christi zonen dederunt, pontificatu maximo. Havn. 1811.

3 He took away Vestalium virginam praecogitam, Sacerdotii immunitatem (which Valentinian I. had confirmed even in 371, Cod. Theod. xii. i. 75) caused the real estates belonging to the temples (agros virginibus et ministeriis deficientium volantate legatos) to be drawn into the exchequer (cf. Theod. xvi. 10, 20), and deprived the vestal virgins and priests of victum modicum justaque privilegia. Symmachus, lib. x. Ep. 61. Ambros. Ep. 17
dria. In Rome, paganism continued to be predominant, particularly among families of distinction, but yet the attempts made by the prefect of the city, Q. Aurelius Symmachus, to have these imperial decrees abolished, and in particular the altar of Victoria re-erected, had no influence upon Gratian († 383), Valentinian II., and Theodosius. In the east, the Christians proceeded far beyond the imperial ordinances. Enterprising bishops led mobs of hirelings or fanatics against the temples, and the monks especially often combined for the destruction of all heathen sanctuaries. The appeal ἡπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν (388–


5 According to Hieronymus in Epist. ad Gal. iv. 3, the Romans were omnium superstitionum sentinent. Respect the heads of Paganism at Rome, Prætextatus, Symmachus, Flavianus, Caecina Albinius, etc., who are introduced speaking in the Saturnalia of Macrobius, see Alph. Mahul sur la vie et les ouvrages de Macrobo in the Classical Journal, xxxi. 81. Beugnot, i. 438.

6 Two embassies, with Symmachus at the head, the first in 382 to Gratian, the second in 384 to Valentinian II. See Symmachus Epist. lib. x. Ep. 61. On the other side, Ambrosii Epist. 17 and 18, ad Valentinianum. Respecting the two later equally fruitless embassies, the one to Theodosius, when he was staying at Milan, the other to Valentinian, see Ambros. Ep. 57, ad Eugenium. Beugnot, i. 410.

7 So Eugenius, bishop of Edessa (see Libanius pro templis, ed. Reisle. o, vol. ii. p. 192, ss. Gothodunus ad Cod. Thod. xvi. 10, 8), Marcellus, bishop of Arpenna (Sozom. vii. 15. Theodoret. v. 21); but particularly Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria. See below, note 12. Rüdiger, i. c. p. 58, ss.

8 Libanius ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν (ed. Reiske, vol. ii. p. 164): Σύρεν ενοι οὖν ἐσθε κακελεύθαν (κακελεύθαν), αὕτη μηδένα προσεξέναι: αὕτη πώς, αὕτη λιβανιμον, αὕτη τάς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλῶν θυματάτων τιμής ἐξέβλασας τῶν νεοῦ, αὕτη τῶν βωμῶν. οὐ θείας μεταμορφοῦστε οὕτως καὶ πείλω μεν τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἐρήμωστε, αὖθις δέ παράρχοντες τῷ πλῆθος τῶν ἐκκλησίων τότε διὶ σαμαρίτινος αὐτῶν παρεκμάαι τῷ πάθει, συγκρόστοιτε δέ τάτα ἑρμηνεύτητε τῇ διᾷ τέχνῃ αὐτῶς πεπορνημένος, μένουσας, ὡς βασιλεία, καὶ κραυγάντως τῷ νόμῳ, θεωρισάτων εὗρη ἱερά, ἥξιλα φέρετος καὶ λήνος καὶ σιδήρων, οὐ δὲ καὶ ἁκνείς τῶντα, χεῖρας καὶ πόδας ἕπειτα Μεσον λεία καθαρομενάντων ὁροφών, κατασκαπτομένων τόξων, κατασπακτόμενων ἀγαλμάτων, ἀνάπτωμεν βωμῶν. τοῖς ἱερεῖς δὲ ἡ σιγή, ἡ τιθάναι δει. τῶν πρῶτων δὲ κείμενων, ὁδῷ ἔποι τὰ δεήται, καὶ τρόπαια τρίπολες έναντία τῷ νόμῳ συνειρεῖται. πολλάτα τοῦν καὶ ταῖς πάλαις, τὸ πολύ δε ἐν τούς ἄγροις. Ρ. 168. Ἑστὶ δὲ οὗτος ὁ σκέλος τόρος τῶν μὲν τῶν ναις ἔκκεμενων, τῶνδέ τα ὄντα τῶν ταλαιπώρων (γενότατος) ἐφαρμοζότων, τὰ το κείμεν οὕτως ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπέρχοντο, ὡς ἀπερχόμενος φέροτης οἱ ἐπελθόντες τῶν ἐκκλησίων οἵτων. τοῖς δὲ οὖν ἁρκεῖ τάτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ γίνο ἑτεροτίμιαι, τῷ τῶν δέσιν ἱερῶν εἶναι λέγοντες καὶ πολλοί τῶν πατριών ἐφερράνται δι’ ἀρχοντος οἰκ. ἀλεξίθης. οὐ δὲ τῷ τέρμῳ τροφάσα κακώ, οὐ τῷ πείνῃ, ὡς φασί, τῶν αὐτῶν θεοποιήσεις θεῶν. ἢ μὲν ἐκ πεπορνημένου παρὰ τῷ εν ἄστει ποιήμα (καλοῦν γὰρ οὕτως ἄνδρα ὑπὲρ πάνω χρηστῶν), ὃν μὲν ἐλθόντες ἀδέρφων, λέγοντες ο ἑλπισμέν, ὅ ποιμεν οὕτως τοῖς μὲν ἐφήσεις, τοῖς δὲ ἀπῆλθαν, ὡς ἐν τῇ μὴ μείζον
390) of the eloquent Libanius, addressed to Theodosius, had no effect; the heathen were immediately afterward forbidden by imperial laws even to repair to the temples; and the destruction of the splendid temple of Serapis 391) by the violent Theophilius, bishop of Alexandria, after a bloody contest, announced the total overthrow of paganism in the east.

When Theodosius had become sole master of the entire Roman empire after the death of Valentinian II. († 392), he forbade all kinds of idolatry by the most severe punishments (392); and during his abode at Rome (394) he brought pub-

11 Valentinian's law for the west, of the 27th February, 391. Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 10: Nemo se hostias pollut, nemo insonem victimam caedat, nemo delubra adeant, templum perdurat, et mortali opere formata simulacra suscipiat. Judices quoque hanc formam continant, ut si quis—templum uspam—adoratur intraverit, quindecim paedo auri ipse protinus inferre cogatur. The same was decreed for the east by Theodosius, L. 11, 17th June, 391.

12 Socrates, v. 16. Sozom. vii. 15. Theodoret. v. 22. Eunapius in vita Aedesii, ed. Schotti, p. 63, ss. Zosimus, v. 23, especially Rufinus, who was at that time in Palestine, Hist. eccl. xi. 22–30. Many impositions of the priests were hereby detected, Theodor. l. c., Rufinus, l. c. 23–25. The heathens were particularly and deeply impressed by the circumstance that the expectation, quod si humana manus simulacrum filio (Serapis) contingisset, terra deliscens illico solveretur in chaos, caecamque repente recta in præcess (Rufin. l. c. 23), had not been fulfilled at the destruction of the statue, and the fear which still remained, Serapin injuriae memorem aquas ultra et afflictiam solitam non largitum (Rufin. l. c. 30, cf. Libanius, above, note 4), was contradicted by an ample inundation of the Nile.

13 Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 12. Impr. Theodosius, Arcadius et Honorius AA. ad Rufinum, Pf. P.: Nullus omnino, ex quolibet genere, ordine hominum, dignitatum, vel in postestate positus, vel honorum perfactus, sive potens sorte nascenda, seu humilis genere, conditione, fortuna, in nullo pontico loco, in nulla urbe, sensum carens simulacrum vel insanem victimam caedat, vel secretiorem piaculo larem igne, mero genium, penates nihil veneratur, accendat lumina, imponent tanta terræ sustentat. § 1. Quodat quispam immolare hostiam sacrificialis adebit, aut sprotand taga consule, ad exemplum majestatis reus licita cunctis accusatione delatas, excipiat sententiam competentem, etiam si nihil contra salutem principium, aut de salute quaesieri. Sufficit enim in crimini molem, naturae ipsius logos velis rescindere, illicita perscrutari, occulta recludere, interdicta tentare, finem quaerere saeclis alienas, spem alieni interiæ polliceri. § 2. Si quis vero mortales opere facta et omum passura simulacra imposito thure veneratur, ac, ridiculo exemplo metus subito, quae ipsa simulacror, vel redimita vittis arbore, vel erecta offensae ara coepitibus varnas imagines, humiliori licet muneris praemi, tamen plena religiosis injuria honore tentaverit, is, utpote violatae religiosis reus, ea domo sua possessione multatur, in quæ eum gentilitia constiterit superstitione simulabatur. Namque omnia loca, quae thursis constiterit vapore fumasse (si tamen ea in jure suisse thurificantium probabatur), fisco
lic sacrifices to an end by interdicting the defraying of them out of the imperial treasury. At that time, he even called upon the senate to declare themselves in favor of Christianity; but the slavish tokens of subjection with which they responded to him had so little serious consequence, that even heathen honors were offered to this zealous Christian emperor after his death.\(^\text{15}\)

\section*{§ 79.}

**Total Suppression of Paganism in the East—Its Struggle in the West After Theodosius.**

Rüdiger, I. c. p. 70, ss. Bengnot, I. c. ii. 1, ss.

Paganism was at present only an external ceremonial, which retained its hold upon a few noble spirits with a feeling of pa-nostro associanda consensum. \(^\text{3}\) Sin vero in templo fanisve publicis, aut in aeribus agrisve alienis talis quasiam sacrificandi genus exercere tentaveris, si ignorance domino usurpata constituerit, xxx. librarum auri mulcetae nomine cogetur inferro, convivem vel vero haec sceleri par ac sacrificiis poena retinebat. \(^\text{4}\) Quod quidem ita per judices ac defensores et curiales singularum urbiunm volumus custodiri, ut illico per hos comperta in judicium deferuntur, per illos delata plectantur. Si quid autem iili tegendum gratia, aut incursa praeternuntendum esse crediderint, commotioni judicilariae subjacuint. Illi vero moniti si vindicant dissimulatione distulerint, xxx. librarum auri dispersio multabuntur, officiis quoque eorum damno parili subjungundis. Dat. vi. Id. Nov. Constantinopolis, Arcadia. A. II. et Rufino Cosz.

\(^\text{14}\) Comp. the narrative Prudent. in Symmachum, i. 403, ss. Especially from 699, ss.: Adepsica, quam pleno subcellia nostra senata Decerant, inane Jovis pulvaria et omne Idolium longe purgata ex urbe fugandum: Qua vocat egregri sententia principis, illius Libera tum pedibus, tum corde frequentia transit.

A different account, and one more accordant with later phenomena, is given by Zosimus, iv. 59. In his representation of the effect of Theodosius's discourse in the senate: Μηδενω δε τη παρακλησει πεισθητος, μη δη θλημαν των αφ' ουπρη πολις ιωσια ραπαδομενων αυτως πατων αναρμες, και προαπιθαι τωτων ελλογων συγκαταθεν (εκτων μεν γιαν ανλαξιον η δη δικαιους και κιλιως σχεδου η ηετες απροθεν τη πολην ελειν: Εσται δε αντι των άλλαξοντων τη δηρησιμουν άγανεων) τητε δε ο Θεοδοσιος βαρυνσεια το δηρευαν ελεγη τη περα τα λεπα και της θυσιας δεπανν, βολεσθαι τε ταυτα περιελειν, κ. τ. λ. (That is to say, the usurper Eugenius had given back again the legacies of the heathen sanctuaries (see note 3) which had been confiscated by Gratian. See Ambros. Ep. 57, ad Eugenium). The consequence, Zosim. v. 38: Οτε Θεοδοσιος δε προσβλησ· την Ελεγνη κοθλην τυραννιδα, την Ρωμην κατελαβα, και της λεσες άγιατας ενουριστης πασιν δελογριαν, την δημοσιαν δοσην τοις λεσες χορηγην άρσησην, απηλαιαντον μεν λεσες και ιερειας, κατελιμπανευ δε πασις ιερογυιας τα τεμπλα.

\(^\text{15}\) Bengnot, i. 487. Hence the heathen poet, Claudianus de tortio Consulatu Honorii, v. 162, ss., who lived at this time, represents the death of the emperor as an ascent to the gods.
triotsion; but with the mass it was kept up merely from unreflecting custom or superstitious fear. With almost all, however, its ancient doctrine was obliged to sink under the pressure of new ideas. 1 Hence the victory of Christianity over paganism internally dead, could not be matter of doubt; 2 although the former often carried on the contest more by external means than by its inward power. 3 Many heathen could not resist

1 Oratius Hist. vi. 1: Deum quilibet hominum contemnere ad tempus potest, nescire in toto non potest. Unde quidam, dum in multis Deum credunt, multos Deus indiscereto timore finxerunt. Sed hinc jam vel maxime, cum auctoritate veritatis operante, tam ipsa etiam ratione discutientur, dicatur: sed et philosophorum sciam quum Deus omnium reppererit, quod in omnibus testimonium verborum Dei et Dei magni et ministeria Dei magni. The heathen grammarian, Maximus of Madaura, writes to Augustine (August. Ep. 43): Olympum montem Deorum esse habitacionem, sub incerta fide Graecia fabulatur. At vero nostrae orbis forum salutarium numinum frequentia possit esse in omnibus et probum. Equidem unum esse Deum sumnum sine initio, sine prole, naturae patre, aum patrem magnum atque magnificum, quis tam demum, tam mente captus neget esse certissimum? Hujus nos virtutes per mundum omnes diffusses multas voces innumeratis, quoniam nomen ejus non est nostrum, proprium velidel est, ignoramus. Nam Deus omnium religiosius communio nomen est. Ita sit, ut, dum ejus quasi quaedam membra carptin variis supplicationibus prosique, totum coloris proctum videamus. No one could endure that the Christian martyrs should be preferred to these deities, who consciently nefandorum facinorum, specie gloriosa mortis, dignum moribus festisce suis exitum malucati perierunt. Sed illi hab tempus, occasionem, tempus, etiam maxime in Romano Deos adsunt tela vibrae, minimo duratura. InMacrobi (about 410) Saturnali. i. 17. A Praetextatus (comp. § 78, note 6) declares the sun to be the one supreme God. Si enim sol, ut veteribus placuit, dux et moderator est omnium religiosis, et solus stellis errantibus praestat; ipsa vero stellarum summa ordinem rerum humanarum—pro potestate disponunt:—necesse est, ut solem, qui moderator nostra moderate, omnium, quo circa nos geruntur, fatacecum aniciorem. Et sicut Maro, cum de una Jumone diceret, Quo nuncine laeso, ostendit, unus Dei efficius varios variis consensos esse numinis; ita diversae virtutes solis nominat Diis dederunt; unde illi tamen sapienter principes prodierunt.

2 Chrysostomus de S. Babyla contra Julianum et gentiles § 3. (Opp. ed. Montf. ii. 540), 'Tn' eledes evnochelitio podi tis 'Elylunrini deudamnoniai ón pláni u' óe evnth elqesin, kai per éwnti diépeis, kathérn twn soxónto twn tchthán paradoxbnta makh, kai melèon aéla báléontov aútema fídeveita, kai dievicolnta kátnta mkrón lófìeita.'

the external advantages presented by it. Few were ready to suffer for their religion. But it is true, that in this manner also the number of merely external Christians was increased—men who still entertained heathen modes of thought and disposition; and the value of Christianity was by no means so generally manifested in the practices of its confessors as before.

In the empire of the east (Arcadius, 395–408, Theodosius II. till 450), which was less disturbed from without, the ordinances of Theodosius against paganism could be strictly enforced. Crowds of monks were sent about through the provinces with full power from the emperors, for the purpose of destroying all traces of idolatry. Even misdeeds and murders were allowed to pass unheeded by the emperors; such as the horrible murder of the female philosopher Hypatia in Alexandria (416). The new-platonic philosophers at Athens, and among them even the celebrated Proclus († 485), were forced to conceal themselves most carefully, because they rejected Christianity. As early as

---

6 Augustini Enarr. in Psalm. cxxi. § 20: Quis corum comprehendens est in sacrificio, cum his legibus ista prohiberentur, et non negavit? Quis corum comprehendens est adorare idolum, et ut clamavit, non fecit, et timuit ne convincentur? Tales ministros Didobus habebat. He then contrasts with them the steadfastness of the Christian martyrs. Chrysostom de S. Babyla, § 7, says of the heathen priests, μάλλον δεσπότων καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν βασιλείων βεβαίως, and describes the neglected state in which the temples, altars, and images of the gods were, in consequence, under Christian emperors.

7 Thus Augustinus Enarr. in Psalm. xxv. § 14, makes a heathen reply: Quid mihi persuadeas ut Christianum sit? Ego fraudem a Christiano passus sum, et nunquam feci: falsum mihi juravit Christianus, et ego nunquam. Chrysostom. in 1 Epist. ad Tim. Hom. x. § 3. (Opp. xi. 602) : Οὐδεὶς ἂν ἂν Ἦλθην, εἰ ημεῖς ὑμεῖς ἐκεῖνοι, ὡς ἐκι—Οὐδεὶς πρόσειν. οἱ γὰρ διδασκόμενοι πρὸς τὴν τῶν διδασκάλων ἀρέτην ὥραι. καὶ ὅταν ἠλθέται καὶ ἠρέτας αὐτῶν ἐπιβιβασθήσατο, τὸν ὅρκην, τὸν τιμήθην, πῶς ἐνεργοῦμεν ἐκεῖνοι τῶν Χριστιανῶν; ὦ ὅρκης βίως ἐπληρώμενος, φυσική γνώσις, κ. θ. λ.

8 Cod. Theod. xvi. 10, 13, ss. By L. 14 their privileges were taken from the priests.


423, all visible traces of paganism had disappeared in the east.\footnote{10}

It was otherwise in the west, notwithstanding the want of all living attachment to paganism in this quarter of the world also. So little hold had it on the minds of the people, that even in Rome, its continued center, where many families of note were still heathen, and many of the highest places were still occupied by heathen,\footnote{11} sacrifices were totally discontinued, after the cost of public oblations had ceased to be defrayed by the state. Under the feeble reign of Honorius (395–423), the earlier laws against paganism still remained in force, and were even increased by the addition of several new enactments; but the emperor was obliged at times to limit their operation,\footnote{12} to acknowledge heathen priesthood as public offices,\footnote{13} and to put a check to the destruction of temples,\footnote{14} for the sake of preserving some degree of tranquillity. The struggle, however, between Christianity and paganism often proceeded here and there to acts of violence, in which the one party prevailed at one time, the other at another.\footnote{15}

As the heathen had always been accustomed to

\footnotesize
\footnote{10} Theodosius II. in Cod. Theodos. xvi. 10, 22. (A.D. 423) : Paganos, qui supersunt, quaequam jam nullos esse credamus, prominulgamur legum jamnudam praecepta compescant.

\footnote{11} Thus Florentinus, A.D. 397, and Flavianus, 399, were Praef. urbis, Valerius Messala, 396, Praef. praet. Italiae, Atticus Consul, 397 (Beugnot, ii. 6). Praefecti urbis were Rufilius Numatianus, A.D. 413, Albinius, 414, Symmachus, 418 : Praef. praet. Ital. 429 Volusianus (l. c. p. 127).

\footnote{12} Honorius had issued, in the year 408, the law Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 42 : Eos qui Catholicae sectae sunt hinnici, intra palatium militare prohibemos. Nullus nobis sit aliqua ratione conjunctus, qui a nobis fide et religione diacordat. But when he afterward wished to nominate the heathen Generidus commander in Rhoetia, the latter did not undertake the office eis eis a diies, idioi te oimai kai khrisem synwolemenos, epamanov elai tas ton vemos, apoidev ekwto, tis asto vnti baxe, orchev te kai stratevexa. Zosimus, v. 46.

\footnote{13} Cod. Theod. xii. i. 166 ad Pompejanum Procons. Africinum, A.D. 400.

\footnote{14} The African bishops resolved at the Concil. Africanum, A.D. 399, to make the following propositions to the emperors, Can. 23 (Cod. Ecl. Afric. c. 58. Mansi, iii. p. 766) : Ut reliquias idolorum per totum Africanum jubeant percutere et tempa reorun, quae in agris vel in locis abditis constituta nullum sanctuarum sunt, jubeantur omnimodino destitu. Can. 37 (Cod. Afric. c. 60) : Ut quoniam contra praecepta divina convivum multum in locis excusentur, quas ab errore gentilis attracta sunt—vetari talia jubeant, etc. But thereupon Honorius, A.D. 399, enacted two laws of an opposite character, Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 10, l. 17 : Ut profanos ritus jam salubri lege submovimus, ita festos convivem civilum et communem omnium laetidiam non patimur sub moveri. L. 18 : Aedes, iulicritus robus vacuus, nostrarum beneficio sanctimoniam, ne quis conetur evertere.

\footnote{15} Regarding the destruction of temples which Martin, bishop of Tours, A.D. 375–406, undertook, with violent opposition on the part of the heathen, see Salpi. Severus de vita b. Martin, c. 13–15. In Annua, a valley of the Rhoetian Alps, the missionaries Sisin
lay the blame of all misfortune on the Christians, so since the
west of Europe had been inundated by barbarous people, and
even Italy had been several times devastated by such hordes,
they were especially loud in declaring all these disasters to be
punishments sent by the gods, and in predicting the speedy
downfall of Christianity. Against these accusations the
writings of Augustine and the Spanish presbyter Or-

nius, Martyrius, and Alexander, were horribly murdered, a.d. 397, by the heathen during
the Pagan festival of the Ambavalia, and the church built by them destroyed. See Acta
SS. (ad d. 29 Mag.) Maji, t. vii. p. 38. In Sufectae, in Africa, the Christians had demol-
ished a statue of Hercules, and the heathen killed sixty of them for it (August. Ep. 268
ad Sufectaneos). How at Calama, in Numidia, the heathen, during one of their festivals in
the year 408, attacked the church there, and persecuted the Christians, may be seen in
Augustinus. Ep. 262 ad Nectarium.

15 When the Gothic king Rhadegaisus, 405, broke into Italy, the heathen said (Augustin. de civ. Dei, v. 23), quod ille dis amiciis protogenibus et opitulantibus, quibus immo-
lare quotidie ferrebat, vincu omnino non posset ab eis, qui talis dis Romanis sacra non
facient, nec fieri a quoquam permitterent. When Rome was subsequently besieged by
Alaric, 409 (Sozom. ix. 6), annuabant eos leonum totis effractisque sic aegrotantibus, 
thum in vico Capitole et in toto populo servarentur. Legatus, Vàncius, in iv. 41, asserts: 'O de innuméritis
totim plagarum cum putavissent, totis vivis se operari, Spiritus, nemo, nisi of
Comp. Bevud. ii. 55. Vàncius, iv. 59: 'Totaque potestiae quae fuerant, quae fuerant, 
ac tota solis, qui sit, patria paradoseus est, in auxilia, calma, qui
miserum, hujus in victima messa sacri, qui eum sacrificar
sacrum ad plena innoxia, qui eum sacrificare
sacrum ad sacrum esse, qui eum sacrificare
sacrum ad sacrificare

17 Many Christians believed that Christ should return 365 years after his first appear-
ance, and the end of the world take place. Philostr. Haer. 106: Alia est hebræïs de
anno annuacio ambiguis, quod ut Propheta Essais: Annumlare annum Dei accepta-
bilem et diem redemptionis. Putant ergo quidam, quod ex quo venit Domini usque ad
consummationem saeculi non plus nec minus securam servum, nisi cecidisse
usque ad Christi Domini iterum de caelo divinam praesentiam. To this Christian expectation
the heathen gave another application. Augustin. de civ. Dei, xviii. 53: Ex cogitaverte
nescio quo versus Graecos tanquam consulentes cuidam divino oraculo effusos, ubi Christum
quidam ab hujus tanquam sacri legati criminum facient innocentem, Petrum autem maleficia
fascisse subjungunt (namely, sceleari magico puere, ut dicunt, amiculare occisur, et dilinunus,
et ritum nefario sepulcras est), ut coeterum Christi nomen per cecidisse
anos, deinde completo
memorato numero servum sine mora saceret finem. In the work de Promissiisibib et
Practiciomibus Dei lib. (inserted in Prosper's works, and written by an African, about
450), it is related, P. ii. prom. 38, how the bishop Aurelius at Carthage had converted
the long-closed temple of Caeselis (the Phoenician Astara) into a Christian church, which,
however, soon after (429) had been destroyed for the purpose of obliterating a heathen
illusion. Cum a quadragesimo parasus vaticinium, velut ejusdam Caeselis proferretur,
quos rurum et via, et templo prisce sacrum ritu redderant—versus Deus—sub Con-
stantio et Augusto Placidis, quorum nunc filius Valentinus pius et christianum imperat,
Unso insistente tribuno, omnia illa ad solum usque perducta agrum reliquit in sepulcrum
secunct mortuorum.

Augustin. Retractat. ii. 43: Interius Roma Gothorum irruptione agentium sub regne
Alarico, utque impetu magnae cladi eversa est, eujus eversionem deorum falsorum mul-
torumque calus, quos usitato nomine Paganos vocamus, in christianam religionem
referre conantes, solito acerbitus et amarus Deum verum blasphemare coeperunt. Unde
ego exaradescens zelog domus Dei, adversus eorum blasphemias velit errone libros de
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sius could do but little; but they must have become dumb of themselves when even the German conquerors became converts to Christianity, and persecuted heathenism.

Hence even Valentinian III. (423–455), with all his powerlessness, could appear again as a decided opponent to paganism. Still it was kept up more or less privately amid the confusion of migrations.


20 So the Goths under Alaric at the sacking of Rome, 410 (Augustin. de civ. Dei, v. 23), qui—ad loca sancta confugientes, christianae religiones reverentia, tuerentur, ipsique daemonibus atque impiorum sacrificiorum ritibus—sic adversarientur pro nomine christiano, ut longe atrocissimum cum eis quam cum hominibus gerere viduerint. Cf. i. 1.

21 Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 63, a.d. 425: Omnes haereses omnesque perfidiae, omnia schismata superstitionesque gentilium, omnes catholicae legis inimicos insectamentur errores. It is decreed, sacrilegii superstitiosi autores, particeps, conscius proscriptione plectendos.

22 So in upper Italy Maximiun Ep. Taurinensis (about 440, ed. Rom. 1784. fol.) Serm. 96, p. 565: Ante dies communcorum caritatem vestram, frater, ut—idolorum omnes pollutionem de vestris possessionibus aferretis, et euergetis ex agris universum gentilium errorem. Nec se alius excusatam putet, dicens, non quasi fieri, non mandavi—taceando eum, et non argentum consensum praebuit immolante.—Tu igitur, frater, cum tuam sacrificare rusticum carnem, nec prohibes immolare, peccas. Cum collam ingressus fueris, reveres in ea paelentes cepitbe, mortuosque carbones. Et si ad agrum processeris, carnis aras lignes et simulacra lapideae. Cum matutins vigilaveris, et videre sanitia vino rusticum, scire debes, quoniam, sicut dicunt, aut diagnosticus [a worshiper of Diana], aut aruspex est: —talis eum sucerdos parat se vino ad plagas deae sune, ut dum est ebrius poenam suam ipsis non sentiat. Nam ut paulisper describamus habitum vatis hujusce: est ei adulterinis crinulibus hirustum caput, nuda labens pectora, pallo cura semicinctae, et more gladiatorum—ferrum gestat in manibus, nisi quod gladiatoris pejor est, quia ille adversus alterum dimicare cogitur, isto contra se pugnare compellitur. So also Maximus contra Paganos (Opp. p. 721) is directed against the still existing idolatry. Comp. ibis Sermo 77, p. 610: Principes quidem tam boni christiani leges pro religione promulgant, sed eas executores non exercunt competentem. In Gaul, Conc. Arelat. ii. ann. 443, c. 23: Si in aliquas Episcopi territorio invisiles aut faculas accendunt, aut arborees, fontes vel saura venearunt, si hoc eruerae neglexerit, sacrilegi reum esse cognoscant. Here persecutions of the Christians must still have taken place once and again, for chapter 10 contains penitence-decisions de his qui in persecutio praecaviti sunt, si voluntarie.
Particular heathen customs, which had become of value to the people or had gained their superstitious confidence, were maintained, notwithstanding all the conversions to Christianity.\textsuperscript{23}

\textit{Idem negaverint;} and chapter 11 respecting those, qui dolore victi et pondere persecutioris negare vel sacrificare compulsi sunt. In Africa: de Promises. et Prædict. Dei libb. P. ii. prom. 38 (comp. above, note 17): Novi quoque ipse, in quaedam parte Mauretaniae provinciae de spelaesi et cavernis ita antiqua producta simulacra, quae fuerant absconsa ut omnis illa cum clericis in sacrilegio pecurii civitas teneretur. In Corsica Paganism continued predominant, and sacrifices were publicly offered. A female Christian named Julia was crucified by the exasperated heathens (between 440-445), because she would not take part in a sacrifice. See Acta SS. Maj. viii. 167 (ad 22 Maj.).}

\textsuperscript{23} In Rome, too, such practices as had a certain political importance were kept up. See Salvianus (presbyter in Marcellis, about 440. Salv. et Vincent. Lit. Opp. ed. Baluzius. Paris. 1684. 2. Bremae. 1688. 4') de gubernatione Dei lib. vi. ed. Brem. p. 106: Numquid, non Consilibus et puli aedificium sacrilegiorum more pascuntur, et voluntatis pnnec auguria quaerunt; ac passe omnia sunt, quae etiam illi quandam pagani veteres frivola atque irridenta duxerunt? Haec propter Consules tantum sunt. The fights with wild beasts were continued, Salvianus, vi. p. 105: Nihil ferme vel criminiem, vel flagiorum est, quod in spectaculis non sit; ubi sumnum sollicitarum genus est mori homines, aut, quod est morte gravius acerbisque, lacerari, expleri ferarum alvus humanus carnibus, comedi homines cum circumstantium laetitia, conspicientiam voluptate—Atque ut hoc fiat, orbis iudicandum est; magna enim cura id agitur et elaboratur.—Sed haec, inquis, non semper sunt. Certum est, et praecipua erroris est excusatio, quia non semper sunt! P. 113: Si quando evenerit,—ut codem die et festivitas ecclesiastica et ludorum agitur, quae a omnium conscientia, quis locus maiore cristianorum visum copias habeat, cavea ludi publici, an stratum Dei?—Non solum ad Ecclesiam non veniunt qui Christianos se esse dicunt; sed si qui insci forte venerint, dum in ipsa Ecclesia sunt, si ludos audiant, Ecclesiam derelinquent.—Maximus Taurin. Hom. c. p. 334: Ante dies plerisque—circa vesperum tanta vociferatio populi extitit, ut irreligiositas ejus penetraret ad caelum. Quod cum requiram, quid sit dator hic velit; dixerunt mihi, quod laboranti lunae vestra vociferatio subveniret, et defectum ejus suis clamoribus adjuvaret. It was believed (Hom. cii. p. 337), lunam de caelo magorum carminibus posse dudum. The heathen festival of the Kalendæ Januariæ was universally observed. Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great, and Peter Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna, express themselves with zeal against it; also Maximus Hom. cii. p. 343: Quis sapiens, qui dominici Natalis sacramentum colit, non obviatatem condemnet Saturnium, non declinet Iaschviam Kalendarem?—Sunt plerique, qui trahentes consuetudinem de veteri superstitione vanitatis, Kalendorum diem pro summa festivitatem procurant.—Nam ita Iaschviant, ita vino et culpas satiatur, ut qui toto anno castus et temperans fuerit, illa die sit tumuloquens atque pollutus.—Illud autem quale est, quod surgentes mature ad publicum cum manuscolo, b. e., cum sternis unusquisque procedit, et salutaturus amicos, salutat praemio antequam osculo? caest. Most striking is that which Salvianus de Caeli viii. p. 105, writes of Africa: Quis non eorum, qui Christiani appellabantur, Caelestem illam (see note 17) aut post Christum adoravit, aut, quod est pejus multo, ante quam Christum? Quis non daenominacororum sacrificiorum nilore plebians, divinae domus timent introit, et cum foedere iporum daenorum Christi altare consecessit?—Ecce quos Afrorum, et maxime nobilissimorum, fides, quae religio, quae christianitas fact!—At, inquis, non omnes ista faciebant, sed potissimini quiunque, ac sublimissimi. Adquiescamus hoc ita esse, caest.
SECOND CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.


§ 80.

INTRODUCTION.

The universally received articles of the Christian faith in the beginning of this period were still so simple as to admit of no comparison with the manifold views which arose, may be seen particularly from the comparison of the different schools, the speculative Origenist, the traditional, and the historico-exegetical, which now first began. And a still greater contrast of systems might be expected from the inclination of the Greek Christians to speculation and argument, when external tranquillity was afforded them, after the cessation of persecution.

Thus theological controversies were unavoidable, though they would have had none other than a salutary influence on the development of reason, if parties had abided by the old distinction between πιστις and γνώσις with clear consciousness; and if debated questions belonging to theology had not been drawn into the province of religion and the church. But the very simplicity of the older articles of faith frequently invited the disputants to appeal to them in their own favor, and so to accuse their opponents of deviating from the faith. If the accused also wished to lay claim for themselves to that freedom of speculation on the basis of the πιστις, the hierarchy, on the other hand, was a natural enemy to such liberty as would withdraw from its guardianship any department affecting the church, and had, of course, an interest in bringing all theological matters of debate from the

1 Cicero de Orat. i. 11: Graeculos homines contentionis cupidiores quam veritatis.
province of theology into the province of religious faith, in order to be able to lay claim to the right of decision. This interest now appeared the more reckless in proportion as opposition to the heathen ceased to be a formidable thing, requiring a forbearing patience within the church, and in proportion as the hierarchy was now supported by worldly power.

Thus religious controversies assumed at the present time a very different character. While they were formerly limited to particular provinces, the whole Christian world was now divided by theological disputes into two parties. To put an end to the division by a final ecclesiastical decision the emperors called general councils (οὐνόμα οἰκονομενικά), elevated their decisions into laws of the realm, and applied worldly power to enforce them universally. In earlier times, the councils summoned against heretics contented themselves merely with warding off the false doctrine by denials; but now the general councils, feeling their ecclesiastical importance, and supported by the imperial power, began to exalt positive decisions regarding disputed points, into ecclesiastical articles of faith. Thus the development of doctrines proceeded more rapidly, while the field left to free speculation was always narrowed in proportion. On this very account, too, opponents presented a much more obstinate opposition, and the schisms became greater and more stiff-necked. The struggle had the most important influence on the development of the internal relations of the church, and was even of great political moment, from the circumstance of the emperors themselves taking a share in it. Hence, from this time forward, the history of theological disputes forms the central point not only of the whole history of the church, but sometimes also of the political history of the Roman empire.

2 Hilarus de Trinitate, ii. 1: Sufficebat quidem credentibus Dei sermo,—cum dicit Dominus: Euntes nunc docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, etc.—Sed compellimus haereticorum et blasphemantium vitii illicita agere, ardus scandere, ineffabila eloqui, inexacta praesumere. Et cum sola sile explici quae praecopta sunt oportet, adorare scilicet Patrem, et venerari cum eo Filium, sancto Spiritu abundare; cogitum sermons nostri humilitatem ad ea quae inenarrabilia sunt extendere, et in vitium vitio conactamur alio: ut quae contineri religioso mentium efportuisset, nunc in periculum humani eloqui prorsuntur.
I. PERIOD OF THE ARIAN DISPUTES.


§ 81.

BEGINNING OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY TO THE SYNOD OF NICE (325).


While endeavors were made in vain to reunite the Donatists and Meletians with the church, the progressive development of the doctrine of the Logos gave rise to a new controversy, which soon became more general and violent than any that had preceded it. The common doctrine of the Logos, after the expulsion of the Monarchians, was, that he is the mediator of all Divine agency in the finite, by the will of the Father, and less than he. Regarding his origin, the emanistic idea had been by far the most general. In opposition to it, the school of Origen represented him as an eternal ray of the Divine glory. This bringing forth of the Logos outside of the Divine essence by the will of the Father was still, however, a creation; and that this creating could not be eternal, was already perceived, when Dionysius of Alexandria, in opposition to Sabellius, gave greater prominence to the fact that the Son was created.¹ But the emanists also took offense at this conclusion; for with them the Logos was eternal, though not as a person, yet still in the essence of God from whom he had proceeded. Dionysius at that time prevented a controversy by yielding; but now ARIUS, a

¹ See Divis. L § 64, notes 7, 8, § 66, note 16. The Romish Dionysius merely infers from the expressions of the Alexandrian the non-eternity of the Logos; the latter denies this, a proof that he did not express it as his opinion. If, however, the Logos was a creature, he was not eternal. Hence the Arians referred even to Dionysius in favor of this doctrine. See § 14, note 7. Athanasius do sententia Dionysii endeavors to excuse him; but Basil the Great, Ep. ix. 2, finds in him the germ of Arianism.
presbyter in Alexandria, who, in the school of Lucian, by a historical-exegetical training had received the love of intelligible clearness, wished to remove the latent contradiction in Origen's doctrine, by teaching that the Logos is a created, and consequently not an eternal being.
with his bishop Alexander on the point (318), who excluded him and his followers from church-fellowship, many bishops in Syria and Asia Minor declared themselves in favor of Arius; some, especially Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, Arius ad Euseb. ap. Theodoret. i. 4, see above, § 65, note 5), because they adopted his views; others, as Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, because they held that the faith of the church was at least not violated by the doctrine of Arius. The most important writer who endeavored to defend the Arian principles was the sophist Asterius of Cappadocia, also a disciple of Lucian (f. about 330). Thus the controversy communicated itself to the whole east. After Constantine had in vain endeavored to induce the contending parties to give up the dispute, by rational representations, he called the first oecumenical council at Nice (325). As the number of Arian bishops was much smaller than that of their opponents, the party of Alexander prevailed, their cause being pleaded by Athanasius, deacon in Alexandria, and Marcellus, bishop of Anycra. The Arian doctrine was rejected; but the ancient emanistic notion was confirmed, and was merely developed farther by the decision

kaλλω αυτόν, προλαβών τάστην αὐτῷ τὴν ὀδύναν ὄδουκεν, ἤν ἂν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ὑπερῆς ἀεχε


4 Fragments of his σφαναγια in Athanasius.


6 According to Eusebius de vita Constantini, this council numbered more than 350 bishops. In later times 318 were usually reckoned to it, and it was called the council of tiγγ. The first persons who have the latter number expressly refer to the 318 servants of Abraham, in whom Barnabas, so early as his day, had found a prediction relating to Christ, c. 9. Hilary de Synodis, c. 86: Et mihi quidem ipse ille numerus his sanctus est, in quo Abraham victor regnum impurum ab eo, qui aeterni sacerdotii est forma, benedicier tur. Liberiis ap. Socrat. iv. 2. Ambrosius de Fide, lib. i. prolog. § 5. Doubtless this sacred number was arbitrarily assumed for the purpose of conferring honor on the council of the Nicenses. Galasius, however, Hist. Conc. Nic. and an anonymous author in the Spicilegium Romanum, t. vi. (Romae. 1841. 8.) p. 698, give the number 300.
that the Son is of the same essence with the Father (ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ). This expression, which had been till now regarded as Sabellian, was very suspicious in the eyes of the oriental bishops. The most of them, however, yielded to the imperial authority, and subscribed the new creed. None but the two Egyptian bishops Theonas and Secundus refused, who were therefore banished with Arius to Illyria. The Nicene decrees were universally proclaimed as imperial law; and when the bishops Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, departed from them, they were sent into exile to Gaul (325).


Concerning the composition of this creed: Athanasius Epist. de decretis synodi Nicennae, and Eusebii Caesar. Epist. ad Caesarienses, most complete as appended to Athanasii Epist. cit. and in Theodoreti H. E. i. 11. The εἰς θεόν is here the Father alone, consequently the sameness of essence between Him and the Son is not a numerical unity of essence. See Münchser über den Sinn der Nic. Glaubensformel, in Henke's neueren Magazin, vi. 334. Even here the sentiment, that the Son exists by the will of the Father, and is less than he, is not spoken against.

8 See Divis. I. § 60, note 13.

9 How actively Constantine employed his influence in accomplishing it may be seen in Eusebii vita Const. iii. 13. Since his view had previously been different (see note 5), and his great object was simply the restoration of peace, Gröner's (K. G. ii. i. 210) conjecture is not improbable that he had been gained over by Hosius, and the latter during his abode at Alexandria; consequently the epithet ὁμοούσιος was of Alexandrian origin, where it had been already set forth in opposition to Dionysius (Div. I. § 64, note 8), and had been again rejected expressly by Arius. (See above, note 2.)
§ 82.

OPPOSITION OF THE EUSEBIANS TO THE NICENE COUNCIL TILL THE SECOND SYNOD AT SIRMION (337).


The opponents of Arianism declared it to be polytheism. On the contrary, the Arians charged the ὄμοούσιος with Sabellianism, and succeeded in spreading this view in the east so generally that Constantine thought he could effect a general union on the disputed dogma only by giving up the expression. Accordingly, the banished were recalled, not only Eusebius and Theognis, but Arius too (328—29) his orthodoxy being acknowledged by the emperor, as expressed in general terms, in a confession of faith which he gave in. Eusebius of Nicomedia obtained a decided influence over Constantine. Several bishops who obstinately adhered to the Nicene decrees, and refused to hold church communion with the recalled, were banished, particularly Eustathius, bishop of Antioch (330). Athanasius himself, now bishop of Alexandria, was deposed by a council held at Tyre (335), and banished into Gaul by Constantine; and Arius, immediately after, was solemnly received again into church communion at Jerusalem. He died not long after at Constantinople (336). Thus the east was separated from the western church; the latter adopting the ὄμοούσιος, and espousing the cause of Athanasius, which the former rejected. This division continued after the death of Constantine († 337), when Con-

1 Socrates, l. 24: ὄ τον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄμοούσιον τὴν λέξιν ἐκλίνοντες τὴν Σαμπλίλιον καὶ Μοντανὸ δόξαν εἰσηγεῖσαι αὐτήν τοὺς προσδεχομένους ἑκάστων, καὶ ἐμὲ τὸν βλασφήμον ἐκάλεσαν, ὡς ἁναρρόθην τὴν ὅπασσαν τοῦ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ. οὐ δὲ πάλιν τῷ ὄμοούσιῳ προσκήμνοι, πολυβελείαν εἰσάγειν τοῖς ἐπώνυμοι νομίζοντες, ὡς ἔλληνικοὺς εἰσάγοντες ἐξερέτρευτο. Augustin. Opus imperf. v. 35: Αrianī Catholicos Sabellianos vocant. On the other hand, Athanasius Expos. Eidoi (ed. Ben. l. 100): Οὗτο γὰρ νοστὸ ὄμοοός, ὡς οἱ Σαμπλίλιοι, λέγοντες μονοούσιος καὶ σῶς ὄμοοός, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁναρροθῆ εἶχαν νῦν. So far as the Nicenes also explained ὄμοοός by ταυτοός, so Theodoret. Dial. v. in fine (of conc. Anecr. below, § 83, note 5), they strengthened the suspicion of Sabellianism.


3 On the death of Arius see Walch's Ketzerhist. Th. 2. S. 500—511.
stains had become sovereign of the west, and Constantius of the east, and that all the more readily, inasmuch as Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, gained the same influence over Constantius as he had formerly over Constantine, and was appointed bishop of Constantinople (338). The prevailing doctrine of the east respecting the Son was the old emanistic doctrine, as had been set forth at the council of Antioch (341), according to which both the Arian formulæ and the Nicene ὄμοιοσις were looked upon as objectionable extremes. The Arians, of whom there

4 The confession of faith of the first council at Antioch is thus prefixed (np. Socrat. ii. 10): Μακάριος οντε ἀδιάλειπον Ἀρείου γενόμενος (πῶς γὰρ ἐπίσκοποι ὤντες ἀκολουθήσαμεν προσδοκήματι) οὐδὲ ἄλλοι τυχὰ πίστιν παρὰ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εκτεθέα τιν ἐδάφεια. All the four Arianish formulæ in Athanasius de Synodus, § 22—25. Cf. Walch Bibli. symbol. p. 109, 88. Ficha Biblioth. d. Kirchenvers. ii. 76. In the formula Antiochena i. w. read: Εἰς ἑνὰ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ μονογενῆ, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰῶνων ὑπάρχοντα καὶ συνήθνα τῷ γεννηθέντα αὐτοῖς πάτρι, δ’ οὕτω τῷ πάντα ἐγένετο, κ. τ. λ. In the formula Anti. ii. I: Εἰς ἑνὸς κόσμου Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τῶν αἰῶνων αὐτοῦ, τὸν μονογενὴ τὸν θεόν, δ’ οὗ τῷ πάντα τῷ γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν εἰκονομένον, δόξαν καὶ εὐαγγέλιον, εἰς τὸν κόσμον, βασιλέα εἰς βασιλέας, κάριον καὶ κυρίον, λόγον ἔστω, σοφίαν, σιδέραν. ψυξίν, δόξαν, ἄνωσιν, θεομαχίαν, ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰς τὸν πρωτοτόκον σάρχα τῆς κτίσεως, τὸν δύτα ἐν ἐν σαρκί πρὸς τὸν θεόν, θεόν λόγον, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγέλῳ: “καὶ θεὸς ἦν ο λόγος,” δ’ οὗ τῷ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐν ἐν τῷ πάντα συνήθεσα τὸν θεόν ἐπὶ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμέρων κατελθοῦσα ἀνωθεν. εἰς τῇ παρῇ τῇ ὑπὸ τῶν γραφῶν ὄρθριν πάντα διαδόθησα, λέγων, ἡ χρόνος, ἡ καιρός, ἡ αἰώνα ἡ εἰνα, ἡ γεγονεῖνα πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθίναι τοῦ νῦν, ἀνάβας ἐστώ καὶ εἰς τῇ λέγει τῷ τῶν νῦν πάντα ἀνέβας—ἀνάβας ἐστώ. In the formula Anti. iii. (Theophani Episc. Tyannensis): Εἰς τὸν τῶν αἰῶνων αὐτοῦ τὸν υπάρχον, θεόν λόγον, δόξαν καὶ σοφίαν, τὸν κόσμον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δ’ οὗ τῷ πάντα τῷ γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων, θεόν τελείου εἰκονομένον, καὶ εἰς πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἐπὶ ἐσχάτον συν ἐς τῶν ἡμέρων κατελθοῦσα. Εἰς τῇ παρῇ παρῇ τῇ πάντα διαδόθησα, εἰς τῇ λέγει τῷ τῶν νῦν πάντα ἀνέβας—ἀνάβας ἐστώ καὶ εἰς τῇ λέγει τῷ τῶν νῦν πάντα ἀνέβας—ἀνάβας ἐστώ. In the formula iv. (sent to Constans in Gaul some months after the council): Εἰς τὸν τὴν μονογενήν οὐν θεόν, τὸν κόσμον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰῶνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, θεόν εἰκονομένον, δόξαν καὶ εὐαγγέλιον. ἔναβας ἐστώ καὶ αὐτός, καὶ πάντες αἱ σωσίωσε τοι. In the formula v (where only two Arianish formulæ are mentioned), the second was given out as the Symb. Luciani Martyris (Div. i. § 65, note 6); and from Theodoret it is clear that this is the still so-called formula Antiochian. ii. Athanasius, Hilary, and Socrates, who give the formulæ, say nothing of it. The anathema at the end is therefore a later addition.

were certainly many, must have concealed their peculiar sentiments behind emanistic formulae. Thus the Orientals were unjustly styled Arians by the Nicenes. More appropriate was the title Eusebians, from their head Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. In order to remove the schism between the east and west, Constantius and Constans united in summoning a new general council at Sardica (347). But here the matter went so far as to issue in an entire separation. The western remained alone in Sardica; the orientals assembled in the neighboring town Philippopolis. Both parties confirmed their former acts; and in the east Eusebianism continued as prevalent under Constantius as the Nicene faith in the west under Constans.

The prejudice of the Eusebians, that Homousianism led to Sabellianism, was not a little favored by the case of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, one of the principal defenders of the Nicene council. By representing the Logos as the eternal wisdom of God, and contending that the incarnate Logos alone could be called Son of God, this bishop manifestly came near Sabellianism; and when deposed from his office (336), was nevertheless declared orthodox by the westerns, and taken under their protection. A pupil of Marcellus, Photinus, bishop of Sirmium,
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6 Respecting the theon en theos in the Antiochian formulae they said (Socrit. ii. 43): Osteos ephratet ev to oikos, avs ephratet pare to Apóstolou ev to oikos, ev to theos (I Cor. vi. 19). Only the Nicene ev to oikos tov theos was not susceptible of an Arian import.

7 So Athanasius frequently of pei Aposetian.

8 That it was held in 347, not 344, is proved by Wetzcr Restit. verae chron. p. 47, against Mansi Coll. conc. iii. 87.

9 Even Hilarus de Synodia § 67, confesses: Multi ex nobis ita unam substantiam Patris et Filii praedicant, ut videri possint non magis id pie quam impie praedicare: habet enim hoc verbum in se et fidei conscientiam, et fraudem paratam.—Unum, in quo par signfficatur, non ad unicum videntur.

10 Marcellus's chief work was do Subiectione domini Christi. (Fragments of it in Marcelliana ed. et admiravit. instructrix Chr. H. G. Retzb. Goett. 1794. 8.) He was answered by Astorius, Eusebii of Caesarea, Acacius (fragments in Epiphanius Haer 72, § 5-9), Apollinaris and Basil of Ancyra. Of these are extant only Eusebii contra Marcellum lib. ii. and de Ecclesiat. theologia lib. iii. (both appended to Eusebii Demonstr. evang. Paris. 1826. fol.) His orthodoxy was acknowledged by Julius, bishop of Rome, (epist. ad Epipaph.) Eusebii Antiochiorum congregatos, in Athanasii Apol. contra Arianos, u. 21-33, Athanasii in several passages, and the Synod of Sardica. On the contrary, the later catholic fathers, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, Stilpius Severns, and others, judged of him unfavorably. The majority of the moderns, Baronius, Petavius, Schelstrate,
taught Sabellianism in a fully developed form. His doctrine was rejected not only by the Eusebians at the second council of Antioch (345), but also by the westerners at a council at Milan (347); and at the first council of Sirmium (351), he was deposed by the Eusebians. The party of the Photinians continued, however, till the reign of Theodosius the younger.

In the mean time, Constans had died (350). Constantius became master of the whole Roman empire, after his victory over Magnentius (353), and now endeavored to introduce Eusebianism by force into the west also. At the synods of Arles (353) and Milan (355), the bishops were forced to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius; all who refused being deposed and banished. Among these were Lucifer, bishop of Calaris; Hilary, bishop of Poictiers; and Liberius, bishop of Rome.\footnote{\textsuperscript{14}}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{11}} It is held also to be a heretic. His most important defender is Montfaucon Distr. de causis Marcelli Ancyromăni ej. Collect. nova Patrum, t. ii. p. 51, ss. Paris. 1706. fol.; reprinted in J. Vogt Biblioth. hist. haeresiologiae, t. i. fasc. ii. p. 293, ss. Hamburg. 1724.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{12}} In the formula Antioch. makróstyx (ap. Athanasius de Synodia § 26, and Socrates ii. 19, cf. Walchii Bibl. symb. p. 115): Βῆδενοςόμεθα δὲ πρὸς τούτοις καὶ ἀναθεμάτιζομεν καὶ τούς λόγους μὲν μόνον αὐτῶν φιλὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνέπαφον ἐπιπλάσιος καλὸντες, ἐν ἔτερο τὸ εἶναι ἐξοντα, τὸν μὲν ὡς τῶν προφατικῶν λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν, τὸν δὲ ὡς τὸν ἐνύδαθεν. Χριστὸς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μουσίν καὶ εἰλόνα τῶν θεοῦ μὴ εἶναι πρὸ ἀιώνων θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐκτὸς Χριστοῦ αὐτῶν γενομένον καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ ἡ τῆς ἡμετέρας οὖς τῆς παρθένου σάρκα ἀνετισθῇ, πρὸς τετρακοσίων ὁχὶ ὄλων ἐντὸν. ἐκτὸς γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀφήθη βασιλείας εἰσχυρεῖται θέλεσιν, καὶ τούτος ἔξεν αὐτῶν μέτα τῆς συντελεσε τῆν κρίσιν. Τούτων δὲ εἶναι οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκελίου καὶ Θωσείνου (Athana. Σκοτείνου) τῶν Ἀγιορειτῶν, ὡς τὴν προσεύχοντα ἐφαρμόζον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς θεότητα καὶ τῆς ἀνεκτελεστοῦ αὐτῶ βασιλείαν ὁμοίως Ἰουδαίοις ἀδετούσιν, ἐπὶ προφάσις τῆς συντελεσε δοκεῖν τῷ μονογενί.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{13}} Baronius placed the first Sirmian Synod in the year 357. On the other hand, Petavius (in Ann. ad Epiph. p. 300 and Diss. de Photino haeretico ejusque damnatione, annexed to the third edition of the Rationar. temp. Par. 1630) correctly in the year 351. See his controversy on the subject with Sirmond, who defended Baronius. Petavius has been followed by Matth. Lorouquanus (de la Roque) Diss. duplex. i. de Photino haeret. ii. de Libero Pontif. Rom. Genev. 1670. 8. P. de Marche de tempore syn. Sirm. In his disser. ed. Pracoq. p. 319. Paggi and Tillemon. Mansi, on the contrary, in the treatise before cited (note 8), places the Sirmian Council in the year 358. The confusion of faith of the first Sirmian Synod (ap. Athanas. de Syn. § 27) is the formula Antich., to which, however, instead of one, twenty-seven anathemas are appended. Of these, Nos. 4-22 are directed against Photianus. Among other things, No. vi. says: Εἰ τές τῆς ὁσίας τοῦ θεοῦ πληνοειδής ή συστελεσθη θάνατος, άναθεμάτῳ τινι ἐντῶς ν ἐκ τ.erb τῆς ὁσίας τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν νόμων ποιεῖν, ο πληνοειδῆς τῆς ὁσίας αὐτῶν νόμων ὑπόθεσε, d. ε. vii. Εἰ τές ἐνυδαθεν ἡ προφατικῶν λόγων νόμων τῶν νόμων τοῦ θεοῦ, d. ε. viii. Εἰ τές ἐνυδαθεν ἡ προφατικῶν λόγων νόμων τῶν νόμων τοῦ θεοῦ, d. ε.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{14}} Many others, both who were banished and those who yielded, are named in Faustini et Marcellini Libellus precum ad Imp. in Bibl. pp. Lugd. v. 654.
§ 83.

DISSENSIONS AMONG THE EUSEBIANS TILL THE SUPPRESSION OF ARIANISM (381).

After the Eusebians had become the predominant party, and those who were internally separated were no longer held together by the necessity of contending together against the Homousiasts, the variety of their opinions, which had been hitherto concealed, began to appear. A strict Arian party came forth among them, which was named sometimes after its leaders, Aetius of Antioch (ἀθεός),\(^1\) Eunomius of Cappadocia,\(^2\) and Aecarius, bishop of Caesarea; sometimes from its principles (Ἀνόμους, Ἐξουκώντιος).\(^3\) In opposition to it, the majority, under the leadership of Basil, bishop of Ancyra, and Georgeus, bishop of Laodicea, held fast by the old emanistic doctrine, adopted the farther development of it which had formerly appeared among the Eusebians, viz., that the Son is of similar essence with the Father (ὁμοοιός τῷ πατρί), and were hence called ὁμοοιονόσται, ἡμιόρθων, Semiariants. The emperor Constantius was attached to the Semiarians; but a powerful party about his court exerted themselves with no less cunning than perseverance in favor of the Anomoeans. And because they could not publicly vindicate their formula, they persuaded the emperor that in order to restore peace, the formulas of the two other parties also must be prohibited; which measure they brought about at the second

---

\(^1\) A συναγώνας by him may be found in Epiphanius. Haer. lxxvi. 10. Other fragments in A. Maji Script. vett. nova collectio, vii. i. 71, s. 202. Respecting him and Eunomius see Select Homilies of John Chrysostom, translated into German by Ph. Mayer. Nürnberg, 1820, p. 147. Lange in Ilgen’s Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. v. i. 33. Baur’s Dreieinigkeit, i. 361.


\(^3\) According to the church-fathers, these Arians rested for support particularly on the Aristotelian philosophy. So also Baur, i. 387. Of a contrary opinion is Ritter Gesch. d. christl. Philos. ii. 65, who denies emphatically that Eunomius was an Aristotelian.
The anathemas of the synod of Sirmium (357). On the other hand, Basil, bishop of Ancyra, called together a synod at Ancyra (358), which established the Semiarian creed in a copious decree, and rejected the Arian.

Constantius allowed himself to be easily convinced that that Sirmian formula favored the Anomoeans; and therefore the confession of faith adopted at the second must now be rejected at a third synod of Sirmium (358), and the anathemas of the synod of Ancyra be subscribed. The Anomoeans, for


5 The decrees of this Synod ap. Epiphani. Haer. 73, § 2-11. Comp. Fuchs, ii. 213. § 9: Ἡκ ἢ ἐν ὄραμιμάτι ἄριθμότοι, καὶ ἐν δομισιμάτι παράκος ἀμαρτίας, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν ταυτότητα ἤγετα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς παρλος οὐσίας δομισιμήτρα; οὕτως οὐδέ τὸ νῦν, ὧν οὐκ ἔσται, εἰς τὴν ἰδιότητα αὐτοῦ τὴν πατρός τὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐσιασμὸν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἰδιότητα. § 10: Καὶ εἶ τοι—μὴ—τὴν ἰδιότητα καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ νῦν πρὸς πατέρα ὑμολογεῖτε, ὡς ἐναντίων ὑμῶν τοῦ πατέρα καὶ τοῦ νῦν, καὶ μήτε πατέρα λέγετε ἀλλ' ὑμῶν μήτε τὸν νῦν, ἀλλ' κατοικία καὶ κτίσμα—ἀνθρώπων ἑτομ. § 11: Καὶ εἶ τοι τὸ ἐκτίσει με, καὶ τὸ γενναῖον με παρ' ἀνθρώπων ἑλκόντων, τὸ γεννᾶμεν τῷ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐσιασμοῦ καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐννοεῖ, ἀλλ' ταῦτα λέγει τὸ γεννᾶμεν τῷ τοίτοι τε εἰς τὸν δύο ὑμιᾶς, τοῦτο ἐκτίσει με καὶ τὸ γεννᾶμεν, κτίσμα μόνον ὑμολογοῦμεν καὶ μεκατείνην, ως παραδέδωκαν ἡ σοφία εἰς τὸν δύο εὐθήνον τὴν ἐννοιαν, τω. ἐ. Καὶ εἶ τοι τοῦ νῦν τὴν μὲν κατ' οὐσίαν πρὸς τὸν ἐκεῖνου πατέρα ὑμολογήτη ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύπτοντος, δι' ὑπό φρεάτις, οὕτως γάρ ὁ πατέρας ζωὴν ἔχει εἰς ἐκαλτό, οὕτως καὶ τῷ νῦν ἔδωκε ζωὴν ἔχειν εἰς ἐκαλτό (Joh. v. 26): τὰν δὲ κατ' ἐνεργείας, δι' ὑπὸ φρεάτες: οὐ γὰρ δι' ὁ πατέρας τοι, ταῦτα καὶ τὸ νῦν ὑμιᾶς ποιεῖ (Joh. v. 19), μόνον τὴν κατ' ἐνεργείας ὑμολογίαν δοῦναι, τῆς κατ' οὐσίαν, ἢ ἐστὶ τὸ καθ' ἐνεργείας ἡμῶν τῇ πάσῃ, ὑποστήριγμα τὸν νῦν—τ. ἐ. (so according to a correction). Εἰ τις—ἀνθρώπους λέγει κατ' οὐσίαν τῶν νῦν τῷ πατρί, τω. ἐ. Εἰ τις τοῦ πατέρα πρεσβυτέρου χρύσιος λέγει τοῦ ἐξ ἐκαλτοῦ μονογενοῦς νῦν, νεώτερον δὲ χρύσιος τῶν νῦν τοῦ πατρός, τω. ἐ. But also finally: Εἰ τις ἐξοικονομεῖ καὶ οὐσίαν λέγει τοῦ πατέρα πατέρα τῶν νῦν, ὑμολογοῦμεν δὲ κατ' ἐκαλτός λέγει τῶν νῦν τῷ πατρί, τω. ἐ.
the purpose of uniting in appearance with the Semiarians, and yet establishing their own doctrine, now adopted the formula, τὸν νῦν ὅμοιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα, ὡς αὐτόν γραφαὶ λέγοντι τὸ καὶ διδάσκονται, and succeeded in convincing the emperor that all parties might be most easily united in it. For this purpose all bishops were now prepared, and then the westerners were summoned to a council at Ariminum, the easterners to another at Seleucia, simultaneously (359). After many efforts, the emperor at last succeeded in getting most of the bishops to adopt that formula. But along with this external union, not only did the internal doctrinal schism continue, but there were besides differences among such as had been like-minded, according as they had gone in with that union or not. Thus Constantius at his death left all in the greatest confusion.

The interference of emperors, so foreign to the object in discussion, now ceased, at least for some time. Julian (361–363) was of course equally indifferent to all Christian sects, and restored all banished bishops to their sees. Jovian also († 364) and his successors in the west, Valentinian I. († 375), then Gratian and Valentinian II. maintained general toleration. On the contrary, Valens, emperor of the east (364–378), was a zealous Arian, and persecuted the Homounists and Semiarians.

Since the last years of Constantius, various causes had been always tending to increase in the east the number of adherents to the Nicene council. When, in its greatest strictness, Aria-

---

7 The same is found in the formula Sirmionicus tertia, which was composed by some Arians at Sirmium, and was submitted at Ariminum (in Athanasii de Synodis Arimini et Seleuciae celebratis epist. c. 8), in the formula Nices condita which was received at the end at Ariminum (in Theodori Hist. eccl. ii. 21) in the formula Sirmionicus (ap. Athanas. de Syn. c. 29) and the Constantinopolitana (ap. Athanas. l. c. c. 30), all belonging to the year 359. Comp. Fuchs, ii. 201, 259, 371, 273.

8 There is a correct estimate of his character in Ammian. Marcellin. xxii. 16: Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem nulli superstitione confudens; in qua scrutanda perplexius, quam compostae gravitas, excitavit discidia plurima, quae progressa fuisset alius concertatione verborum: ut catervis Antistitum jumentis publicis ullo citoque discursibus per Synodos, quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suam trahere constar arbitrium rei vehiculariarum succideret nervos.

9 Ammian. Marc. xxii. 5: Utque dispositionem roboraret effectum, disidentes Christianorum Antistites cum pleba discissa in palatum intrumissos monent civilibus, ut discordia consopitiis quiesque nullo vetante religioni suae serviret interspitis. Quod aedebat ideo obstinate, ut dissensiones angente licentia, non timere inanimandum postea plebeam; nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi forales plerique Christianorum, expertus. Saepeque dictabat: Audite me quem Alemanni audierunt et Franci.
entals, who held fast by the emanation of the Son from the Father, must have felt a most decided aversion to it; while the Nicene decrees were naturally allied to those older notions, as fuller developments of them. Besides, the unity of the Nicenes, as contrasted with the constant wavering of the Eusebians, could do nothing less than make a most favorable impression. To this was added, finally, the influence of monachism, which, having now arisen in Egypt, and speedily excited universal admiration, was closely connected with Athanasius; and in all countries where it was diffused, was busy in favor of the Nicene council.  

First of all, Meletius declared himself in favor of the Nicene confession, immediately after he had been nominated bishop of Antioch, A.D. 361. But the old Nicene community which had still existed in Antioch from the time of Eustathius (§ 82, note 2), and was now headed by a presbyter Paulinus, refused to acknowledge the former Eusebian as bishop; and this Meletian schism soon found a ground for itself also in the doctrinal distinction that the Meletians believed they must abide by three Hypostases in the Trinity, while the old Nicenes would only acknowledge in it three Prosopae. The council of Alexandria,

10 Hence the frequent persecutions of the monks in Egypt by the Arians. Cf. Athanasii, Enycl. c. 3. Hist. Arianorum, c. 70, 72, and often. In like manner under Valens, Socrat. iv. 22 and 24. Thus the the monks of Cappadocia, in the year 363, broke off church communion with Gregory, bishop of Nazianzum, father of the theologian, because he had subscribed an ambiguous formula. See Ullmann’s Gregor. v. Nazianz. S. 61. Gregory of Nazianzum, Orat. xxi. p. 388, says of the monks in reference to that occurrence: Οἱ οὐκ ἀνίκητοι ἀγάπης εἰρημένοι τι καὶ μέτριοι, τούτο γε σὺ φέροντι ἐπικεκλήσθης εἰναι, θεον προδομάνα τι διὰ τῆς ἡμιχίας. ἄλλα καὶ λίαν εἰναι οὐκεταία πολεμικοί τι καὶ δύσμαχοι —καὶ θάτων λέγει τι μὴ δέον παρακυνήσειν, η δέον παραλίπεσεν.

11 Epiph. Haer. lxxii. c. 28, 34. Socrat. ii. 44. Sozom. iv. 26. Theodoret. ii. 27. Soon after (363) many other Semiarian bishops joined him in a Synod at Antioch (Socrat. iii. 25).  

13 Respecting this schism, see Walch's Ketzerhistic, Th. 4, S. 410, ff.  

12 The Nicene Synod considered οὐσία and ὑπόστασις as synonymous when it unanthemizied the formula ἐξ ἑκείνῃ ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας εἶναι. The old Nicenes, the Egyptians, and Westerners, held fast by this. So Athanasius Ep. ad Apion. c. 4: Ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστι, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαντικόν ἔχει, ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ δυν. ἢ γὰρ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία ὑποτεθέντες ἔσται. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἐπάρχει. Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. xxi.) derives this interchange of the terms from the poverty of the Latin language, which certainly translated both by substantia. We might venture to suppose here that the Nicene creed originated especially under the influence of a Latin, Hosius (see § 81, note 9). Hence the expression τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, as well as τρεῖς οὐσίαι, in Rome and Alexandria was regarded as Arian, and Meletius and Eusebius, bishops of Samosata, were here accustomed τοις Ἀριστοτέλεις συγκαταθηματιζομενοι (Basil. Ep. 266). Basil may be considered the representative of the opposite view. Ep. 336: Οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις ταῦταν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν, ἢν ἔχει τὸ
assembled by Athanasius (362), sought, indeed, not only to smooth the way generally for the Arians to join their party by mild measures, but endeavored particularly to settle this dispute; 14 but *Lucifer*, bishop of Calaris, gave firm footing to the Meletian schism about the same time, by consecrating *Paulinus* as bishop of the Eustathians. Although *Lucifer*, from dissatisfaction with the mildness of the Alexandrian synod, separated with his followers from the church, 15 he had nevertheless put a great obstacle in the way of uniting the old and new Nicenes by the step taken in consecrating Paulinus. The westerns and Egyptians acknowledged *Paulinus*; the oriental Nicenes, *Meletius*, as the orthodox bishop of Antioch. If the emperor *Valens* (364–

---

14 Comp. similar explanations by others in Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. 1, 11.) He declares it therefore to be a matter of the highest importance to acknowledge treis ὑποστάσεις, since even Sabellius taught μᾶς ὑπόστασιν and τρία πρόσωπα. Comp. especially Basili Ep. 38: also Ep. 123, 210, 214. (Klose’s Basil. d. Gr. S. 28.) Consequently he is delighted with his explanation τοῦ τρεῖς ἀναγκαίου εἶναι τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὁμολογεῖν, Epist. 535 ad Epiphaniun. In Epist. 263 ad Occidentales, he accuses Paulinus of a leaning πρὸς τὸ Μαρκέλλου ὄνομα, ὥστε νῦν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὑποστάσει ὁμολογεῖν, ἀλλὰ προεικῆθηται, καὶ πᾶλιν ὑποστρέφεται καὶ τῶν ὑπό προσελθεῖν. The Orientals generally had entertained the same suspicion against the Latins. See Basili Ep. 69, ad Athanasianum, A.D. 371: ἐπιτίθεται δὲ ὡς κακῶς παρὰ τῶν τῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναγκαῖος, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν καταφέρονται, τό τὴν Μαρκέλλου αἵρεσιν αὐτῶς (Occidentales)—ἐξορίσαι. ἐτελέσατε τοῦ ὁμολογεῖν ἀναγκαίος. Μαρκέλλῳ δὲ, τῷ κατὰ διάμετρον ἐκείνῳ τῆς ἁγιασίας ἐποδημάτων, καὶ της αὐτῆς τῆς ἡμιονίας τῆς ἡμῖν ἀναγκαίας—ἐξορίσατε, ἀναγκαίος μὲν ἐπενεκμάται. A milder judgment is given by Gregory. Naz. Or. xxv.: Τῆς μίας ὀνείρας καὶ τῶν τριῶν ὑποστάσεως λεγόμενος μὲν ὡς ἡμῖν ἀναγκαίος νοσομένος δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Ἱεραπετῆς ὁμολογεῖν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἀναγκαίας διά στενοίτητα τῆς παρ᾽ αὐτῶν γλῶσσης καὶ ὑμνήσεως πιέζουσι πανεύριον ὑπὸ τῆς ὁμολογίας τῆς ὑπόστασις, καὶ διὰ τούτου ἀντεικνύοντος τὰ πρόσωπα, ἐν μὲν τρεῖς ὀνείραις παρουσίας: τί γίνεται ὡς Ἡμᾶς γελῶσον ἢ ἔλεγομεν; πάσης ἑδύνης διαφάνη ἡ περί τοῦ ἡχοῦ συμπεριφορά;
had now favored the Semiarians instead of the Arians, he might, perhaps, have considerably checked the further spread of the Nicene party; but since he tried to make Arianism alone predominant by horribly persecuting all who thought differently,\textsuperscript{16} he drove by this means the Semiarians who did not sink under persecution, to unite still more closely with the Nicenes. Thus a great part of the Semiarians (or, as they were now also called, Macedonians, from Macedonianus, bishop of Constantinople, who had been deposed at the instigation of the Arians, 360),\textsuperscript{17} declared themselves, at several councils of Asia Minor, in favor of the Nicene confession, and sent an embassy to Rome to announce their assent to it (366).\textsuperscript{18} However much the Arians, supported by the emperor Valens, endeavored to counteract this new turn of affairs, yet the Macedonians were always passing over more and more to the Nicene creed; and for this the three great teachers of the church in particular, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa, began now to work. These new oriental Nicenians did not believe their faith changed by their assent to the Nicene formula, but thought they had merely assumed a more definite expression for it in the rightly understood ὀμοιοσώσις.\textsuperscript{19} They

\textsuperscript{16} The λόγος προσφωνητικός, by which Themistius about 379 in Antioch is said to have disposed the emperor to milder measures, Socrat. iv. 32, Sozom. vi. 36, is lost, and must not be confounded with the Orat. de religionibus (§ 77, note 5), Neander, ii. 1, 149, A.

\textsuperscript{17} Socrat. ii. 45.

\textsuperscript{18} Socrat. iv. 12: Φθορὰ μάλλον καὶ βίω στιουαχρομένων, κατὰ πάλινς διεπρεπεβίωντο πρὸς ἄλλους, διηλουτέρει δειν ἐς ἀνέκδοτης καταφεύγειν περὶ τοῦ ἄδελφου τοῦ βασιλέως (Valentinianum I.), καὶ ἐπὶ λιμέρων τῆς Τρόμης Ἕπισκοπον, ἀσπασθεῖλα τοῖς ἐκείνων πίστιν μᾶλλον ἢ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς περὶ Θεόδοσιον. Cf. Sozom. vi. 10.

\textsuperscript{19} Syn. Antioch. ann. 365, Epist. ad Iovinum (ap. Socr. ii. 29): Τὸ δοκοῦντο ἐξὸν τοῦ ὁμοιοσώσεως, τὸ τοῦ ὀμοιοσώσιος σημασία, ὅτε ἐκ τῆς συνόντος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ νέος ἤγειρεν, ἵνα ὁ ὁμοιοσώσιος κατ’ ὁσίον τοῦ πατροῦ. Those sent by Macedonianus to Liborius (Sozom. vi. 10) to ὁμοιοσώσεως ὁμοιοσώσεως ἐκομίσαντες, οὐ τῷ ὁμοιοσώσεως τὰ συνήθεσιν. In like manner Basilus Ep. ix. ad Maximum: Ἐγὼ δὲ—τὸ ὁμοιοσώσεως κατ’ ὁσίον—δέχομαι τὴν ὁμοιοσώσεως ψυχῆς, οὐ εἰς ταύτην τὸ ὄμοιοσώσεος ἐφορεύσας, κατὰ τὴν ἐνώπιον συνεχείαν τοῦ ὁμοιοσώσεως διάνοιαν. Basil had belonged to the Semiarians (Klose's Basilii d. G. Stralsund. 1835. S. 21), and with its leaders, such as Basil of Anaea, and Eustathius of Sebaste, had been active at the theological disputations in Constantinople, 359. (Gregor. Nyss. contra Eunom. i. p. 391. Philostorg. iv. c. 12.) He writes, however, of himself, Epist. 223, § 3: Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ τολμῶ κακοῖς ἐν κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδείς πεπλαγμένος ζητήσας τὸν τὸν θεοῦ φιλόπλυτος, ἡ ἐτέρῳ φροντὶς μετάμιγμα ἐπιτίθεσαν. Ὅπως ἐν γὰρ τό σπέρμα σιδερείας ἡ ταύτην τοῦ ἐκείνου, τῇ κατὰ γένος μεταβαλλόμενον, ἀλλὰ κατ’ ἄλλην τελεσίμους μέριοιν μέν ἀπὸ μικρῆς ἁμαρτίας, τῆς τοῦ ἐκείνου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκείνου ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου γενεθηκαί. In this sense Athanasius, de Synodis § 41, passes judgment also on the Semiarians: Πρὸς δὲ τοῖς ἀποδεχόμενοις τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐν Νικαια καθιστών, περὶ δὲ μόνον τὸ ὀμοιοσώσεως ἐκφεύγοντας, χρῆ μὴ ὡς πρὸς ἐκθροίς διακείεσθαι. καὶ γάρ καὶ
abided by the three hypostases of their Semiarianism, and attached themselves to the Meletians; but on this very account they could not keep church communion with the old Nicenes, notwithstanding all the efforts made by Basil to effect that object. Since they supposed that they had unchangeably remained steadfast to their faith, they also continued to consider their Eusebian and Semiarian forefathers as orthodox, although condemned by the old Nicenes. Thus the canons of the oriental councils held during the schism, constantly remained in force, particularly those of the council of Antioch, A.D. 341,

---


22 Innocentius I. Ep. 7, ad Constantinopolitanos, A.D. 405, designates these 25 canons as composed by heretics,—non solum non sequendos, verum etiam unum cum hereticis et schismatisbus dogmatibus condenmandos: yet the orientals held them fast. The council of Chalcedon appeals to them, Act. 4. Soon after they were translated in the priscæ version with the Greek Codex Canonom, were transferred for the greater part into the Canones Apostolorum (See Divia, I. § 67, note 5), and enjoyed from this time forward, even in the west, undisputed authority. Pope Zacharias, Ep. 7, ad Pipinum, calls them beatorum patrum sanctiones; Nicolaus I. Ep. 9, ad Michaelum Imp. venerabilem Antiochenos et sacros canones. On this account modern Catholic historians have wished to make two Antiochian councils, a Catholic and a Eusebian one. Eman. a Scholstrate sacz. Anticheronem concill pro Arianorum conciliabulo passim habitum, nunve vero primum ex antiquitate auctoritati suae retinuit. Antverp. 1681. 4. P. et R. fratres Ballerinii de antiquis collectionibus canonum, P. i. c. 4, § 2 in the appendix to the Opp. Leonis M. Venet. 1757.
and of Laodicea (perhaps a.d. 363), which canons afterward passed over from the oriental to the occidental church.

During this time new schisms had been made by new disputes on points of doctrine. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, amid the controversies respecting the Logos, had for a long time remained untouched, and very different views respecting it were in consequence entertained. But when in the east not only the Semiarians, but also many of the new Nicenians could not get rid of the Arian idea that the Holy Spirit is a creature and servant of God, the other Nicenes took great offense at this, and opposed these errorists as Πνευματομαχόν. But they were


23 Because Gratian Decreti, P. i. Dist. 16, c. 11, says of the Laodicean canons: Quorum auctor maxime Theodosius Episcopus exitit, Gothofredus ad Philost. and Pagi Crit. ann. 314, note 25, conjecture that the Eunomian Theodosius, bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia, brought about this synod. Cf. Philostorg. viii. c. 4.

24 Gregorii Naz. Orat. theol. v. de Spiri. S. § 5 (Orat. 31, formerly 37): Τῶν δὲ κοθήματος αὐτῶν τῶν κοθήματος τούτων, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ. Οἱ δὲ υἱοί ἐκ τῆς γοργής, εἰς φώς, ως ἀθάνατοι σώματα διαδοθέντως: οἱ δὲ κοθήματος αὐτῶν εἰσεβεβίωσαν, οἱ δὲ τούτων εἰσεβεβίωσαν καὶ τοῖς χειλεσίαις, k. t. l. Hilarius de Trin. ii. 29: Cum dicerent, per quern sit (Sp. 8.), et ob quid sit, vel qualis sit; si responsor nostrorum disceptabit dicentium: “per quern omnia, et ex quo omnia sunt, et quia Spiritus est Dei, donum fidei;” disceptant. Apostoli et Prophetae, hoc tantum de eo quod esset loquentes. On the following dispute see Baur’s Dreieinigkeit, i. 490.


26 They were first attacked by Athanasius Epist. iv. ad Serapionem Episc. Thumanum (between 358 and 360), after Serapion had informed him (Epist. i. init.) ζωῆς καὶ θεοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἡ ζωὴ τῆς θεοῦ, καὶ θεοῦ πνεύματος. As Serapion emendated (about 365), they were considered to be legitimate. Historia eccl. ii. 24: Καιρός χρώματος τοῦ κυρίου θεοῦ, καὶ καθημερινῶν κυρίου φρονήσεων (about 359), de Uraniis, c. 67: Semiariosi sunt quaeque. Hic de Patre et Filio bene scintiant—Spiritum autem non de divina substantia, sed Deum versus, sed factum atque creatum Spiritum praedicantur, ut cum conjungant et comparent creaturas. In all these writers Pneumatomachi is still the exclusive appellation of these errorists. On the contrary the Semiarians were at that time called Macedonians. At the time of the first council of Constantinople (381), Constantinople was the chief seat of the Semiarians (cf. Gregorii Naz. vita a Gregor. Pregab. consecrata. Socret. ii. 45: Οἱ πρὸς Μακεδονιαν
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not yet all prepared to style the Holy Spirit God. Finally, the number of sects was increased by a zealous adherent of the Nieceen council, Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, who, misled, perhaps, by his aversion to Origen, believed that he was necessarily obliged to concede to the Arians the position, that the Logos in Christ supplied the place of the rational soul νοῦς or ψυχή λογική, and from about 371 gathered round him the ad-

eis τῶν 'Ελλησπόντου πλειονάζων). Hence the appellative Semiantri, Pneumatomachi and Macedonian (can. 1 and 7) were used as synonymous by this council. Inasmuch as the peculiarity of this party regarding the doctrine of the Son was unimportant, nothing but their views of the Holy Spirit remained to make them heretical. Hence, by an easy transition, Macedonius came to be considered the author of this heresy, as is the case so early as Sozom. iv. 27: 'Ετειοδ Μακεδώνος ἀποβολή τῆς Κοινωνικτοπούλεσις ἑκκλησίας, εἰςχείτο τῶν νῦν θείων εἰναι, κατὰ πάντα τε καὶ κατ' οὕτων ἡμῶν τῷ πατρί: τὸ δὲ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἀμώμον τῶν αὐτῶν προσεβείων ἐπεφαίνετο, δίκαιον καὶ ἐπιρήτην καλῶν, καὶ ὁsa περὶ τῶν θείων ἄγγελων λέγων τίς σῶκ ἀν ἁμαρτώ. Hence, from this time forward the usual name for those who were heretical in their views of the Holy Ghost was Macedonian, instead of Pneumatomachoi; although it is unquestionable that Macedonius, though he entertained those sentiments, like all the Semarians, was not the author of them.

27 Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, who had been at the head of that Semarian embassy to Rome (see note 18), and had since become a Nicene, declared: 'Εγὼ οὖν θείων ἀνθρώπων τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἄγιον αὑρωμαί, οὔτε κτίσμα καταλαμβάναμ (Sozom. ii. 25). It is true that subsequently the orientals accused him before the Occidentals of having gone over to the Arians, and having become ρωσσευτής τῆς τῶν πνευματομάχων αλήθεσεως (Basilii, Ep. 283, § 3). In conformity with that earlier declaration of Eustathius was the conduct also of his friend at that time, Basil the Great. He would have all admitted to church-fellowship, Ep. 113, τού τῆς λέγοντας κτίσμα τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἁγιόν. But he himself abstained from calling the Holy Ghost God, on which Gregory of Nazianzum was obliged to hear reproaches (Gregor. Ep. 96, ad Basil.), and excommunicated Basil in this way: Πόλεως περὶ αὐτὸν ὁ πάλιμος, κοντοίκαν λαβέθαι τῶν αὐτοτικών γυμνῆς τῆς φωνῆς (namely περὶ τοῦ πνευμάτος, ὡς εἶναι—tν ὡς εἰδόθή της ἐκκλησίας, βραβώθη, δὴ τὸ κακὸν ἐν τῇ πάλαι. So also in his laudatory address to Basil, Orat. xx. p. 364. The monks in Caesarea were particularly indignant against Basil, but in opposition to them he was justified by Athanasius Ep. ad Palladium: Ἀντὸς μὲν γὰρ, ὡς τιθάληκα, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῦ οὐδὲνησε μισθόν γένεται, ἐνα τοῖς ἀδελφοϊς κερδήθη. Cf. Garnier vita Basilii, p. 95, sq. That Basil made up his view of the Holy Spirit from Plotinian ideas of the ideal world, and the world of soul, is shown by A. Jahn, Basilius Magnus plotinizans. Bernae. 1838. 4. When Gregory of Nazianzum preached the deity of the Holy Spirit's openly, it was objected to him (Orat. theol. v. de Spir. S. § 1): Πάθεν ἡμῖν ἐπισείασης, ἐνυμοθεύτης καὶ ἔγραμον; and he admitted, § 26: 'Εκφύσεσαν φανερῶς ἡ παλαιών τῆς Πατράς, τῶν Υἱῶν ἁμώμοντες ἐφανέρωσαν τὴν συμφορὰν τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ Θέου τούτῳ, ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τῆς θεότητος: ἐμπληρεῖται τοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, σαφεστέραν ἡμῖν παρέχει τὴν σαφείταις διεξάγειν. See below, § 84, note 24.


29 Comp. Baur's Dreieinigkeit, p. 589. So early as in the epist. synod. Conc. Alex. A.D. 362, in which even delegates of Apollinaris took part, we find, but without the name o'
vocates of this sentiment (Apollinaristae, Ἑυνουκιασταῖ, Δυμωρυταῖ)."}

31 Thus Theodosius, who as a Spaniard was a zealous adherent of the Nicene council, found at his accession to the throne, in

the latter, the polemic declaration: 'Ὡς ἀλληγορῶν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο, δὲτι ὦ σῶμα ἄψυχον, ὦν άνασβοθῶν, ὦν άνάψυχον είρην ὦ σωτῆρ. This opinion is also contradicted by Athanasius, especially in Epist. ad Epictetum (371), contra Apollinarium libb. ii (372), yet without naming Apollinaris (see Möller’s Athanasius, Th. 2. S. 263, ff), although Epiphanius Haer. 77, considers those works as refutations of it. Basil the Great heard of the heresy of Apollinaris in 373 (Ep. 129 ad Meletium), and wrote about it 374 (Ep. 264 ad Occidentales, and Ep. 265 ad Aegyptios). Fragments of the writings of Apollinaris belonging to the present subject (περὶ ἐνσωμάτωσιν, περὶ πίστεως) are preserved chiefly in Gregory of Nyssa and Theodoret. Fragments of several epistles of Apollinaris are found in Leontius Byzant. (about 590) adv. fraudes Apollinaristarum libb. 2. (ex. lat. vers. Turrini in Canisii Lect. aut. ed. Basnage, i. 608, ss. Gallandii Bibl. PP. xii. 706). Scattered fragments of every kind are in Majill Scriptt. vett. nova coll. tom. vii. P. i. Answers to Apollinaris were written by Diodorus Tarsusensis, Theodotus Antiarchos, and the two bishops of Alexandria, Theophilius and Cyril. Still extant are Gregori Naz. Ep. ad Neoct. or Orat. 46, and Ep. ii. ad Clecchonum, or Orat. 51 and 52 (Ullmann’s Greg. von Naz. S. 401, ff); and the far more important Gregorii Nysseni ἀντιЛенинικης πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολλιναρίου (prim. ed. Zaenklnus Moulin, veter. eccl. Gr. and in Gallandii Bibl. PP. vi. 517). Nomismis de Natura hominis, c. 1. Ταύτης μὲν, ἐν ἑστι καὶ Πλάτωνι, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ ἄλλου τῶν νοείσυνων, εἰς τρίων τόν άνθρωπον συνυπάρχον πολίτρων, σῶματος, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ νοοῦ. Οἷς ἡκολούθηκε καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος, ὅ τις τὰς ἁμαρτίας, τὸν δὲν θεραπεύον τῶν θεμελίων τῷ ἰδίῳ δόξῃ, καὶ τὰ λακτά προσακομοῦσα, κατὰ τὸ οἶκος δόγμα. Apollinaris ap. Greg. Nyss. c. 35: 'Ο ἀνθρώπος εἰς ἑστιν εἰς πνεύματος καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σῶματος.—C. 9: Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα, τούτους τῶν νοεισύνων, ἅν ἔχειν ὁ Χριστός μετὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σῶματος, εἰκώτις ἀνθρώπου εἰς σώματον λέγεται (1 Cor. xv. 47, ss.)—C. 7: Θέσεις μὲν (ἑστις) τὸ πνεύματι τὰ σωματία, ἀνθρώπου δὲ τῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ προσκληθεῖσα σαρκὶ.—C. 23: Οὐκ ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώπους (Phil. ii. 7), διότι οὐ ὁμοιότος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὸ καρπότων.—C. 39: Εἶ ἀνθρώπῳ τέλειον σωμάτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἔρρην.—C. 43: Εἰς μὲν φῶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ, εἰς δὲ θάνατος.—C. 48: Εἴ καὶ πάντων τῶν ὅπως ἔστε τοῖς χωρίοις ὁ ἐπουρανίος ἀνθρώπως (ὁποῖο τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπως ἔσται τοῖς χωρίοις), οὐκ ἐπουρανίως ἀλλὰ ἐπουρανίως θανάτου ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ.—C. 44: Πάντων τῶν Κυρίων προσκυνεῖται, καθὸ ἐν ἑστὶ, πρόσκοποι καὶ ἐν ζώνι μετ' αὐτῶν. Μονὸν θεοὶ προσκυνεῖται μετὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς ἡ σῶρας αὐτῶς. From this resulted the principle of one nature in Christ, Apoll. fragm. ap. Majum, vii. i. 16: Μᾶς δὲ συγκράτησε τῇ φωσε ἀνθρώπῳ τῶν κόσμων ἑγόθου, μᾶς δὲ συγκράτησε τῇ φωσε σωματικὴ τῇ καὶ θεικῇ. In another fragment Apollinaris designates the entire spiritual principle in man as ψυχή, and makes the place of it in Christ be supplied by the Logos. Ap. Majum, vii. i. 203: 'Ο Ἰσθραῖος τῆς ἀληθείας, διὸ ὁ λόγος σῶρος ἑγόθου, οὐ προσέθηκε, καὶ ψυχή: ἀνάπτυξαν γὰρ δῶ δώ ἐκεῖνον καὶ διήθησιν εἰς τῇ ἑν κατοικίᾳ, ινα τὸ ἐπέκειντο κατὰ τὸ ἑπάνω ἀντισταθεῖν ἵστατο τῆς ψυχῆς διὰ τὴν θελήματος καὶ ενεργείας. Οὐκοῦν οὐ ψυχῆς ἀνθρώπως ἐπεκτάτω ἐνός, ἀλλὰ μόνον σωμάτως Ἀβραάμ᾽ τῷ γὰρ τῶν σώματος Ἰσθρά ἡνα ἔπανεν καὶ σωματικῶν τῶν Σωματικῶν νόμων. Some of his disciples, especially Polémnius (Polemina) taught ἐκ τῶν ἑυρομένων καταλειμμένως τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ σῶμα, ὡς ἐν σώματι τὸ ἑπάνω τῇ τοῦ Χρήστου. Epiph. Haer. 77, § 29, 20. Theodoret. Haer. fab. iv. 9. Ch. A. Salig. de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Gaddherp. 1723. 4.—From this time forward the threefold division of man began to be considered heterodox. Keil. Orbis. acad. t. ii. p. 641, ss.

the west (379) universal toleration; in the east Arianism prevalent, the Homouxiasts persecuted, and besides them the parties of the Photinians, Macedonians, and Apollinarists, with innumerable other sects. After conquering the Goths, he began forthwith to declare Homusianism to be the catholic faith, and to persecute other parties. The more effectually to remove existing evils, he summoned a general council at Constantinople (381), by which the schism between the Nicenes was peaceably removed, and the Nicene creed enlarged with additions directed against heretics who had risen up since its origin. 33


34 To this Synod Meletius, as bishop of Antioch, was summoned, not Paulinus, with whom the westerns communicated, and was even a proédros of the council (Gregorii Naz. Carmen de vita sun, v. 1514). When he died during the council, Flavius was appointed to succeed him, without reference to Paulinus (Ullmann, S. 245). The schism did not entirely disappear till a.d. 413 (Theodoret. v. 25).

35 Symb. Niceno-Constantinopolitanum: Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἑνα θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, παρθένην εὐφροσύνην καὶ γῆς, ὄρατον τὰ πάντα καὶ ὁράτων καὶ εἰς ἑνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν άιον τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ μονογενέστερῳ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντω πρὸς πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φώς ἐκ φωτός, θεόν ἄλλημα ἐκ θεοῦ ἄλλημα, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν ῥήμα τῶν ἁγίων πνευμάτων καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθοῦσα εἰς τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ σωρωθέντα εἰς πνεύματος ἱστού καὶ Μαρίας τῷ παρθένῳ, καὶ ενανθρωπήσαστα: σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἤπειρον Πνεύματος, καὶ πασχόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα κατὰ τὸν γαρφόρον καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ καθιζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρός καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρίνας ἑως καὶ νεκροῖς οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἱστοῦ πνεύμα, τὸ κύριον (according to 2 Cor. iii. 17. See Theodoret. ad h. 1), τὸ ζωοποιῶν (according to Joh. vi. 63), τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός ἐκποροδομοῦν (according to Joh. xv. 26), τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροδοκοῦμεν καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλήσας διὰ τῶν προφήτων εἶς μιᾶς ἅγιαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. 'Ομολογοῦμεν ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἁμαρτίαν προσδοκούμενον ἀνάτασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωῆς τοῦ μείλιστος αἰῶνος: 'Αμήν. J. C. Saucer Symbolum Niceno Constantinopol. exposuit et ex antiquitate ecclesiastica illustratum. Traj. ad Rheinf. 1718. 4. Already, about 375, a Roman synod under Damasus had declared Sp. S. cum Patre et Filio unus potestas esse atque substantias (Manis. iii. 489), and an Illyrian synod, ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τὴν τριάδα Πατρός, Υἱοῦ καὶ ἄγιον Πνεύματος (Theodoret. iv. 8): But in Constantinople they did not yet venture to give utterance to any unbiblical formulas respecting the Holy Spirit, in order not to stir up new controversies in the east, where there were still so many opponents of his deity.—Immediately after the
Valentinian II. allowed the Arians in the west to enjoy freedom of religion some years longer; but the case was quite altered by Theodosius, and a universal suppression of the sect ensued. The last traces of its existence in the Byzantine empire appear under the emperor Anastasius at Constantinople, 491–518.

The subject of the controversy was merely the point of sameness in essence between the three persons. The unity and equality of the persons, which necessarily resulted from holding sameness of essence, was not fully acknowledged at once even by the Nicenians, but continued to be more clearly perceived, until at last it was expressed by Augustine for the first time with decided logical consequence.

close of the council, Theodosius passed the law of the 30th July, 381. (Cod. Theodos. xvi. 1, 2; Epist. 20, 21, 22.) Rusn. Hist. Eccl. ii. 15. In the mean time, however, but a small number of Arians had gathered around the empress at Milan. Cf. Epist. ii. Conc. Aquil. ann. 381, ad Imp. ap. Manners, p. 622: Per occasiones partes duobus in angulis natum, hoc est in lateres Daciae Ripensis ac Moesiae fidei obstrepi videbatur.

When driven away by Maximus, he found refuge with Theodosius. His law against the heretics, a.d. 388, see Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 15. Cf. Gothofred. ad h. legem. Soon after even an Arian was written in defense of his doctrinal creed. See the interesting reliquiae tractatus in Lucae Evang. and fragmenta sermonum in Ang. Maji Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, t. iii. P. ii.


39 When driven away by Maximus, he found refuge with Theodosius. His law against the heretics, a.d. 388, see Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 15. Cf. Gothofred. ad h. legem. Soon after even an Arian was written in defense of his doctrinal creed. See the interesting reliquiae tractatus in Lucae Evang. and fragmenta sermonum in Ang. Maji Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, t. iii. P. ii.
Among the theological schools of this period the most distinguished were that of Origen, and the Syrian historico-exegetical, whose origin belongs to the preceding period. Origen enjoyed the highest esteem, and it is to be attributed to the wide-extended influence of his writings that notwithstanding these furious theological disputes, some freedom in theology was still preserved. In the great question of the time, both parties could appeal to him.\(^1\) When the Arians referred to the declaration in his own writings, and in those of his disciples Dionysius and Theognostus, that the son is a creature, Athanasius, on the contrary, drew from the same source arguments for the eternal generation of the Logos.\(^2\) Men were the less perplexed by contrary passages in his writings, inasmuch as they knew and already practiced many expedients for the purpose of making such expressions of the fathers as were contradictory to the more modern views, powerless and void.\(^3\) Thus Origen had adherents among both parties. Among the Eusebians, he had in particular Eusebius Pamphili, bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine († 340), a man distinguished alike for his love of peace and his merits as a church historian.\(^4\) Among the Nicenians, were

\(^1\) Hence the contradictory opinions concerning him. Epiphanius Haer. 64, c. 4, declares him to be the father of Arianism; and Socrates, vii. 6, wonders how Timotheus could have been at the same time an admirer of Origen and an Arian, since Origen ἄγαθος ἡμῶν ἰησοῦς ἐν υἱῷ τοῦ πατρός.


\(^3\) See Münchener, l. c. S. 156, ff. 492, ff.

\(^4\) His biography, composed by his successor Acacius (Socrat. ii. 4), is lost He is called
Athenasius, the father of orthodoxy, from the year 328 bishop of Alexandria, frequently banished and again recalled († 373); ² 
Basil the Great, from the year 370 bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia († 379); ³ his brother Gregory, from 370 bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia († about 394); ⁷ Gregory of Nazianzum, ὁ θεολόγος, the intimate friend of Basil, bishop of Constantinople.

an Arian by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Hilary, Jerome, etc., defended by Socrat. ii. 21, and


⁸ The "Festal Letters" make this date certain.
from 380–381 († 390); and Didymus, president of the catechetical school in Alexandria († 395). Even toward the west also, where they were accustomed to derive their knowledge uninterrupted from the Greek literature, Origen’s influence had extended, and the most important occidental writers of this period, Hilary, bishop of Poictiers from A.D. 350, living an exile in Phrygia from 356–360 († 368);11 the Luciferian Hilary, deacon in Rome (about 380),12 and Ambrose, bishop of Milan from 374 († 397),13 honored and employed him as a teacher. So also the two distinguished western monks living in Palestine, Tyronius Rufinus of Aquileia,14 who had been six years a pupil of Didymus in Egypt, but, since the year 378, had led an ascetic life on the Mount of Olives († 410), and Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus of Stridon, the first scriptural expositor


10 Panier’s Gesch. d. christl. Erbentamkeit, i. 663.


14 Respecting his writings, see below, § 85, note 4.
of his day, who lived at the head of a society of monks in Bethlehem from A.D. 386 († 420).\textsuperscript{15}

In addition to the Origenist school, the Syrian \textit{historico-exegetical} school in the east had many friends.\textsuperscript{16} To it belonged, among the Eusebians, \textit{Theodore}, bishop of Heraclea († about 358),\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Eusebius}, bishop of Emesa († 360),\textsuperscript{18} and \textit{Cyril}, bishop of Jerusalem, who afterward adopted the decrees of the Nicene council, and was present at the council of Constantinople (381) († 386).\textsuperscript{19} Among the oriental Nicenians, \textit{Apollinaris}, bishop

\textsuperscript{15} At that time Jerome wrote to Paula respecting Origen (Inst. Invect. in Hieron. lib. ii. see Hieron. Opp. ed. Martinay, vol. iv. t. ii. p. 68 and 480): Quis enim unquam tanta· legere potuit, quanta ipse conscripsit! Pro hoc sodore, quid acceptum pretii? Damnator a Demetrius episcopo: exceptis Palaestinae et Arabiae et Phoenicæ atque Achææ sanctuaribus in damnationem ejus consentit (add. orbis): urbs Roma ipsa contra hanc cogit sententiam, non prophetem damnatae novitatem, non prophet haeresin, et nec adversus eum radici cases simulat, sed quin gloriam eloquentiae ejus et scientiae ferre non poterunt, et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur. See a notice of his writings in § 85, note 5.


\textsuperscript{18} Respecting him see Socrates, ii. 9, and Sozomenus, iii. 6. Both say of him: 'Υπήρετο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μέμφεται, ὡς τὰ Σαβδολίων φρόνων. On the contrary, he is called in Jerome in Chron. ad ann. x. Constanti: Arianae signifer factionis. Cf. Hieron. Cat. c. 91: Eusebius Eusebii Episcopum, elegantiss et rhetoricae ingenii, innumerales, et qui ad plasmum populci pertinent, conferit libros, magisque historicam secatus, ubbis qui declarare voluit, studioskissime legitur: e quibus vel praecepi sunt adv. Judaeos, et Gentes, et Novarianos, et ad Galatas libb. x., et in Evangelia homiliae breves sed pluriennes. His exegetical character is more distinctly drawn, c. 119 (see below, note 29). Thilo über die Schriften des Eusebii v. Alexandri u. d. Eusebii v. Emesa. Halle. 1832. 8) shows that the three discourses published by Augustus (Euseb. Emes. quae supersunt Opusc. Eliberfeldi. 1832. 8) do not belong to Eusebius of Emesa, but, along with many others, to one Eusebius of Alexandriæ, belonging to the fifth or sixth century (an old life of this Alexandrian and several discourses are extant in the Speculum Romanum, t. ix. Romae. 1643. 8). Among the extant writings of Eusebius of Emesa (on them see Thilo, p. 58), the most important would be the two books on tide adv. Sabellianum in the Opuscula, xiv. Eusebii Pamp. ed. J. Sirmond. Paris. 1643 (also in Bibl. PP. Lugd. iv. 1), if it could be proved that they really belong to him. Thilo makes it probable, p. 84.

of Laodicea (between 370 and 390), known by his heresy respecting the person of Christ; *Ephraem*, deacon in Edessa, the prophet of the Syrians († 378); and *Diodore*, presbyter in Antioch, bishop of Tarsus from 378 († before 394), were attached to it. From the school of the latter proceeded *John Chrysostom*, deacon from 381, 386 presbyter in Antioch, from 398 bishop of Constantinople († 407), and *Theodore*, presbyter in Antioch,


20 His writings (adv. Porphyrium, libb. xxx., contra Eunomium, etc.) are all lost. Many of his interpretations of Scripture are preserved in the Catecheses. Philostorgius ap. Suidam, s. v. Apollinaris prefers him to Basil and Gregory of Nazianzum: Οὗτος γὰρ ὑπ' ἐκείς ἐν ταῖς Ἐρημίδοισιν οἰκεῖ οὖσε τε ἐν τοῖς. Cf. Fabricius-Harles. vol. vii. p. 588, ss.


22 Hieron. Cat. c. 119: Diodorus Tarsensis Episcopus, dum Antiochiae eisset presbyter, magis clarius. Extant ejus in Apostolam commentarii, et multa alia, ad Eusebii magis Eneseni characterem pertinentia: cujus cum sensum secutus sit eloquentiam imitari non potuit propter ignorantiam sacraulum litterarum. Socrat. vi. 3: Πολλὰ βιβλία συνέχειας γράφη τὸ γράμματι τῶν θείων πράσεως γραφῶν, τὰς θεωρίας αὐτῶν εκτραπέτομεν. For his orthodoxy, which was afterward called in question, see Facundi Ep. Hermianensis (about 548) pro defensione trium Capitolurum lib. iv. c. 2. His writings, which have been all lost, and among them commentaries on most of the biblical books, whose loss must be chiefly regretted, are enumerated by Theodore Victor ap. Suidas, s. v. Διοδόρος, and by Ebedesus in Assemani Bibl. orient. ii. i. 88. Cf. Fabricius-Harles, ix. 278, ss. Fragments are found in Marius Mercator, Photius (Cod. 129) and others. Among the Chaldaean Christians, who held him in great repute (see Assemani, iii. ii. 294), many of his writings may have been preserved in translation.

23 Although he had been previously distinguished by similar honorable surnames (thus he is called in Proclus, bishop of Constantinople after 437, *peri paradóseis tòv thias leitougarç* in Gallandii Bibl. PP. ix. 681: δὲ τὴν γλώσσαν χρησάσας *Iovvýγ,* yet the surname Chrysostom first occurs in Johannes Moschus (about 630) pratum spirit. c. 131, and is generally employed after Concil. vi. in the year 680. His works are: Orations, among which the homilies on the New Testament writings are also of exegetical importance.

from 393 bishop of Mopsuestia († 429), the most eminent exegetical writer of the Syrian school.

The difference of the exegetical principles of the two schools gave expression to itself even in controversial writings. This dispute however had an entirely scientific character, and did not prevent them recognizing each other's merit. As the Origenist Jerome made diligent use of the interpreters of the Syrian school, so also Origen for the most part stood in high estimation with the Syrians. But small traces of doctrinal controversies are
now to be found between the two schools. Those orthodox Origenists did not adopt all the peculiar doctrinal sentiments of their master; nor were these doctrines all reckoned damnable. A pretty wide field for free investigation was still left to reason, and the passion with which the question of the relation of the Son to the Father was discussed, made this doctrine so much the test of orthodoxy, almost indeed exclusively so, that they never thought during the Arian controversy of limiting freedom of inquiry on other subjects. Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus were known as Origenists. Many others held to single points of Origen’s creed without being attacked on that account. Chalcedius and Synesius came to adopt still more remarkable opinions by joining new-Platonism with Christianity; yet the latter was consecrated bishop of Ptolemais by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, although he gave public expression to his convictions (410). The belief in the inalienable capability of


28 Gregor. Naz. Orat. 33 (de Theol. i.) in fine: Φιλοσόφει μοι περὶ κόσμων η κόσμων, περὶ θλησ, περὶ ψυχῆς, περὶ λογικῶν φύσεων βελτίων τα κι γερόντων, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, κρίσεως, ἀντιπόδων, Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. Εἰ θυτοίς γάρ καὶ τὸ ἐπιτη- χάνεις σὺκ ἄμφοτερον, καὶ τὸ διαμαρτύτης ἄμφοτέρον. Even in the west the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls was not yet regarded as heretical. Augustine de Libero arbitrio, iii. 21: Hærum autem gnatur de anima sententiarum, utrum de propugnac. veniant, ut in singulis quibusque nascantibus novae sint, ut in corpore nascentium jam aliquibus existentibus vel mittantur divinitus, vel inde sua sponte laborantur, nullam temere affirmare oportet. Cf. Hieron. Epist. 126 (al. 82), ad Marcellinum et Anaspsychiam.


30 On this theology see Guérick de schola Alex. P. ii. p. 332, ss, especially on the pre- existence of souls, p. 361, and the possible conversion of the devil, p. 359, 308, especially Lücke Quesistiones ac vindicat. Didymianus P. i. p. 9, ss. Against the former, Gregory of Nazianzum declares himself very decidedly (see Ullmann, p. 414, ff).

31 The doctrine of Hilary regarding the humanity of Christ, de trin. x., was made up from the opinions of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. See my Comm. qua Clementis Alex. et Origenis doctrinae de corpore Christi exemplantr. Gotting. 1837. 4; that of C. Marius Victorinus philos. (about 365) in Comm. in ep. ad Ephes. i. 4 (Maji Scriptt. vett. nova collect. iii. ii. 90, 93, s.), animas nostras et anti mundi constitutionem fuisse, quippe cum sua substantia in aeternum semper exstiterint, is Origenistic.


33 Synesius Ep. 105, ad fratrem Eothopiam announces why he felt it a hazardous thing to assume the office of a bishop, which had been offered him. Among other things, it is
improvement in all rational beings, and the limited duration of future punishment was general even in the west and among the opponents of Origen, that, even if it may not be said to have arisen without the influence of Origen's school, it had become entirely independent of his system. On the other hand, millenarianism, although it had been abandoned by most theologians, had still many friends among the people, without their being considered as heretics on account of it.


25 Augustini Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 112: Frustra nonnulli, immo quam plurimi, acteri nam damamtorum poenam et cruciatus sinre intermissione perpetuos humano miserentur affectos, atque ita futurum esse non credunt: non quidem scripturas divinis adversando, sed pro suo modo dura quaerere molliendo et in leniorem flectendo sententiam, quae putant in eis terribilium esse dicta quam veritas. Non enim obliviscercunt, inquit, misericordi Deus, aut continetur in ira sua miserationes suas. (Ps. lxxvii. 10).

26 In Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose expressions on the subject have been preserved by Salomo, bishop of Bassora (about 1293), in Assemini Bibli. Or. iii. l. 393. Respecting Theodore comp. Photii Cod. 81, Marius Mercator. p. 346, ed. Balduzi.
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A thorough opposition between the two schools was established by the circumstance that the Syrian school acknowledged Holy Scripture alone as the source of doctrine, while the disciples of Origen advocated their Gnostic tradition as a second source. But they did not attain to a scientific examination of these two positions, since all scientific free movement in the province of theology was soon checked from another quarter. In the same degree as monachism prevailed, there spread also a prejudice against having any thing to do with worldly science and heathen writers. By this means there was formed and strengthened a crowd of traditional theologians, who, inimical to all free inquiry, would endure no opinion which could not be pointed out in the fathers. Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, from the year 367 († 403), may be regarded as the representative of this tendency. Even in his Panarion (Haer. 63 and 64), he made himself known as a bitter enemy of Origen; and when the Arian controversy was at an end, he began an open war against Origenism. While this contest put a stop to all free inquiry in the east, the western world was contemporaneously bound in spiritual fetters by Augustine; and free science every where banished from the church as a thing which causes mischief.
II. PERIOD OF THE ORIGENISTIC AND PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES.

§ 85.

ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.


Shortly after the termination of the Arian controversies, Palestine was the chief seat of Origen's followers. Among them the most distinguished were John, bishop of Jerusalem (386–417), and the two monks, Rufinus and Jerome. Here Epiphanius made his appearance in the year 394, and demanded with zeal the condemnation of Origen. John and Rufinus resisted him: while Jerome, who was anxiously alive to his orthodoxy, yielded, and broke off communion with the church of Jerusalem. By the efforts of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, he was indeed induced to renew it, 397. In the mean time, in the same year, Rufinus went back to Rome, and endeavored, by a revised translation of the writings of Origen, which were as yet little known, to procure a more favorable opinion of him in the west. By this means a violent controversy was created between him and

1 Cf. Kimmel de Rufino Essubii interpretate (Gerne. 1838), p. 57. Hieronymi lib. ad Pammachium contra Joan. Hieros. (ap. Martianay Epist. 58). Here the following erroneous doctrines are attributed to Origen (comp. Div. L. § 64, note 15): 1. In libro προ ἀρχαίαν (I. 1. § 6) logiaur: sic est enim incongruum est dicere, quod possit filius videre patrem, qui inaequum est opinari, quod spiritus s. possit videre filium, 2. quod in hoc corpore quidem in carne sunt animas relinquat, et, antequam homo fiet in paradiso, inter rationales substantias in coelestibus commoratur; 3. quod dicat, et diabolum et daemones autors poenitentiam aliquando, et cum sancta ultimo tempore regnavit, 4. quod tamincs pellicias humana corpora interpretetur, quibus post ossificationem et ejunctionem de paradiso Adam et Eva induti sunt, 5. quod carnis resurrectionem, membrorumque compositionem, et sexum, quo vivi dividitur a feminis, apertissimae neget, 6. quod sic Paradisum, alphorizet, ut historece superum veritatem, pro barboribus angulos, pro fluminibus virtutes coelestes intellegant, totamque paradisista continentiam tropologica interpretatione subvertat, 7. quod aquas, quae super caelos in scripturis esse dicuntur, sanctus supernasque virtutes; quae super terram et infra terram, contrarias et daemonias esse arbitrant, 8. quod imaginem et similitudinem dei, ad quam homo conditus fuerat, dictas ab eo perditam, et in hominum post paradisum non fuisse.

Jerome. Origen, however, having been condemned in Egypt, Anastasius, bishop of Rome, condemned him also. Rufinus retreated to Aquileia, and continued his meritorious services in the translation of Greek works († 410). Jerome, on the other hand, gained for himself great merit by his continued labors on the translation of the Bible into Latin, and his commentaries († 420).

Soon after these controversies in Palestine, the ambitious and violent Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria (385–412), came forth as the enemy of Origen. The Nitrian monks were divided into two parties, the Origenists and the Anthroponomorphists. Moved by personal hatred to some individuals of the first, and afraid of the fanaticism of the latter, Theophilus caused Origen to be condemned (399, 400), then demanded the most noted bishops to do the same, and prosecuted, with the greatest cruel-

---


7 Theophilus, according to Palladius ap. Montfaucon, xiii. 20, had the distinguishing surname Ἀρείπαλλάξ.

ties, the monks who had adopted the peculiar views of Origen. These unfortunate persons repaired at last to Constantinople, where John Chrysostom of Antioch had been bishop, contrary to the wishes of Theophilus, since 398, as much beloved by the better part of his clergy as he was hated by the more corrupt, by the luxurious court, and the empress Eudoxia. Theophilus directed his deadly hatred against Chrysostom, because the latter received the banished, and made representations to Theophilus on their behalf, and because by their complaints they procured from the emperor a summons commanding the bishop of Alexandria to appear in person at Constantinople before Chrysostom. After some delay, Theophilus appeared in Constantinople (403), and there succeeded in uniting the foes of Chrysostom, in procuring false accusers, and causing sentence of deposition and exile to be pronounced upon him at a synod (Syn. ad. Quercum). It is true Chrysostom had to be recalled in a few days, on account of an uproar among the people, but he was as quickly displaced, chiefly through the influence of Eudoxia, and died in exile at Pontus († 407). Though the Romish bishop Innocent greatly condemned these acts of violence, he could not succeed in bringing Theophilus to account. In consequence of such conduct,

86) : Breviter scribimus, quod totus mundus exultet, et in tuis victorias glorietur, eductuique Alexandræa vexillum crucis, et adversus haeresin trophaea fulgentia gaudens populum turba peraspectet. Macte virtute, macte zelo fidei ! Ostendisti, quod luxus ac taciturnitas dispensatio fuit, non concensus. Libere enim Reverentiae tuae loquor. Donecnum te niamim esse patientem, et ignorantes magistri gubernacula, gesistebamus in iterum perditorum : sed, ut video, exaltati manum diu, et suspendoristi plagam, ut fercrea fortes. Jerome translated into Latin all the writings that appeared against the Origenists (in particular Theophil Libri pauchales, ill., with a new catalogue of Origen's heresies). Those translations, with the correspondence between Jerome and Theophilus, are most fully given in Vallarsi, vol. i. Ep. 86, ss. How little Theophilus acted on this occasion according to his conviction is proved even by his subsequent conduct to Synesius. See § 84, note 33.


10 An extract from the Acts of this Synod is given in Photii Bibli. cod. 59.

11 Beginning of a sermon of Chrysostom (according to Socrat. vii. 18. Sozom. viii. 20) : Μάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς μαίνεται, πάλιν ταράσσεται, πάλιν ἀρχεῖται, πάλιν ἐπὶ πίνακα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἑωράνου ἐτεῖ ταῖς Ἀφανείς.

12 Chrysostom's own account of the events in Constantinople, Ep. ad Innocentium I. A.D. 404 ap. Palladius Ep. ad eundem, from exile A.D. 407 (both in Constant. Innoc. P. Epist. 4 et 11). Isidore, abbot in Palaestina, passed a judgment on these proceedings soon after Chrysostom's death (lib. i. Epist. 152) : Ἡ γείτων Ἰδρυτάς συναντάς ἁφόρησες, Μουσία παραπτωμένης, τῶν Φάραώ οἰκειομένης. Τὸν λυθμένην καὶ χρυσολάτρην προβαλλόμενη Θεόφιλον, τέσσαρα συναφεῖς, ἡ μάλλον συναπτότατας ἄφημοιν, τὸν θεολόγον καὶ θεολόγων κατεπλημμένον ἄθρωπον.—Ἀλλ' οἶκος Δαβίδ κραταίωσε, ἀσθενεὶ δὲ ἡ σὺ σωκλᾶ.

13 His epistles and those of Honorius are in Manzi Conc. coll. iii. 1095.
Rome broke off all church communion with Constantinople; and in the latter city itself, a great part of the church remained faithful to Chrysostom (Johannites), and kept themselves apart from his successors, whom they looked upon as intruders, until the wrong that had been done to him was atoned by the solemn bringing back of his bones (438).

§ 86.

CONTROVERSIES WITH HERETICS IN THE WEST.

During the Arian disturbances, the Manichaeans had been silently spreading in the west, because for the most part they conformed externally to the catholic church. In Spain, they coincided with the Gnostics,¹ and from contact with them arose the doctrine with which Priscillian (about 379) came forth in Spain.² His most violent opponents, the bishops Idacius and Ithacius, first obtained the condemnation of his doctrines at the synod of Caesaraugusta (380); and next they prevailed on the usurper Maximus to put him to death at Treves (385). The

¹ Jerome often alludes to the spreading of Basilides's followers into Spain (Comm. in Ezech. liv. xviii. ad Es. lxiv. 4, Ep. 120, ad Hedibiam : Basilidis Haeresin et Iberas nae- nias. Prolog. in Genesis : Iberae naenias. Comm. in Amos. c. 3 : Iberae ineptiae), and in Ep. 53 ad Theodorum derives the doctrine of Priscillian from him. With him agrees Sulp. Severus, ii. 46, representing Priscillian's doctrine as derived from Egypt (infamis illa Gnosticorum haeresis), as first brought to Spain by one Marcus, a native of Memphis, communicated by him to Agape and Helpidius, and as having come through them to Priscillian. It is not denied hereby that a new development of doctrine originated with Priscillian, and it is expressly acknowledged by others that Manichaeism had an influence upon it. The emperor Maximus, in Ep. ad Siriciunm ap. Baronius 387, no. 66, calls the Priscillianists nothing more nor less than Manichaeans; Hieronymus Ep. 43, ad Cesiphon- tem, calls Priscillian partem Manachaei; Augustinus Ep. 36 ad Casulan, says that the Priscillianists were very like the Manichaeans, and de Haeres. c. 70: Maxime Gnosticorum et Manichecorum dogmata permixta sectantur. There were many, however, who were inclined to perceive orthodox doctrine under a strange garb. Hieronymus Catal. c. 121: Priscillianus est nullius gnosticae, i.e., Basilidis et Marcionis haereses accusator, defendentibus alius, non haec cum sensisse ut arguiatur.

² His history Sulp. Sever. Hist. sacr. ii. 46-51, who calls the Priscillianists Gnosticorum haeresis. Something of their doctrine, but unsatisfactory, is found in P. Orossii Consultatio s. Commodorium ad Augustinum de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum, and in Leonis M. Epist. 93 ad Turibium Episc. Asturic. Priscilliani canones (doctrinal consequences) ad S. Pauli Epist. cum prologo, published in the Splicleigum Romanum, t. ix. (Romae. 1843) P. ii. p. 1, have been altered by a bishop called Peregrinus Juxta sensum fidei catholicae, and accordingly are no longer a source whence we may derive a knowledge of Priscillian's doctrine. Walch's Katzerhist. iii. 378. Neander, ii. iii. 1477. Dr. J. H. B. Lübkerdt de haereti Priscillianistarum. Havniae. 1840. 8.
Priscillianists, however, continued to exist in spite of all persecutions till the sixth century.

At the same time, the persecution of the Manichaeans, who were especially hated for various reasons, was also renewed. Valentinius I., who tolerated all other sects, forbade them to assemble in public for their worship, in 372; and succeeding emperors enacted new and still more rigorous laws against them. But their most zealous adversary was Aurelius Augustinus, born at Tagaste, in Numidia, who had himself belonged to the Manichaeans for a considerable time, but had been converted at Milan by Ambrose (387). Afterward, as bishop of Hippo Regius in Numidia (from 395 to 430), he became as formidable an opponent of heretics, as he exercised an incalculable influence on his own and subsequent times, by his doctrinal and polemical writings. His energies were directed in a high degree against


4 Besides the numerous writings against heretics, biblical commentaries (cf. Clasen Aurel. Augustinii sacrae scripturae interpres. Hafn. 1827. 8.), [Davidson's Hibernomethica p. 133], sermons (Paulii's Gesch. d. christl. Beredsamkeit. i. 781), ascetic writings, letters, the following are to be especially noted: de Civitate Dei lib. xii. (comp. § 73, note 18). De Doctrina christiana lib. iv. (ed. J. Chr. B. Teegius. Lips. 1769. 8. C. H. Bruder, ed. strect. Lips. 1839. Paulii, i. 684). Confessiones libb. xiii. (c. praeft. A. Neander. Berol. 1823. 8.) Retractions libb. ii. Opp. ed. Monachi Benedictiæ or Congreg. St. Mauri. Paris 1679-1700. xi. voll. recus. cum appendice cura Jo. Clerici. Antwerp. 1700-1703. xii. voll. Venetiis. 1729-35. xi. vol. fol. Operum supplem. i. cura D. A. B. Caillaux et D. B. Saint-Yves. Paris. 1836. fol. Opp. emend. et aucta. Paris 1836. 88. xi. voll. 8. The more all parties had occasion to appeal to the writings of Augustine, in consequence of the high authority in which they stood, the greater was the danger of their undergoing intentional and unintentional corruptions. Even so early as the ninth century Hincmar (about 860), de non trina deitate (Opp. i. 450), unjustly accuses others of what he is disposed to do himself, i.e., of corrupting them. The doctrinal position of the editor had its influence also in the earlier editions. It is even proclaimed in the title of the Opp. Venet. 1584: In quo curavimus re- moveri ea omnia, quae fideli suae haereticæ praevia possecus infere, quæ Benedictines were the first who proceeded critically in their edition, but by this they gave offense to the Jesuits, who asserted they had falsified the Cod. Corbejones. On the other side wrote Mabillken Supplementum libri de re diplomatica c. 13. On this came forth the Jesuit
the Manichaean. Several were converted by him, but many still remained in Africa. Even in Rome, there were secret Manichaean at that time; but their numbers were very much increased there after the conquest of Africa by the Vandals (429). Hence Leo the Great, bishop of Rome (440–461), exerted himself to the utmost to detect and convert them. His zeal, supported by imperial ordinances, was not ineffectual; but yet single Manichean opinions continued to exist till far into the middle ages.

There were still more furious controversies in Africa in the fourth century against the Donatists, among whom the fanati-


5 * His writings against the Manichaens, see Div. I. before § 61.
8 * Sources and works see Div. I. § 72, note 25.
cal Agonistici, called by the catholic Christians Circumcelliones, appeared, for the purpose of rendering their cause victorious by external force. The most formidable opponent of the Donatists was Augustine, who at last effected, by the emperor’s interference, a conference with them in Carthage (411), at which they were completely vanquished, in the judgment of the

9 Concerning the time of the origin of the Agonistici or Circumcelliones, see Optatus, lib. 111. c. 4: Veniebant Paulus et Macarins (sent by the emperor about 348), qui perquebér ubique dispungenerunt, et ad unitatem singulos hortarentur: et cum ad Bagajemem civitatem proximarent, tunc alter Donatus—ejusdem civitatis Episcopus, impedimemum unitati et obiecerent venientibus supera memoratis opponere cupiunt, praegenis per vicina loca et per omnes munera misit. Circumcelliones Agonisticos nuncupans, ad praedictum locum ut concurrerent, invitavit: et eorum illo tempore concursus est flagitatis, quorum dementia paullo ante ab ipsis Episcopis impie videbatur esse successa. Described by Augustini de Haeres. lib. 61. c. 69: Ad hanc (Donatistaram) haeresim in Africa et illi pertinent, qui appellantur Circumcelliones, genus hominum agreste et famosisimae undaeae, non solum in alios humana facinor perpetuo, sed nec sibi eadem insana foritate parendo. Nam per mortes varias, maximeque praeceptiorem et aequum et ignum, se ipsos necare consenuerant, et in istum furor eorum alios quis poterint sexus utrisque seducer aliquando, ut occidantur aliis, mortem nisi fecerem comminantem. Verumtamen plerique Donatistarum (non) displicent tales, nec eorum communiones containiari se putant. Idem contra Crescon, iii. 61. c. 4: Quotidie vestrorum incredibili patimur facta Clericorum et Circumcellionum, multo pejora quam quarumlibet latronum atque praedorum. Namque horrendis armatis cajusquis generis telis, terribiliter vagando, non dico ecclesiasticam, sed ipsam humanae quietem pacemque perturbant, nocturnis agressionibus clericorum catholicon invassae domos undas atque inanes delerentur; ipsos etiam rapitos et furibus tassos, ferroque concisos, semivivos abjiciunt. Insuper—occis eorum caeleb aceto permixto infundentes—excruaciæ amplius eligunt quam citius excceouare. § 47: Circumcellionum vestrorum, nobilis furor horrore devoutæ vestris clericis satellitium usquequaque odioseissime innuit. Idem contra Gaudentium, l. 51. c. 32: Cum idololatriæ licentia usquequaque fervoret—istis Paganorum aruis festa sua frequentantibus ignobant (cf. Epist. 185, § 12: quando adhuc cultus fuerat idolorum, ad Paganorum celeberrimas sollemnitates ingenua turbarum agmina venient, non ut idola fractequent, sed ut intercenderat a cultibus idolorum: doubtless in the time from Julian to Gratian).—Procter haece sunt saxoniam et montium horrida prænupta, voluntariorum creberrimus mortibus nobilitata vestrorum; aquis et ignibus rarius il sesebant, praeceptis greges consummabatur ingentes. Quis enim nescit hoc genus hominum in horrore facinoribus inquitum, ab utilibus operibus otiosum, crudelissimum in mortibus alicuius, vilissimum in suis, maxime in agris territians, ab agris vacans et victus sui causa collas circumiens rusticass, unde et Circumcellionum nomen accept ? Ejud. Enarratio in Psalm. cxxxii. § 53: Quando vos recte haereticis de Circumcellionibus in absentia cooperitis—iliis vobis insatissant Monachis. Primo si comparandi sunt, vos videte. Comparetur ebrisum cum sobris, praeceptis cum consideratis, fiorentem cum simpliciis, vagantes cum congregatis. § 6: Fortasse dicti sunt nostri non vocantur Circumcelliones: vos illos ita appellatis contumeliosaque nomine. Agonistas eos vocant. Sic eos, inquit appellamus propter agonem. Certum enim, et dictum Apostolos: certamen hominum certavi (2 Tim. iv. 7). Quia sunt qui certant adversus diabolum et praevaleant milites Christi, Agonistici appellantur. Utilina ergo milites Christi essent, et non milites doli, a quibus plus timetar Deo laudes quam fremitus leonis. Illi etiam insulare nobis audent, quia fratres, cum vident homines, Deo gratias dicunt. Vos Deo gratias nostrum ridetis: Deo laudes vestrum plorant homines (cf. contra literas Petilianii, ii. § 146: conside rate paululum, quam multa, et quantum lactum dederint Deo laudes armatorum vestrorum).


11 Gesta collationis Carthagine habita prim. ed. Papiirius Masson, Paris 1539. 8, accord-
imperial commissioner. This victory, and the imperial ordinances that followed, very much weakened the party, though remnants of it are found as late as the seventh century.

§ 87.

PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.


Augustine exerted the greatest influence on the theology especially of the occidental church, by his system of the relation of Divine grace to the human will, which he developed in the Pelagian controversy. The freedom of the will, the evil consequences of the fall, and the necessity of Divine grace, had always been admitted in the church, without any attempt having been made to define, by ecclesiastical formulas, the indefinable in these doctrines. Since Tertullian, an opinion had been peculiar to the Latin fathers which was wholly unknown to the Greek church, that the sin of Adam had been transferred as a peccable principle to his posterity, by generation (tradux animae, tradux peccati). This must necessarily have had some influence on the doctrines of free will and Divine grace. Pelagius and Caeles-


12 After several other laws against them, Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 52, Honorius ordered a general fine to be exacted of them. Also : Servos etiam dominorum admonitio, vel colonos verbem crebris horam a prava religione revocabit.—Clerici vero ministri eorum ac perniciosissimae sacratissimae ablati de Africano solo quod rito sacriego polluerunt, in exilium virilim ad singulas quasque regiones sub idonea prosecutione mitiantur, ecclesiam eorum vel conventiculis praeclisque, si quis in eorum ecclesias haeceticorum largitas prava contentur, proprietati Catholicae (sicut jam diximus statuimus) vindicat. In addition to all this, 414 L. 54 : Evidenti praecipetio se agnoscat et intestabiles, et nullum potestatem aliquas inueni habere contractus, sed perpetuo inustos infamia, a coetibus honestis et a conventu publico separandos.

1 Horn. Comm. de tententisi eorum Patrum, quorum auctoritas ante Augustinum plurimum valuit, de peccato originali. Goetting. 1801. 4. Wiggers, i. 403, sq. How groundlessly Augustine appealed in support of his theory to Gregory of Nazianzum is shown by Ullmann in his work Gregor. v. Naz. S. 438, sq. 446, sq.

2 Hilarius Pictav. in Matth. c. 18, § 6 : In unius Adae errore omne hominum genus
tius, two monks universally esteemed for their morals, had distinguished themselves even during their abode at Rome (till 409), by giving peculiar prominence to the doctrine of free will for the promotion of personal virtue. Afterward they repaired to Africa (411), whence Pelagius soon passed over into Palestine. But Caelestius, when he became a candidate for the office of presbyter in Carthage, was accused of various errors which had proceeded from the tendency to exalt free will, and was excluded from church communion by a synod at Carthage (412); on which he went to Ephesus.

The doctrines of Caelestius, however, had gained many friends, and therefore Augustine was induced to oppose them, although personally he had no share in the transactions of the synod by which Caelestius was condemned. His attention was soon drawn to the writings of Pelagius, as the teacher of Caelestius, which he refuted, but always as yet with respect and forbearance. But after Jerome, in Palestine, had begun to raise suspicions


2 Particularly did Pelagius disapprove the address to God, in Augustini Confess. x. 29: Da quod jubes, et jubes quod vis, see August. de Dono perseverantiae, c. 20.

4 Marius Mercator has preserved from the Gestis Concilii the seven points of accusation (Commomitorium i. ed. Baluz. p. 3, Comm. ii. p. 133): I. Adam mortem factum, qui sine peccato, sive non peccaret, fuisse mortum. II. Quoniam peccatum Adam ipsum solum lacesit, et non genus humanum. III. Quoniam infantes, qui nascentur, in eo statu sunt, in quo Adam fuit ante prevaricationem. IV. Quoniam neque per mortem vel praevaticationem Adams omne genus hominum moritur, neque per resurrectionem Christi omne hominum genus resurgit. V. Quoniam infantes, etiam si non baptizentur, habent vitam aeternam. VI. Quoniam lex sic mitter ad regnum coæorum, quonodo et evangélium. VII. Quoniam et ante adventum Domini fuerunt homines impeccabiles, id est sine peccato (p. 37: Posse esse hominem sine peccato et facile Dei mandata servare, quin et ante Christi adventum fuerunt homines sine peccato). Cf. Augustin. de Gestis Pelagii 11. Caelestius' defense of the second and third points in Augustin. de Pecce. orig. c. 3, 4 (from the Synodical acta): Dixit, de traduce peccati culbiæ me esse, sit tamen, ut cui donavit Deus gratiam sperbatis, consentiam; quia diversa ab eis audivi, qui utique in ecclesia catholica constituted sunt presbyteri. Sanctus presbyter Rufinus (perhaps the celebrated, see Norius Hist. Pelag. i. 2, and de Syn. quint. c. 13) Romanæ qui munit cum sancto Parmachio: ego audivi illum dicentem, quia tradux peccati non sit.—Lict quaecosis res sit ista, non huerosia. Infantes semper dixi egere baptizari: quid quaerit alia?

5 Augustine's controversial writings till 415: Sermones, 170, 174, 175, 293, 294; Epist. 140 ad Honoratum; 157 ad Hilarium (in reply to his information of Pelagian in Sicily in Epist. 156); especially de peccatorum meritis et remissione (s. de baptismo parvulum), lib. iii. ad Marcellinum (in the third book against Pelagii expositiones in Pauli Epist.). and de spiritu et littera ad eundem. These writings from 412-414. De natura et gratia against Pelagii lib. de natura (Ep. 169, § 13, adversus Pelagii huerosiam) and de perfectione justitiae hominis Epist. s. liber ad Eutropium et Paullum, against Caelestii definitions, both in the year 415.
against Pelagius of being an Origenist, for he hated him from some trifling causes; and after Orosius, a presbyter sent by Augustine, had failed in his attempt to procure the condemnation of the Pelagian doctrine, with John, bishop of Jerusalem, and also with the synod at Diospolis (Lydda, 415), Augustine laid aside all forbearance, and opposed Pelagianism severely and bitterly in many works. The African bishops solemnly condemned the heresy at the synods of Mileve and Carthage (416), and Innocent I., bishop of Rome, fully agreed with them. After Innocent's death († 417), Pelagius and Caelestius applied to his successor Zosimus, by whom they were declared orthodox.

---


7 August. Epist. 169, § 13: Scripsi etiam librum ad sanctum presbyterum Hieronymum de animae origine (is Ep. 166), consules cum, quomodo defendi possit illauenta, quam religiosa memoriae Marcellino suum esse scriptum, singulas animas novas nascentibus fieri, ut non labebatur fundatissima ecclesia sordes, quae inconcessae credimus, quod in Adam omnes meruitur, et nisi per Christum libeneretur, quod per suum Sacramentum etiam in parvis operatur, in condemnationem trahatur. Occasione quippe cujusdam sanctissimi et studioseissimi juvenis presbyteri Orosi, qui ad nos ab ultima Hispania, id est ab Oceanis literae, solo sanctarum scripturarum ardore inflammatum adventit, unitero noluit, ut ad illum quosque pergaret, persaesi.

8 See the narrative in Orosii Apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate.


11 His reply to Carthage August. Epist. 181, to Mileve Ep. 182, and in Constant.

12 See especially Caelestii symb. ad Zosim, below note 19. The three letters of Zosimus ad Aureliam et easter Epist. Afric. the first two of Sept. 417, the third of 31 March, 418, may be found in Constant. In the first it is said: Ipsum sanctum Caelestium, et qui uque in tempore ex diversis regionibus aderant sacerdotes, admodum, has tendicens quasciorem et inepta certamina, quae non sedificant, sed magis destruunt, ex illa carissi-
but the Africans adhered still to their judgment in the synod at Carthage (417), and the general synod held at the same place (418), and succeeded in obtaining from Honorius a sacrum rescriptum against the Pelagians. Zosimus now also yielded, and condemned Pelagianism in the Epistola tractoria. The Italian bishops were compelled to subscribe this; and eighteen who refused were deposed. Among them also was Julian, bishop of Eclanum, who continued to defend Pelagianism in various works, against which Augustine wrote several in refutation.

The Pelagians did not form an ecclesiastical, but simply a theological party. They had also no common type of doctrine, and therefore deviated from one another in particular points. Their opinions, which are to be found without disfigurement only in their own works, may be reduced to the following arti-

13 Fragment of the Synod's letter to Zosimus in Prosperi l. contra collatorem, c. 15: Constituimus, in Pelagium atque Caeselium per venerabilem episcopum Innocentium de beatissimi apostoli Petri sede prolatae manere sententiam, domum aperississiua confessione fæteantur, gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, non solam ad cognoscendam, verum etiam ad faciendum justitiam nos per actus singulos adjuvant, etc.

14 Mansi, iv. 377. The eight (or nine see Norisius, l. c. p. 135, the Benedictine preface in t. x. Opp. Aug. § 18, and App. t. x. p. 71) Canones against the Pelagians are in the collection of the decrees of councils put erroneously as the first of the synod at Milove, A.D. 416, ap. Mansi, iv. 335.


16 Fragments of it in Appendix p. 108 and ap. Constant. That the tractoria was not issued before the African council and the sacrum rescriptum, as is supposed by Baronnins, Norisius, Garnier and others, but after both, is proved by Tillemont, t. xiii. p. 738, 739, and the Benedictines, praeaf. ad t. x. opp. Aug. § 18. Hence August. contra duas epist. Pelag. ii. c. 3: Quin etiam (Pelagiani) Romanos clericos arguent, scribentes, "eos jussionis terrore pecusos non erubisse praevirationis crimine admirerere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholicis dogmati adfererent, postea promniarent, malam hominum esse naturam."


18 Three works of Pelagius have been preserved complete by the circumstance of their having fallen among those of Jerome, viz., Pelagii expositiones in epist. Pauli, before the year 416. (That Pelagius is the author is proved by J. G. Vossius Hist. Pelag. i. 4. Probably Cassiodorus emended doctrinally nothing but the commentary on the Ep. to the Romans. Comp. Rosenmüller Hist. Interpret. iii. 503.)—Epistola ad Demetriadem A.D. 413 (cum aliis aliorum epistolis ed. J. S. Semler. Hal. 1775. 8. Cf. Rosenmüller l. c. p. 599, ss.)—Libellus fidei ad Innocent. l. A.D. 417 [taken into libros Carolinos de imagin. cultu iii. c. 1, as confessio fidei, quam a SS. Patribus acceperimus, tenemus et puro corde credimus;
cles. "There is no original sin. Man can by his free will choose good as well as evil. Every one therefore can obtain salvation (salmus s. vita aeterna). In Christianity a still higher salvation is presented, for which baptism is a necessary condition (regnum coelorum). As the law was formerly given to


19 Caelestii Symb. fragm. i. : Infantes autem debebant secum secundum divinam unification evangelicae et secundum evangeli sententiam, confitear, quia Dominus statuit, regnum caelorum non nisi baptizatus posse conferri: quod quia vires naturae non habent, conferri necesse est per gratiam libertatem. In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non ibidem diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce (or peccatum naturae, peccatum naturali) firmare videamus, quod longe a catholic sensu alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postnata sem exercetur ab homine, quia non naturae delectum, sed voluntatis esse demonstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum, ne diversa baptisantia genera facere videamus, et hoc praemunire necessarium est, ne per mysterior occasionem, ad creatorii injuriun, malum, antequam fiat ab homine, tradit dicatur homini per natural. Pelagii ep. ad Demetr. C. 4: Ferat sententiam de naturae bene ipse conscientia bona.—Quid illud obsevo est, quod ad omne peccatum aut erubescemus, aut timentem? et culpam facti nume robore volunt, nume pallore monstramus?—a diverso astim in omnibus fatoi, constantes, introspidit samus?—Est enim inquam in animis nostris naturalis quaedam (ut ita diximmer) sanctitas, quae velut in arce animi prassidens exercet boni malique judicium. But comp. c. 8: Neque vero alia nobis causa difficultatem bene faciendi facti, quam longa consuetudo vitiorum, quae nos infecta a parvo, paulatimque per multos corruptit amos, et ita postea obligatos sibi et addictos tenet, ut vina quodammodo videtem habere naturae.

20 Pelagius ap. August. de Pocc. orig. 14: Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel labilales vel vituperabiles supusus, non omnibus oritur, sed agitur a nobis: capaces enim utruisseque rei, non pleni nasciur, et ut sine virtute, ita et sine vitio procreaverunt: atque ante actionem propriam voluntatis, id solum in homine est, qui Deus condidit. Epist. ad Demetr. c. 3: Volens namque Deus rationabili creaturam voluntarii boni munere et liberis arbitrii potestate donare, utruisseque partis possibilitatem homini inserendo proprium quia fecit, esse quod velit: ut boni ac mali capax, naturaliter utrumque posset, et at alterum voluntatem deflectere. Hence Caelestii definitiones are proofs, hominem sine peccato esse posse. Among other things it is said, def. 2: Hieronym quaequandum est, peccatum voluntatis an necessitas est? Si necessitas est, peccatum non est, si voluntatis, vitari potest. 5. Hieronym quaequandum est, utrumque debeat homo sine peccato esse. Procul dubio debet. Si debet, potest: si non potest, ergo non debet. Et si non debet homo esse sine peccato, debet ergo cum peccato esse, et jam peccatum non erit, si illud deberi constiuerit.

21 August. de Pocc. merit. et remiss. i. 30: Sed quia non ait, inquirant, "Nisi quia
facilitate the bringing about of goodness, so now the instructions and example of Christ, and the particular operations of grace. The latter, however, always follow the free purpose to be good. God's predestination therefore is founded solely on his foreknowledge of human actions."

Though Augustine had formerly in his controversy with the Manicheans conceded much to free will, and taken a very different view of predestination, he had long before Pelagius adopted a stricter view, which was for the first time developed in the controversy with the Pelagians in the following system.

renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non habebit salutem, vel vitam aeternam," tantummodo autem dixit "non intrabit in regnum Dei" (Jo. iii. 5) : ad hoc parvuli baptizandi sunt, ut sint etiam cum Christo in regno Dei, ubi non erunt, si baptizati non fuerint: quamvis et sine baptismo si parvuli moriantur, salutem vitamque aeternam habituri sint, quotidianum nullo peccati vinculo obstricti sunt. In ilio mense, Origen ad Rom. ii. 7, see Div. I. § 67, note 1.

22 Pelagius de Libero arbitrio (ap. Ang. de grat. Chr. 7): Hieros imperitiissimi hominum putant injustam divinae gratiae facere, quia dicimus eum sine voluntate nostra nequaquam in nobis perinde sanctificat; quasi Deus gratia suae aliquid imperaverit, et non illis, quibus imperavit, etiam gratiae suae auxilium subministret, ut quod per liberum homines facere jubentur arbitrium, faciunt possunt implores per gratiam. Quam nos non, ut tu putas, in ilio tantummodo, sed et in Dei esse adjuvator confiteremur. Adjuvat enim nos Deus per doctrinam et revelationem suam, dum cordis nostri oculos aperit; dum nobis, ne praestentibus occupemur, futura demonstrat; dum diabolus pandit insidias; dum nos multiformi et ineffabili doce gratiae caelestis illuminat. Ejusdem ep. ad Innoc. (ibid. c. 31): Ecce apud beatitudinem tuam epistola ista me purget, in qua pure atque simpliciter ad peccandum et ad non peccandum integrum liberum arbitrium habere nos dicimus, quod in omnibus bonis operibus divino adjuvatur semper auxilio. Quam liberi arbitrii potestatem dicimus in omnibus esse generaliter, in Christianis, Judaeis, atque Gentilibus. In omnibus est liberum arbitrium equilateral per naturam, sed in solis Christianis juvatur a gratia.

23 August. de Præcedest. Sanct. c. 3: Quo praecipus testimonio (1 Cor. iv. 7) etiam ipsis convictus sum, cum similiter erravem, putamus fideem, quia in Deum credimus, non esse domum Dei, sed a nobis esse in nobis, et per illum nos impetrare Dei dona, quibus tempore et in cœlo vivimus in hoc saeculo. Neque enim fideem putabam Dei gratia praeventi, ut per illum nobis daretur, quot posseceremus utilizare, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non praecedent praecox non veritate: aut autem praedicto nobis Evangelii consentiuntur, nostrum esse proprium, et nobis ex nobis esse arbitrarer. Quam meum errorem nonnulla opuscula mea satis indicant ante episcopatum meum scripta (in particular the expositio quarundam propositionum in Ep. ad Rom. c. 60 et 61, other works against the Manicheans. See Wundemann, ii. 79 and 91. Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. iii. 1393). Cf. Retractat. ii. 33.

24 Comp. lib. de diversis quaestionibus 83 (written A.D. 388-393). Qua. lxxxviii. § 4-6. De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum, i. i. Qu. 3 (A.D. 397). Münch's Dogmengesch. iv. 200.

"By the sin of Adam human nature became physically and morally corrupt." From it evil lust (concupiscencia) has come, which, since it has become the inheritance of all men by generation, has come to be original sin, in itself dammatory (peccatum originale, vitium originale, vitium haereditarium), and prevails so much over the will of the natural man that he can no longer will what is good, as he should do, out of love to God, but sins continually, however his actions may externally appear. From amoenitatis theol. c. 2. On the other hand Norisius in the Vindiciis Augustiniannis c. 5, § 5, seeks to defend him.—The Augustinian system is very differently represented, because the most opposite parties wished to find their own sentiments in it. It is most correctly described by the Reformed, the Dominicans, Augustines, and Jansenists; most misrepresented by the Jesuits.

26 Wiggers, i. 106.

27 Comp. especially the books de Peccato originali and de Nuphtiis et Concupiscencia.—De civ. Dei xiv. 1: A primus hominibus admissum est tam grande peccatum, ut in deriuos eo natura mutaretur humana, etiam in posterius obligatione peccati et mortis necessitate transmissa. De Peccat. merit. et remiss. i. 9: Ille, in quo omnes moriuntur, praeter quod eis qui praeceperunt Domini voluntate transgrediuntur, imitacionis exemplum est, occulta etiam teneb carnalis concupiscentiae suae tabilicavit in se omnes de suo stirpe venientes. De Nuphtiis et Concupiscencia, i. 24: Ex huc carnis concupiscencia, tanquam illis peccati, et quando illi ad turpia consentitur, etiam peccatorum matre multorum, quosque nascitur proles, originili est obligata peccato, nisi in illo renascatur, quoniam sine ista concupiscentia virgo concepit: propter, quando nasci est in carne dignatus, sine peccato solus est natus. De Corrept. et Gratia 10: Quia vero (Adam) per librum arbitrium Deum deseruit, justum judicium Dei expertus est, ut eum potius suas stirpes, quas in illo adhuc posita tota cum illo peccaverat, damnaretur (de Peccat. merit. et remiss. i. 10, Rom. v. 12 is cited for this purpose, in quo omnes peccaverunt, εφ' ὑπ' ἄνωτερα πίστεως, quando omnes ille unus homo fuerunt). Quotquot enim ex hac stirpe gratia Dei liberasur, a damnatione utique liberatur, qua jam tenetur obstricti. Unde etiam si nullis liberaretur, justum Dei judicium nemo juste reprehenderet. Quod ergo punc in comparationis percutium, in suo numero multi liberantur, gratia fit, gratis fit, gratiae sunt agendaria, quia fit, ne quis velut de suis meritis extollatur, sed omne os obstruatur, et qui glorietur, in Domino glorietur. De Pec. orig. 31: Unde ergo recte infans illa perdizione punitur, nisi quia pertinent ad massam perditionis, et juste intelligitur ex Adam natus, antiqui debiti obligatione damnatus, nisi inde fuerit, non secundum debitum, sed secundum gratiam liberatur! Hence the Pelagians accused him of holding the doctrine of a tradux animae and tradux peccat (Traducian). Inclined as he may have been to that view, he left the question of the origin of souls undecided. Cf. de Anima et ejus origine libb. iv. Opus imp. iv. 104: Arguo de origine animarum cunctationem meam, quia non audeo docere vel affirmare quod nescio (cf. de Peccat. merit. et remiss. ii. 36).

28 Contra duas opisth. Pelagianorum, i. 3: Quis autem nostrum dicit, quod primum hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de humano genera? Libertas quidem perit per peccatum, sed illa quae in paradiso fuit, habendi plenam cum immortalitate justitiam; propter quod natura humana divina indiget gratia, diecete Domino; si vos Filii liberavit, tunc vere liberis erit (John viii. 36), utique liberi ad bene justaque vivendum. Nam liberum arbitrium usque adeo in peccatore non perit, ut per illud peccat, maxime omnes qui cum delectatione peccant et amore peccati; hoc eis placet, quod eis libet. De gratia Christi 36: Quid autem boni faceremus, nisi diligeremus? Aut quomodo bonum non facimus, si diligamus? Etsi enim Dei mandatum videtur aliquando non a diligentibus, sed a timentibus fieri: tamen ubi non est dilectio, nullum bonum opus imputatur, nec recte bonum opus vocatur, quia omne quod non ex fide est, peccatum est, et fides per directionem.
this corrupt mass of humanity (perditionis massa) God resolved from eternity to save some through Christ, and leave the rest to deserved perdition. Though baptism procures forgiveness of sin, even of original sin, it does not remove the moral corruption of man. Therefore Divine grace alone, and irresistibly, works faith in the elect, as well as love and power to do good. The others, operatur. Ac per hoc gratiam Dei, qua caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis, sic conferat, qui vult veraciter conferiri, ut omnino nihil bona sine illa, quod ad pictatam perspicatur veritatem justitiam, fieri posse non dubitet. Wiggers, i. 121. J. G. L. Duscher Hist. doctrinae de ratione quae inter peccatum originale et actualis intercedit apud Irenaeum, Tertulliam, Augustinum. Gottingae. 1. 1836. 8.

29 De Nupt. et Concupisc. i. 26: In eis ergo qui regenerantur in Christo, cum remissio nem assipient proreus omnium peccatorum utique necesse est, ut resstam etiam hujus liceat adhae manentis concupiscentiae remittatur, ut in peccatnm, sicut dixi, non impetetur, manet acta, praeclerat recta. De Poecat. de meritis et remiss. i. 19: Caeterum quis ignat, quod baptizatus parvulus, si ad rationales annos veniens non crediderit, nec se ab illis consciis concupiscitibus abstineret, nihil ei propter, quod parvus accept? Verumtamen si percepto baptismate de hac vita emigraverit, soluto recta, cui originaliter erat obofio, perficietur in illo lumine veritatis, quod incommutabiliter manens in aeternum, justificantos preservat creatoris illuminiat.

30 In the beginning of the controversy Augustine still thought of these operations of grace as resistibles, See De Spiritu et Litera, c. 34: Agit Deus, ut velimus, et ut credamus, sive extrinsecus per evangelicas exhortationes, sive inresecus, ubi nemo habet in potestate quid ei veniat in mentem, sed consentiente vel dissentiente propria voluntatis est. His ergo modis quando Deus agit cum anima rationalis, ut ei credat (neque enim credere potest quoddam libero arbitrio, si nulla sit suasio vel voluntas cui debet), profecto et ipsum volle credere Deus operatur in homine, et in omnibus misericordia ejus praevectus nos: consentire autem voluntati Dei, vel ab ea dissentire, sicut dixi, propria voluntatis est. But in his later works they appear as irresistibly acting. De Correct. et Grat. 7: Quinque ergo ab illa originali damnatione ists divinae gratiae largitate discreti sunt, non est dubium, quod et procuratur eisdem evangeliis; et cum adiunct, credat; et in fide, quae per delectionem operatur, usque in finem perseveraret; et si quando exercit, corripit et mendacit; et quidam eorum, etiam non corripiantur, in viam quam reliquamque reedcant; et nonnulla accepta gratia, in qualibet actato, periculo hujus vitae mortis certitate subtrahuntur. Haece enim omnia operatur in eis, qui vasa misericordiae operatur est eoa, qui et elegit eos in filio suo ante constitutionem mundi per electiorem gratiam. De Gratia Christi, c. 24: Non lega atque doctrina inasmone formiscens, sed interna atque occulte membri aequabilis inest efrofere operari Deus in cordibus hominum non solum vera revelationes, sed etiam bonus voluntates. De Correct. et Grat. c. 9: Quinque ergo in Deo providentissima dispositione praescit, praecedentibus, vocatis, justificatis, glorificati sunt, non dico etiam nondem renati, sed etiam nondem nati, jam filii Dei sunt, et omnino perire non possunt. Ibid. 12. Ac per hoc nec de ipsa perseverantia boni voluit Deus sanctus suos in viribus suis, sed in ipso gloriam. Tantum quippe Spiritus sancto accedunt voluntas eorum, ut idea possint, quia sic volant; ideo sic velit, quia Deus operatur, ut velit. Subventum est itigur infirmitati voluntatis hominum, ut divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter ageretur. Ibid. 14: Non est itaque dubitandum, voluntati Dei, qui in oculo et in terra omnia, quaecunque voluit, fecit, et qui etiam illa, quae futura sunt, fecit, humanas voluntates non posse resistere, quo minus factum ipsa quod vult: quandoquidem etiam de ipsa hominum voluntatibus, quod voluit, cum voluit, fAcit. These moral effects of grace Augustine comprehends under Justification, cf. Opus imperfect. contra Jul. ii. c. 168: Justificat impiam Deus, non solum dimittendo, quae mala facti, sed etiam donando caritatem, quae declinat a male et facti bonum per Spiritum sanctum.
to whom the grace of God is not imparted 31 have no advantage
from Christ, and fall into condemnation, 32 even an eternal one.” 33

Such were the opposing systems, apart from the consequences
with which the misrepresentations of the combatants reproached

31 For the most part Augustin uses the expression Praedestinatio only of predestina-
tion to happiness, but sometimes also of condemnation. Tract. 110, in Ioan. distinguishes
duplex cum mandum, unum damnationem praedestinatum, alterum ex inimico amicum factum
et reconciliatum. Enchlorid. ad Laur. c. 100: Haec sunt magna opera Domini, ut, cum
angelica et humana creatura peccasset,—etiam per sese creaturae voluntatem, qua
factum est quod Creator, ipse quod voluit: bene utens et malis, tamquam
summe bonus, ad eum damnationem, quos justae praedestinavit ad poenas, et ad eum
salutem, quos benigne praedestinavit ad gratiam. Cf. de Gratia et Lib. arbicr. c. 21: Ope-
rori Deum in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates quacunque voluerit, sive
ad bonum pro sua misericordia, sive ad mala pro meritis eorum. Ratrummns de Praedest. II.
(in Vett. auctorum, qui ex. saec. de praedest. et gratia scripscrunt opera, cura Gilb. Mau-
guin. i. 62) has collected several passages of this kind. Comp. however Wiggers, i. 305.
32 De Peccat. mereti. et remiss. i. 4: Quoniam nihil agitare aliquid, cum parvoli bap-
tuzant, nisi ut incorporeit ecclesiae, id est, Christi corpori membribe societant, man-
ifestum est, eos ad damnationem, nisi hoc eis collatam fuerit, pertinere. De Gratia et Lib.
arbicr. 3: Sed et illa ignorantia, quae non est eorum, qui scire nonolunt, sed eorum, qui tan-
quam simpliciter nesciant, neminem sic excusat, ut semperino igne non ardeant, si pro-
terea non crediat, quia non audiret omnino quid credaret; sed fortasse, ut mitius ardeant
(cf. contra Iulianum, lv. 3. Absit, ut sit in aliquo vera virtus, nisi fuerit justas. Absit
autem, ut sit justas vorae, nisi vivat ex fide.Minus enim Fabricium quam Catullum puni-
etur, non quia iste bonus, sed quia illa magis mala: et minus impius, quam Catullum,
Fabricium, non veras virtutes habendo, sed a veris virtutibus non plurimum deviantio.)—
De Corrcept. et Gratia. 7: Ac per hoc et quod Evangeliom non audierunt, et qui co audito in
melius commutati perseveranteriam non acceperunt, et qui Evangelioc audito venire ad
Christum, hoc est, eum credere noluerunt, quoniam ipse dixit, Nemo venit ad me, nisi
ei datum fuerit a Patre meo (John. vi. 66), et qui por actatam parvulam nec credere potue-
rant, sed ab originali noxa solo possent lavare regeneratam docilis, quod tamen non ac-
cepto mortui perveniant; non sunt ab illa comprensionis discreti, quam constat esse damnat-
tam, cunctibus omnibus eum uno in damnationem. Ibid. 13: Propor hujus ergo utilitatem
secrcti credendum est, quosdam de filiis perditionis non accepto domo perseverandi
usque in finem, in fide, quae per dilectionem operatur, inceptere vivere, et aliquando fidet
liter ac justi vivere, et potens cadere, neque in hoa vita, priusquam hoc eis contingat,
aferri. De Praedest. Sanct. 8: Cur autem istum potius, quam illum liberum, inscriptiona
unt judicia ejus et inquisitae visae ejus (Rom. xi. 33). Melius enim et hic audimus
ant dicamus: O homo, tu quis es, qui responsurus Deus (Rom. ix. 20). How much perplex-
ity the passage, 1 Tim. ii. 4, qui omnes vult homines salvos fieri, occasioned Augustine, is
proved by his numeros and all very forced attempts to explain it. So de Corrcept. et Grazia.
c. 14. Contra Jul. iv. c. 8: Omnes i. q. multos; Enchlorid. ad Laur. 103: Omnes i. q. om-
nis generis. De Corrcept. et Gratia. c. 15: Omnes homines Deus vult salvos fieri, quoniam
necessarium est quod divino volere, nesci quam fieri salvum ipse voluerit.
33 De Civ. Dei. xxii. c. 23. Enchlorid. ad Laur. c. 112 (see above, § 84, note 35). The
last passage is against those who inferred from Psalm lxxvii. 10, that the punishment of
hell will have an end. Still he concedes to them: Sed poenas dannatori certam tempo-
rum intervallum existimant, si hoc eis placet, aliquatenus mitigari. Etiam sic quippe in-
telligi potest manere in illis ira Dei (Jo. iii. 36); h. e. ipsa damnatio—ut in ira sua, h. e.
manente ira sua, non tamen continent miserationes suas (Ps. lxvii. 10): non actu sup-
plicio finem dando, sed levamen adhibendo vel interponendo cruociatus. In the Enarrat
in Psalm cv. § 2, however, he declares even this conjecture too bold.
one another,\(^{34}\) for the purpose of exciting universal abhorrence of the enemy’s doctrine. The sentiments of Augustine were ecclesiastically confirmed by the decisions of African synods and by Zosimus in the west; although their author himself felt how dangerous they might be made to morals, and was able to bring them forward in popular instruction in no other than an inconsequential way.\(^{35}\) The Greek Church could not but stumble at them; but it troubled itself little about such controversies.\(^{36}\) The exiled western bishops hoped, therefore, that they would so

\(^{34}\) So the Pelagians palmed on Augustine the opinion, per diabolum aliquid substantiae creatum in hominibus (Augustin. de Nuptiis et Concupisc. ii. 34), quasi malum naturale cum Manichaeis sapient, qui dicit, infantes secundum Adam carnaliter natos contagium mortis antiquae prima nativitate contraire. On the contrary, Augustinus contra Juliam, lib. i. and ii. But Pelagianism also was not less misrepresented by its opponents. August. de Pec. mer. et rem. ii. 2, designates the Pelagians as tautum praesumentes de libero humano voluntatis arbitrio, ut ad non peccandum nec adjuvandum nos divinitas opinetur. C. 5: Dieum, accepto semel libero voluntatis arbitrio nec orae nos debebit, ut Deus nos adjuvet, ne pecussumus. Epist. Conc. Carthag. ad Innocent. (Aug. Epist. 175) § 6: Parvulos etiam propter salutem, quae per salvatorem Christum datur, baptizandos negant—promittentes, etiam si non baptizentur, habituros vitae aeternam.

\(^{35}\) De Dono perseverantiae, c. 22: Dolos vel impietati medici est, etiam utile medicamentum sic alligaro, ut aut non prosit, aut obisit. One should not say to the church: Ita se habet de praedestinatione definita sententia voluntatis Dei, ut aliis ex vobis de infidelitate, accepta obediendi voluntate, veneritis ad fidem. Quid opus est dici, aliis ex vobis? Si enim Ecclesiae Dei loquinar, si credentibus loquinar, cur alienos eorum ad fidem venisse dicentes caeteris facere videamur injuriari? cum possimus congruentius dicere: Ita se habet de praedestinatione definita sententia voluntatis Dei, ut ex infidelitate veneritis ad fidem accepta voluntate obediendi, et accepta perseverantia permaneatis in fide? Nec illud quod sequitur est omoine dicendum, i. e. caeteri vero qui in peccatorum delectatione remorarint, idem nondum survivant; quia necum vos adjutorium gratiae miseratis crexit: cum bene et convenienter dixi positum et debet: si qui autem adhuc in peccatorum dannabilium delectatione remorarint, apprehendite saluberrimam disciplinam: quot tamen cum feceritis, nolite extolli quasi de operibus vestris aut gloriaris, quasi hoc non accepertis; Deus est enim, qui operatur in vobis et velle et operari pro bona voluntate—de ipso autem curae veste vero rectoque condiscite vos ad praedestinationem divinæ gratiae pertinent. Augustine is inconsistent when he, Epist. 194, c. 4, in accordance with his system, declares prayer to be an effect of Divine grace, and, Epist. 157, c. 2, says, we receive Divine grace humiliter petendo et faciendo, and, Op. imperf. iii. 107: Homines quando audint vel legunt, nunquamque recepturam secundum ea, quae per corpus gessit, non debent in suae voluntatis virtute confidere, sed orae potius talem sibi a Domino preparari voluntatem, ut non intret in tentationem.

\(^{36}\) Comp. the refutation of Augustine's doctrines by Theodore of Mopsuestia, ap. Marin Mercator, ed. Baluz. p. 399, ss. ex. gr. p. 342: Nihil horum prospecere potuit mirabilis peccati originalis assessor, quippe qui in divinis scripturis nequaquam fuerit exercitatus, nec ab infancta, iuxta b. Pauli vocem, sacras didicerit literas.—Novissime vero in hanc dogmati recidit novitatem, qui diceret, quod in ira atque furor Deus Adam mortalem esse praceperit, et propter eis unum delictum cunctos etiam nequam natos homines morte multaverit. Sic autem disputans non veretur nec confunditur ca sentiro de Deo, quae nec de hominibus saum sapientibus et aliquam justitiae curam gerentibus utrum quis ascintasse tentavit, caet. The Greek church historians are altogether silent concerning the Pelagian controversy.
much the more readily obtain protection in Constantinople, as they believed they had wholly in their favor the works of Chrysostom, which were highly esteemed in that place. 37 Hence they applied particularly to Nestor, who had been bishop of the see of Constantinople since 428. But since very prejudicial representations of Pelagianism had been disseminated from the west, especially by Marius Mercator, 38 who was personally present in Constantinople, 39 Nestorius saw the necessity of giving prominence to the ruinous consequences of the fall and the necessity of baptism, which the Pelagians were said to deny. 40 But on the other hand, he found the Pelagians themselves who had fled to him, so little heterodox, that he asked from the Romish bishop Caelestin (429) an explanation respecting the grounds of their condemnation. 41 This very relation of the Pe-

37 So Julian appealed to Chrysostom. See August. contra Jul. i. c. 6, s. With the same view Annianus, doubtless the Amnianus PseudoDiaconus Celcedensis who is mentioned by Hieron. ad August. (August. Ep. 209) as a writer in favor of Pelagianism, and who was also present at the synod of Diospolis (see Garneri Diss. i. ad Mariam Mercat. c. 7), translated into Latin numerous homilies of Chrysostom, of which Hom. viii. in Matth. and Hom. vii. de iudiciis S. Pauli still exist. Comp. his Prologus ad Orontium Episc. (who was condemned at Ephesus for being a Pelagian) prefixed to the Hom. in Matth. (Chrysost. Opp. ed. Montfaucon, t. vii. init.): Quid enim vel ad prudentiam eruditus, vel ad exercitacionem ignatus, vel ad dogma purgatius nostrum servius offeratur, quan praecipua haec tam insignis animi ingenuique monumenta? Et hoc maxime tempore, quo per occasionem quamvis minus difficilium quaestionum edificationis morum atque ecclesiasticae disciplinarum sitis insolenter obstrepit. Quid pregressus ille commendavit, quam ingentias nobis a Deo libertatis decus cuius confusio praecipuum inter nos gentilesque discrimen est, qui hominem, ad imaginem Dei conditum, tam infideliter fati violenta et peccandi putant necessitate devinctum, ut is etiam perorisus invideo cogat? Quid ille adversus eodem magistros potius insinuat, quam Dei esse possibili mandata, et hominem totius vel quae jubetur vel suadetur a Deo capacem esse virtutem? Quo quidem solo et inquit ab imperante propellitur et praeviranti rursus affigitur. Hanc vero iste eruditorum decus cum de gradiae etiam institutum, quam illam uberate, quanta etiam cautione concelebrat? Non enim in alterum aut inuenatus, aut nimius, sed in utroque moderator. Sic liberae ostendit hominum voluntates, ut ad Dei tamen mandata facienda divinae gradiae necessarium ubique faciatur auxilium: sic continuum divinae gradiae auxilium commendavit, ut ne studia voluntatis intermatem. Chrysost. in Epist. ad Rom. Hom. x. expressly rejects, as an absurdity, the opinion that by Adam's disobedience another person becomes a sinner. On the relation of grace to freedom he speaks in Epist. ad Hebr. Hom. xii.


39 Marius Mercator always gives special prominence to the tenets of Caelstii (see note 4), though Pelagius had rejected most of them at the synod of Diospolis.

40 Nestorii Sermones iv. contra Pelagium (Latin, partly in nothing but an extract in Marius Mercator, p. 130. The four discourses in the original among Chrysostom's orations ed. Montfaucon, x. p. 733) are not aimed directly against Pelagius.

41 Marius Merc. p. 119: Contra haeresin Pelagii seu Caelstii—quamvis recte sentiret
lagians to Nestorius was ruinous to them in the west; an internal necessary connection between Pelagianism and Nestorianism was hunted out,42 and at the third general council at Ephesus (431) Pelagianism was condemned along with Nestorianism.43 Yet the Augustinian doctrine of grace and predestination was never adopted in the east.44

But even in the west, where this doctrine had been ecclesiastically ratified, there were never more than a few who held to it in its fearful consequences. Its injurious practical effects could not be overlooked, and appeared occasionally in outward manifestation.45 The monks in particular were naturally opposed to a view which annihilated all the meritoriousness of their monastic exercises.46 Hence Augustine soon found his doctrine disputed even by opponents of the Pelagians.47 The monks of Massilia especially, adopted a view of free grace between that of Augustine and that of Pelagius, which seems to have originated chiefly with John Cassian († soon after 432).48

et doceret, Julianum tamen ex Episcopo Ecclanesi cum participibus suis hujus haeresis signiferum et antesignanum, olim ab apostolica sententia exactionem atque depositum, in amicitiam interim consulit suscipiendum. Sper enim absolutionis promittera, ipsum quoque Caeslestium litteris suis—consolatos est. This writing follows, p. 131. On this account Nestorius applied, in the year 429, to the Romish bishop Caeslestine, in two letters (ap. Baronius ad ann. 430, no. 3, ap. Constant among the Epist. Caeslest. Ep. vi. and vii.). In the first: Julianus, caest.—supe—Imperatorem adierunt, ac suas causas deflerunt, tanquam orthodoxi temporibus orthodoxis persecutionem passi supe eadem et apud nos lamentantes.—Sed quoniam apertior nobis de causis eorum notitia opus est.—ignare nobis notitiam de his largi, caest.

42 See below, § 88, note 18.
43 See below, § 88, note 27.
44 Münchener's Dogmengeschichte, iv. 238.
45 Comp. the memorable controversy among the monks of Adræcum, 426 and 427. August. Epist. 214—216. Retractt. ii. 65, 67. Some (Ep. 214) sic graeiam praedicant, ut negent hominis esse librum arbitrium, et, quod est gravis, dicunt, quod in die judicii non sit redditurus Deus unicaique secundum opera ejus. They said accordingly (Retr. ii. 67), neminem corripiendum, si Dei praecepta non facit, sed pro illo ut faciat, tantammodo orandum (different after all only in the form, not essentially, from the doctrines of Augustine!) Others (Ep. 215) asserted, like the Semi pelagians, secundum aliquam merita humana dari gratiam Dei. A strictly Augustinian party stood between. Against the first Augustine wrote de Correctione et Gratia; against the second de Gratia et libero Arbitrio. Comp. Walsh's Ketzerhist. 245, ff.
46 Comp. for example Cassiani Coll. xix. 8: Finis quidem Coenobitae est, omnes suas mortificare et crucifigere voluntates, ac secundum evangelicae perfectionis salutare mandatum nihil de crastino cogitare. Quam perfectionem prorus a nemine, nisi a Coenobita impieri posse certissimum est.
48 His works: De institutis Coenobiorum libri xii. Collationes Patrum xxiv. De
a disciple of Chrysostom. Augustine received the first account of these Massilians, or, as they were first named by the Scholastics, Semipelagians, from his zealous adherents Prosper of Aquitania, and Hilary (429), and attempted to bring them over to his views in his last two works (429, 430). After Augustine's death, Prosper († 460) continued the controversy.


Comp. especially Collat. xiiil. (according to Wiggers, ii. 37, written between 428 and 431, according to Geffken, p. 5, somewhat before 428). Among other things we find, in c. 9, Propositum namque Dei, quo non ob hoc hominem fecerat ut perieret, sed ut in perpetuum viverit, manet immobile. Cujus benigneus cam bona voluntatis in nobis quantulamunque sanctitam omnisse perspexerit, vel quum ipse tamquam de duris silicis nostris coedis excussisset, confret cam et exsuscitaret, suaque inspirations confortaret, volens omnes homines salves fieri, et ad aigionem veritatem venire (1 Tim. ii. 4).—Qui enim ut peraret unus ex pusillis non habet voluntatem, quomodo sine ingenti sacrilegio putat-ndus est, non universaliter omnes, sed quosdam salves fieri velle pro omnibus?—C. 8: Adest insuperabiliter nobis semper divinae prophetiae quantum pictus creaturam, ut non solum comitetur eam, sed etiam prececati usque proficiscatur. Qui cum in nobis ortum quendam bona voluntatis inspexerit, illuminat eam confestim, atque confortat, et incitat ad salutem, incrementum tribuenus ei, quam vel ipsa plantavit, vel nostro conatu viderit emersisse. Et non solum sancta desideria benignus inspirat, sed etiam occasions praestruit vitae, et opportunitatem boni effectus a salute vires directionem demonstrat errantium.—C. 9: Ut autem evidenter clarat, etiam per naturas homum, quod beneficio creatoris inducantur est, non numquam bonarum voluntatem proinde principia, quae tamen nisi a Domino dirigatur, ad consumptionem virtutum pervenire non possint. Apostolus testis est dicens: Velle adjunct mihi, perficeret autem bonum non invenio (Rom. vii. 18).—C. 11: Haec duoc, i. e., vel gratia Dei, vel librum arborihum, sibi quidem iuvicem videntur adversus, sed utraque concordant, et utraque nos pariter debere suiscipere, pietatis ratione colligimus, ne unum hominum subtrahentes, ecclesiasticae fidicil regulam excessive videamur. C. 12: Unae excedam us est nobis, ne ita ad Dominum omnia sanctorum merita referamus, ut nihil nisi iud quod malum atque perversum est humanae ascribas naturae. Dubitari ergo non potest, inesse quidem omni animac naturaliter virtutum semina beneficio creatoris inserta, sed nisi haec opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire. Collat. iii. c. 12. Nullus justorum sibi sufficit ad obtinendum justitiam, nisi per momenta singula titubanti ci et corruenti fulcimento manus sua suppscerit divina clementia. Wiggers, ii. 47.


81 De Praedestinatione Sanctorum liber ad Prosperum. De Dono perseverantiae liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium (s. liber secundus de Praedest. Sanct.)

with greater violence, but could not prevent the Semipelagian doctrines from spreading farther, especially in Gaul. To these Semipelagians also belonged Vincentius Lirinensis († 450) whose Commonitorium, composed in the year 434, was one of the works most read in the west as a standard book of genuine Catholicism.\(^5\)

**III. CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE PERSON OF CHRIST.**

§ 88.

NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY.

Sources: Nestor’s own account (Evagrius Hist. eccl. i. 7) was made use of by Irenaeus (Complete, then from 444 to 448, bishop of Tyre) in his Tragedia s. comm. de rebus in synodo Ephesina, ac in Oriental toto Gestia. This last work of Irenaeus is lost; but the original documents appended to it were transferred in the sixth century, in a Latin translation, to the Synodicon (Variorum Epist. ad Conc. Eph. pertinentes ex MS. Casin. ed. Chr. Lupus. Lovan. 1682. 4, in an improved form ap. Mansi, v. 731, and in Theodoreti Opp. ed. Schulze, v. 608). Marius Mercator also has many fragments of Acts, Opp. P. ii. (see above, § 87, note 36). A complete collection of all the Acts is given in Mansi, iv. p. 367, ss. and t. v.—Account of this controversy by Ibas, bishop of Edessa, in the Epist. ad Maria Persam (mostly contained in the Actis Conc. Chalced. Act. x. ap. Mansi, viii. p. 241, ss.).—Liberantius’s (archdiascon in Carthage about 553) Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum (ed. Jo. Graneriis. Paris. 1675. 8, ap. Mansi, ix. p. 630, and in Gallandii Bibl. PP. xii. p. 119).—Besides Socrates, vii. c. 29, ss. Evagrius, i. c. 7, ss.


In the Arian controversy the doctrine concerning Christ’s person had been touched upon, but without being fully developed. When the Arians inferred from the Catholic doctrine of a human soul in Christ that there were two persons,\(^1\) the


\(^1\) See § 53, note 28.
Orientals indeed could not be led astray by this means from holding fast the human in Christ, as long as they remained true to their historic-exteretical principles; but the Nicenians in Egypt and the west began to give strong prominence to the unity of his Divine person, for the purpose of obviating that Ariotic objection, and to consider Christ accordingly in all rela-

2 So Eusebius of Emesa (§ 84, note 18) in the fragments in Theodoret Eranistes Dial. iii. (Opp. ed. Schultze, iv. 258), and in the work de Fide adv. Sabellinum, in so far as we can venture to ascribe this work to him. See Thilo über die Schriften des Eusebi. v. Alex. u. des Euseb. v. Emisa, S. 75.

3 Athanas. de Incarn. verb. (Opp. ed. Montfaucon, ii. 1, ap. Mansi, iv. 689): Ομολογένες καὶ εἶναι αὐτῶν οὐν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεοῦ κατὰ πνεύμα, οὐν ἄνθρωπον κατὰ σάρκα: οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ένα νῦν, μίαν προσκυνητὴν καὶ μίαν ἀποκαταστάσιν: ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον σεσαρκωμένην, καὶ προσκυνομένη μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μὴ προσκυνηθήν. Since Cyril, a follower of Athanasius, appeals to this passage (lib. de recta fide ad Imparatices, § 9), it has by this means the most important external testimony in its favor. Several writings were assigned to the Romish bishop Julius I., in which the unity existing in Christ was strongly expressed. There are still extant the Epist. ad Dionysium (ap. Mansi, ii. 1191). A. Maji Scripttt. vett. nova coll. vii. i. 144, cited as genuine by Gennadius (about 490), in which the μία φύσις is expressly and plainly asserted; the Epist. ad Prosdocium (ex. cod. Oxon. ed. J. G. Ehrlich. Lips. 1750. 4), regarded as genuine by the council of Ephesus, by Cyril, Marcus Mercator, Facundus, and Euphranor bishop of Antiocch about 586 (Phostii Cod. 229), which rejects the phrase ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ θεοῦ προσκυνηθῆς, and three fragments lately published by Majus, l. c. vii. i. 165, the first and third of which are mentioned by Ephraem, l. c. How strongly also Hilary was inclined to the doctrine of one nature may be seen in Münchener's Dogmengesch. iv. 16. Baur's Dreieinigkeit, i. 681. By this means the mode of expression in the writings of Julius is rendered more intelligible from the general tendency of the west at that time. —After Eusebius and the later Monophysites continually appealed to Athanasius, the Romish bishop Felix (270-275), and Julius (337-352), and to Gregory Thaumaturgus, as unam naturam Dei verbi decretantes post unitio nem, whose testimonia Cyrilus in lbb. adv. Dioscorum et Theodorum has put together; (see Collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis, A. D. p. 331, Mansi, viii. 820; a Jacobito collection of this kind translated from the Arabic, see Spicilegii, Rom. iii. 694), many Catholics began to ascert that these testimonies have been interpolated by Apollinarists (see Collatio, l. c. p. 821. Leontius de Sectis, act. viii. Justinianus Imp. contra Monophys. in Maji Scripttt. vett. nov. coll. vii. i. 309), notwithstanding Euphranor bishop of Antiocch, about 526 (Phostii Cod. 229), and Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, about 580 (Phostii Cod. 229), admit the genuineness of the passage of Athanasius and of the Ep. Julii ad Prosdocium. Leontius (contra Monophys. ap. Majus, vii. i. 143, s.) appeals to the testimony of Polemon, a disciple of Apollinaris, as proof that the passage ascribed to Athanasius belongs to Apollinaris. The place in question in Polemon may be completely put together from the two quotations p. 143 and p. 16, but it says something quite different. Polemon speaks against the inconsistency of those who asserted μίαν φύσιν τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, and yet assume in Christ θεοῦ τέλειον and ἄνθρωπον τέλειον, while Apollinaris had rightly rejected the two natures, and taught εἶναι αὐτῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (as above in the passage of Athanasius). In short, Polemon meant to say, Athanasius had borrowed that doctrine from Apollinaris, but fell into an inconsistency with himself in so doing. Ap. Majus, l. c. p. 10, there is also a fragment of Apollinarii Epist. ad Jovian, in which that passage has been interpolated word for word as above; but it does not at all suit the construction, a sign that it has been inserted.— The moderns, however, especially Catholic writers, have retained the view that all those writings proceeded from Apollinaris. It has been defended in reference to the letters of Julius, particularly by Muratori Anecdot. græce, p. 341, sq.; and with regard to all those
tions only as God. 4 When Apollinaris, following this tendency still farther, denied to Christ a reasonable human soul, his opponents, it is true, were united in asserting that Christ is perfect God and man in one person, but in the east they were now accustomed to distinguish the two natures, and the predicates used to describe them, with greater care; and the two most eminent men of the Antiochian school, Diodore, bishop of Tarsus, 5 and Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, 6 confirmed the accuracy of this distinction by their writings, which were highly esteemed in the whole east; while in Egypt the formula of Athanasius, of one Divine nature made flesh, was maintained. On the other hand, 7 Ambrose 8 and Augustine 9 in the west endeavored, after

passages above named by Le Quien Dissert. Damasc. ii. prefixed to his edition of Ioannes Damasc. i. t. p. xxxii. ss. Comp. on the other side Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen. Gaetphyrbyt. 1723, p. 112, ss. p. 365, ss.

4 Thus Mary is called θεοτόκος by Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 43. Cyril Call Hieros. Catech. x. p. 146. Athanasius Ort. iii. contra Ariam. c. 14, 33. Didymus de Trin. i. 21, 94; ii. 4, 133, and Gregory of Nazianzum goes so far as to declare the man godless who will not employ this appellation. Hechstyl, preboster in Jerusalem (§ 343), calls David θεοτόκης (Photius Cod. 275). In many apocryphal writings James is called ἀδελφόθεος (see Thilo Thome in the Notit. οριον. p. x. ss. Cf. Photius Cod. 149).

5 Comp. § 84, note 21. See the fragments ap. Leontius contra Eutychians et Nesterianos, in Caniusi, Thessaur. numon. edc. ed. Basnage, i. 591.

6 See § 84, canus. 24. In the Theodore's confession of faith (Act. Conc. Ephesinii, Act. vi. ap. Manisi, t. iv. p. 1347, in Latin in Marisi Mercator, see Walch Bibl. synab. vetus, p. 203, ss.): Χρις ὧν καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας, ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμέρας σωτηρίας ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν δεσπόταν Χριστόν οἰκονομία ὁ δεσπότης ξετέλεσε θεοῦ, εἴδεναι, ὅτι ὁ δεσπότης θεὸς λόγος ἀνθρώπων εἴληθε τελειοῦ. ἐκ σπείρας υπατί Δαβίδ, ἐκ φυσιᾶς τὸ νοερόν καὶ σωφροσύνης ἀνθρώπινος ὁ ἀνθρώπων ὑπατί καθ ἡμῶς τῆς φύσεως, πνευμάτων ἀγίων ἐνῷ ἐν τῇ παρθένου μήτρᾳ διαπλάσθεσθαι, γενόμενον ὑπὸ γονακίον καὶ γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον—ἀποφθέγματος οὐφφλεσθην ἐννυτή. ὁμάλατο μὲν αὐτὸν κατὰ νόμον ἀνθρώπων πειραθήναι κατασκόπησεν, ἡγείρας δὲ τό κεκραυγὸν ἀκούσας καὶ καθὼς οἱ δεξίων τοῦ θεοῦ, ἱδον ἡ ὕπερνάν πάνη ἐπάρχων ἄρρητως, καὶ ἐνοικίας—τὴν παρά πάνη τῆς κτίσεως δέχεται προσεύκρεντα, ὡς ἀδριώτητος πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἐχον τῶν συνάρειαν, ἀγαθοῖς θεοὶ καὶ ἐννοίᾳ πάσης αὐτῇ τῆς κτίσεως τῆς προσεύκρεντος ἀπουροποίησιν. Καὶ οὗτος δίο φαμέν υἱὸς ὁντις διὸν κυρίου. ἐπειδῆ εἰς θεοὶ κατ᾽ οὗτον ὁ θεὸς λόγος—ὑπερ αὐτοῦ συνημένος τε καὶ μετέχον θεότητος κοινωνεῖ τῆς υἱὸν προσεύκρεντα θεοῦ καὶ τημῆς—καὶ κύριος κατ᾽ οὗτον ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ὡς συνημένος αὐτοῦ κοινωνεῖ τῆς τημῆς—'Ενα τοῖς τῶν κόσμων οἴκου καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δότε ὑμῖν τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο—πρωτότοκος μὲν τῶν θεῶν λόγων φυσιῆς, τοῦ κατ᾽ οὗτον υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ κυρίου, συνεπεκόντες δὲ τῷ λήθει, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ὅπως Ναζαρέθ, ἐν ἑκατέρον θεὸς πνευμάτω καὶ ἀνάμεως ἐκ τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν λόγον συναφεῖς τῆς ἑορτῆς τε μετέχοντα καὶ κυριότητος. 'Ος καὶ δεσπότης Ἀδών κατὰ τὸν μακάριον καλεῖται Παῦλον, κ. τ. λ. Comp. the fragments of this confession in the acts of the fifth general council at Constantinople, A.D. 553, ap. Manisi, t. 203, and in Leontii contra Eutych. et Nestor. lib. iii. ap. Caniusi-Basnage, i. 585. The latter fragments, published only in Latin in Caniusi, were published in the Greek original by Majus Script. vett. nova coll. vi. 300.

7 Maserber's Dogmengesch. iv. 32. Baur's Dreieinigkeit, i. 653.

8 Comp. especially the fragments in Thesoretii Dini. ii. (ed. Schüle, iv. 129).

9 Augustini Ep. 169, ad Evodium. § 7: Homo—ununitatem personae Verbi Dei—
the example of the two Gregorys, to avoid the two rocks of this doctrine, viz. the division into two persons, and the non-recognition of two natures; and thus the Gallic monk Leporius, in Africa (about 426), occasioned the prelude of the Nestorian controversy, while forced to retract assertions by which the unity of Christ’s person appeared to be endangered. 10

Nestorius, a presbyter of Antioch, by his elevation to the see of Constantinople, came into a difficult position (428), as far as he had both to contend against envious rivals, and was also obliged, by his extraction and position, 11 to undertake the task of completing the incipient restoration of Chrysostom’s honor, which Cyril, 12 the nephew and worthy successor of Theophilus, 13

constitutus est, permanentae tamen Verbo in sua natura incommatibiliter. § 6: Sicut in homine—animal et corpus una persona est, ita in Christo Verbum et homo una persona est. Et sicut homo, verbi gratia, philosophus non utique nisi secundum anima dicitur, nec ideo tamen absurde—dicimus philosophum caesum, philosophum mortuum—cum totum secundum carne accidat, non secundum illud, quod est philosophus: ita Christus Deus—et tamen recte dicitur Deus crucifixus, cum hoc cum secundum carnem passum esse, non secundum illud, quo Dominus gloriae est, non habeatur incertum. Ep. 137 ad Volusianum, § 9: Ita inter Deum et homines modulator apparuit, ut in unitate personae copulans utramque naturam, et solita sublimaret insolitis, et insolita solitis temperaret.

§ 11: Ergo persona hominis mixtura est animae et corporis: persona autem Christi mixtura est Dei et hominis. Enchiridion ad Laur. c. 34, 36.

10 Comp. epistola Episcop. Africæ ad Episc. Galliae et Lepori libellus emendationis (prim. ed. Jac. Sirmond. Paris. 1539). Mansi, iv. 517. In the latter it is said: Tame dici Christum filium Dei tune etiam naturæ de sancta Maria non negaromus, sicut ipsi recordamini; sed minime attendentes ad mysterium fidei, non ipsum Deum hominem natum, sed perfectum cum Deo natum hominem dicabantis; pertimescentes scilicet, ne divinitati conditionem adsignaremus humanam. His present faith: Confitemur domino ac Deum nostrum Jesum Christum unicum filium Dei, qui ante saecula natus ex patre est, novissimo tempore de Spiritu sancto et Maria semper virginum factum hominem, Deum natum: et confitemur utramque substantiam carnis et Verbi, unum eundemque Deum atque hominem inseparabilem pia fidei credulitatem susceputis; et ex tempore suscipiunt carnem sic omnia dicimus, quae crant Dei, transitum in hominem, ut omnium, quae erant hominum, in Deum veniretur: ut lac intelligenter verbum factum sit caro, non ut conversionis aut mutabilitatis aliqua cooperit esse quod non erat, sed ut potentia divina dispensationis Verbum patris, manquet a patre discendam, homo proprii fieri dignaretur, incarnatusque sit unigenitus seceret ilo mysterio, quod ipsa novit. Nostrum namque est, credere, illius nosce. Ac sic, ut ipsa Deus Verbum, totum suscipientis quod est hominibus, homo sit, et assumptus homo, totum accipiendo quod est Dei, aliud quam Deus esse non possit. Cf. Cassianus de Incarnatione Christi, i. 5.

11 Thus, for instance, against Proclus and Philip, presbyters in Constantinople, both of whom had expectations of being raised to the episcopate. Socrates, vili. 36, 29.


13 The admonition addressed to him by the pious Isidore, abbot of Pelusium, serves to characterize him (lib. i. Ep. 370): Παρετέθης τῷ Χριστῷ: μὴ [αὖ ζύζε] οὖσας ἡθέους ἀνοικόν ἦν παρὰ θεοτοκῷ κεχρωστηκαί, ἔσοντα εκκελείαν μεθόδεον, καὶ αὐτῶν αὐτῇ διάκοναι εν
bishop of Alexandria († 444), considered derogatory to the honor of his see. He soon gave an opportunity to the malevolent watchet of his proceedings by denying the propriety of calling Mary theotokos. A bitter but fruitless correspondence took place between them. Cyril resolved to make a bishop of

προσχήματε εσφεκειας κατασκέυαξε. It may refer to that affair of Chrysostom, or to the commencement of the controversy with Nestorius.

14 The bishop of Constantinople, Atticus, about 420, had been obliged to introduce Chrysostom's name into the Diptychs, after the example of Antioch and at the pressing request of the people, and invited Cyril to do the same (Attici Ep. ad Cyrilum, in Cyrilii Op. v. iii. 201). The latter, however, refused to comply with the suggestion, desiring that the sentence pronounced on Chrysostom should be righteous maintained (I. c. p. 324). However, immediately after Nestor's elevation, new demonstrations of honor were added, Marcellinus Comes (about 534) in Chronico ad annum 428 (Chronica mediæ nevi ed. Roesser, i. 263): Benissimae Josanii Episcopi dudum malorum Episcoporum avulsa exclasti apud Comitatum (at the imperial court) coepit memoria celebrari mensae Sept. d. xxvi. That Cyril continued to regard the condemnation of Chrysostom as a righteous measure is shown by his Epistola ad Acaciam (ap. Mansi, v. 629. Theodoreti Opp. ed. Schulze, v. 699).

15 Extracts from Nestor's discourses in the Greek original are given in the Actis Syn. Ephesin. b. Mansi, iv. 1197. Nestorii Sermones in a Latin version ap. Marius Mercator (ed. Baluz. p. 53, ss.). From the first address: theotokos i. o., puerperea Dei s. genitrix Dei Maria, an autem ἀνθρωποτόκοι i. e. hominis genitrix ? Habet materem Deus ? Ergo excusabilis, gentilitas matres diis subintroducens. Paulus ergo mendax de Christi doctate dicit, 112. decto dicens ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτως, άνεν γενεαλογίας (Hebr. vii. 3). Non peperit creatura increabilem, sed peperit deum deumitatem instrumentum. Non creavit Deum Verbum Spiritus sanctus—sed Deo verbo templum fabricatus est, quod habitaret, ex virgine (according to John ii. 21). Est, et non est mortuus incarnatus Dei, sed illum, in quo incarnatus est, suscitavit: inclinatus est elevare, quod nescit, ipse vero non eccidit. Si jacentem elevare volueris, nomine continges corpus corpore, et te ipsum illi conjungero eliam cringere, atque illa illi conjunctus ipse manes quo eras ? Sic est illud incarnationis aeterna sacramentum. Propter utentem illud sacramentum, quod uitur, colo, propter absconditum adoramus quod foris videtur: inseparabilis ab eo, qui oculos parum est Deus. D divisive natura, sed conjuncto reverentiam. Dominicam itaque incarnationem inintimiscimus, vnam theodechom tis thei λόγον ανθρωπολογίμονον μορφην, i. e. susceptionem Dei formam unam ace pari quasi Deum Verbum deitas ratione venirem, tanquam divinitatis vere inseparabilis simulacrum, tanquam imaginem absconditi judicis. Duplicem configurerim, et adoramus ut unum: duplum enim naturam unum est propter unitatem. Sermo iii. (ib. p. 71): Ego natum et mortuem Deum et sempiternum adorare non quce. Quia natus est et per partes incrementorum temporibus eginit, et mensibus legitimus portatus in ventre est, hic humanum habitum naturam, sed Deo sancte conjunctam. Aliud est utriusque nata, quia nato de Maria conjunctis erat Deus ille, qui est Verbum patris, etc. Comp. the extracts in the Actis Syn. Eph. p. 1197: 'Ωταν ον η theia graφη μελη λέγειν η γέννησιν του Χριστου την εκ Maria της παρθενου, οβάνασον, οδόμαου φαίνετε τιθεια το theoς, άλλ Χριστός, ή νιός, ή κύριος, το προελεξεν τον θεον λόγον εκ της Χριστοτοκοι παρθένου, παρά της theos ειδολογισμόν γραφης—τα δε γεννησθαι θεον εξ αυτης, οδόμαου ειδολογισμον.'

15 Cyril proclaimed Nestor's erroneous doctrine on all sides. Thus he said to Acacius, bishop of Berhoea, that a zealous adherent of Nestorius had said in a church of Constantinople: el ta theia theotokon tis Maria, anathema esto. The holy Acacius sought in vain to exercise the storm (Epist. ad Cyril. in Cyrilii Opp. v. iii. 63): it was the duty of bishops, katastelai tis exagegelisean σωφρονει της δοθη διασειζον και διεταιζει την εκκλησιαν του θεου ετοιμως έξων. Many in Constantinople synagogein dokousi tis ἀβδετητα οπις έναντως έχουσι κατα διανοιαν την ἀπατουλκη πιπετε, etc.
sttineplo once more feel the superior weight of Alexandria. By
misrepresenting the doctrines of Nestor to Cælestine, bishop of
Rome, he created the prejudice among the westerners, or at
least strengthened it, that Nestorianism was only an offshoot of
Pelagianism, which at once sealed Nestor's fate in the west.

17 Cyril Epist. ad Cælestium and Comm. const. Possidiono (his messenger) ap. Mansi, tom. 1015, ss. and p. 548, and ap. Constant. In this last we read: 'H Nestoriius
apostolus, malleum de kakodoxia, taevn en el tivn dunamein. Phaini
ot to theos logos progeugon-
koj, to de tis agias parthenon genwvmenos agios estai kai megas, eis tov elgelato
autoj, kai parapexiasai mnev genwvmeni deix anhdros ek tis parthenon, ekeristatai de autov
to kaloleiathen tis autov dunamein, kai dygeven auton. 'Hste kai einaithropidhes legai
profiton to theos logos, to suyn anei, kai anbropo agiwn to tis parthenon, kai
to autov legemetai einaithropidhes. 'Hspev de suyn tis prosofites, auton, phain, kai tosum
kato meliai sunexomein. Día tov elgelato phaini pantoche tivn legem tis dunamein, all' omoixei
nomoiaka, estir epit evn to evn, kai os en el layv proi tis kathos ki aut he
meto Moutth, omoixei ena kato meto soi (Iou. i. 5). Krapontos de tov suynexomein legem, to el meris
sunexi autov. Día tov autov otox theos elgelato autov elaiis legem, all' os en othelekoi
to theos kekplemenon omoixevi kai orpos nomoiaka, omoixevi elgelato duoleita kyrion, kai

18 In the year 439 Cassian wrote, desired by the Romish archdeacon (subsequently bishop) Leo, his lib. viii. de Incarn. Christi adv. Nestorium (cf. Wiggers de Jo. Cassiano, p. 28, s.), although it is probable he was acquainted with Nestor's heresy merely from that
Egyptian description of it. Lib. i. c. 3, he says of a new heresy which had broken out at
Bellay (Belgicarum urbe), to which, according to chap. iv., Leoporis also belonged: Pecu-
liare re proprium supradictae illius haereses, quae ex Pelagiano vivisses, eo progressi
sunt, ut assererent, homines, si volint, sine peccato esse posse. Consequens enim exist-
imabat, ut si homo solitarius Jesus Christus sine peccato fuisse, nonnes quoque homines
sine Dei adiutorio esse possint, quocidem ille homo solitarius sine consortio Dei esse potvis-
set.—Unde adverdit novus nunc jam, non novas haereses auctor, qui Dominum Salvator-
emque nostrum solitarium hominem naturum esse contendit, idem se omnino dicere, quod
Pelagianistae ante dixerant: et consequens error suae esse, ut qui solitus sine peccato
solitarius hominem Jesum Christum vivisse asserit, nonnes quoque per se homines sine
peccato posse esse blasphemem.—Nec dubium id est, re ipsa petitum declarante. Hinc
enim illud est, quod intercessiones suis Pelagianistarum queras hominumque, et
scriptis suis causas illorum asserit, quod subtiliter his, vel ut verius diciruss, subdole patrocinatu, et
consanguineae sibi improbitati improbo suffragatur affectu, etc. Comp. § 87, not 41.
In vain did Nestor represent to Caelestine that he rejected the expression θεότοκος only in its false acceptance. He was declared a heretic at synods held at Rome and Alexandria (430), and Cyril published twelve anathemas, in which he sought to establish the true doctrine of Christ's person against Nestor's heresy. These anathemas were not only answered by Nestor

Hence Lib. v. c. 1, haeresim illam Pelagianae haereses discipulum atque imitatem; and c. 2, to Nestor: Ergo videas, Pelagianum te virus vomere, Pelagiano te spirita sibilare. In like manner Prosperi epistulam Nestoriani et Pelagiani:

Nestoriana laus successi Pelagianae,
Quae tamen est usque procerana meo.
Infelix misereas genetrix et filia natas,
Prodixi ex ipsa germine, quod peperi, etc.

19 Nestorii Epist. iii. ad Caelestin. (ap. Mansi, iv. 1025, v. 725, ap. Constant, among the Epp. Caelest. no. vii. viii. and x.) From the Epist. i.: Unde et nos non modicum corrup-
tionem orthodoxo apud quosdam hic perreptentes, et etsi et licitae circa aegros quotidie innumer. Est enim negotium non parvo, sed utilius potius Apollinaris et Euseb. Dominica enim in homine unione ad cusanam conterminationis confusionem passim com-
miscuit: adeo ut et quiorem apud nos clerici—aperte blasphemum Deum Verbum Patri homousion, tamquam originem initium de Christotoco virginum summatum, et cum templo suo aedificatus exspect, et consequitum. Carnem dicunt post resurrectionem suum non manisisse carnem, sed in naturam transissee deisatis.—Si quis autem hoc nomen Thetotum propter na
tam humanitatem conjunctam Deo Verbo, non propter parientem proponent; dicimus quidem hoc vocabulum in ea, quae peperit, non esse conveniens (opoeret enim veram matrem de eadem esse essentia ae ex se natum): fori tamen potest hoc vocabulum—co
quod solum nominetur de virgine hoc verbum propter inesperabile templo Dei Verbi ex
ipsa (natum), non quin ipsa mater sit Verbi Dei: nemo enim antiquiorum se parit. From Epist. iii.: Ego autem ad hanc quidem vocem, quae est θεότοκος, nisi secundum Apol-
linaris et Arii fuores ad confusionem naturam proferunt, velutinius dicere non resistit: nec tamen ambigo, quin haec voc θεότοκος illi voci cedat, quae est χριστοτόκος, tamquam prolatae ab Angelis et Evangelis.—Placuit, vero, Deo adjutura etiam synodom inex-
cusabileri totius orbis terrae indicem ipse propter inquisitionem aliarum rerum ecclesiastic-
arum: nam dabitiasione verborum non aestimo habiitam inquisitionem differentiae, nec
impedimentum esse ad tractatum divinitatis Domini Christi.

20 With the synodal letter relating to the same in Cyril, Opp. v. iii. 67. Mansi, iv.
θεοτοκον του άγιων παρθενον: γεγενηκε γαρ σαρκιων σαρκα γεγονον των εκ θεου
λογων: αναθημα ἐπιτ. ii. Ei του ουχ όμολογηθη, σαρκι καθως ευπορεται ημωβι των εκ
θεου πατρος λογων, ενε το ειναι Χριστου μετα τως ιδιων σαρκος, των αυτων οηλοιντε θεου
τε ουδε και ανθρωπον, υ. ε. iii. Ei το επι του ενος Χριστου διαιρει τις αποστεια της
ενειω, μοιη συναιτων αυτωσι συναιτει τα κατω των άξεσιν, ηγουν αιθεταιν ει δυνα-
στειν, ουδε δη μαλλον συνωδη τα καθως ενωσιν φυσικων, υ. ε. iv. Ei της προσωπων
δυσιν, ηγουν ευπορεταις, τας τε εν τοις εναιγελειας και αποστολικως συγγραμμα
διαινοντων φωνω, η επι Χριστου παρα των άγιων λογομενοις, ει τω αυτω περι ενουθε
τας μεν ως αννησερω παρα των εκ θεου λογων ιδιων νοομεν ιπσοπετη, τας δω ως θεο
πρετεις μονο τω εκ θεου πατρος λογω, υ. ε. v. Ei της τολμη λεγειν θεοφαρον ανθρωπον
του Χριστου, και αοιδη ται μαλλων ουδη ειναι κατω ιλετηςιας, ως πων ενα και φωσει, καθω
γενον σωρες πο λογως, και κεκοιμηθε τα παραπλησιας ημιν αιματως και σαρκης, υ. ε. vi. Ei
tης τολμη λεγειν θεου η δεσπότερν ειναι του Χριστου του εκ θεου πατρος λογου, και αοιδη
δη μαλλων των αυτων όμολογηθη ουδεν ομοι τα και ανθρωπων, ως γεγονοτος σαρκος τον
in as many anti-anathemas, but they also excited great commotion among the Syrian bishops. Nestor had explained himself satisfactorily to John, bishop of Antioch, concerning the admissibility of the expression θεοτόκος: while Cyril seemed entirely to do away with the distinction of natures in Christ.

In Greek:

λόγου κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ὑ. ὁ. vii. Εἰ τὸς φύσιν, ὡς ἀνθρώπων ἐνεργήθη καὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὸν Ἰχθύν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς εὐδοξίαν περιμένει, ὡς ἐτερων παρὰ αὐτῶν ὑπάρχοντα, ὑ. ὁ. viii. Εἰ τὶς τοιοῦτο λέγειν τούτων ἀνθρώπων συμμετρευόμεθα οὐχὶ τῶν θεῶν, λόγω, καὶ συνιστάμεθα καὶ συγχρηματίζωμεν θεῶν, ὡς ἔτερων ἐτέρω (τὸ γὰρ "Σῶον ἅ ἐστι προστίθεμεν, τούτῳ νοεῖν ἀναγκαῖον) καὶ οὐκ ἕλθεν μᾶλλον καὶ προσκυνήσει τιμῆς τῷ Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ μίνα αὐτὸ τῇ διάλογῳ ἀναπτύξεται, καθὼς γέγονεν σαρξ ὁ λόγος, ὑ. ὁ. ix. Εἰ τὶς φήσῃ, τὸν ἑνὰ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δυσβαδίζεται παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς ἀλλοτρία δυνάμει τῇ δι’ αὐτοῦ χρώμονα, καὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δυνάναι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἐκάθαρτοι, καὶ τὸ πληρόν ἐν ἀνθρώπως τῶν θεοσμείας, καὶ οὐκ ἥλθεν μᾶλλον αὐτὸ τὸ πνεύμα φήσῃ, δ’ οὐ καὶ ἐνήγγειλα τῷ θεοσμείῳ, ὑ. ὁ. x. Ἀρχεῖα καὶ ἀπόστολον τῆς ὑμηττος ἵμας γεγονόντος Χριστὸν ἡ θεία λέγει γραφή, προσκεκκομένων τε ἐπεὶ ἤμοι ἑαυτῶν εἰς ἴσημον ἑθικά τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, εἰ τὸν παντὸν ἀρχείον καὶ ἀπόστολον ἥμων γεγονόντας φήσῃ οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν λόγον, δέ γένοσαν σαρξ καὶ κατ’ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ ἔτεραν παρὰ αὐτοῦ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ γυναικός ἡ εἰ τῇ λέγει, καὶ ἠπαχθεὶς προεφευρεῖται αὐτὸν τὴν προσφοράν, καὶ οὐκ ἥλθεν μᾶλλον ἐπεὶ μόνων ἵμων· οὐ γὰρ ἀν ἐδεχθήσατο προσφοράς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτιῶν. ὑ. ὁ. xi. Εἰ τὸς θεὸν ἤμοι λεγοντες τῷ τοῦ κυρίου σώματος ἠμας εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἥλθεν αὐτὸ τὸ θεὸν πατρός λόγον, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ θεός τυνις παρ’ αὐτοῦ, συνημένον μὲν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἁξίαν, ἣν ὡς μόνην θείαν ἐνδοξίαν ἐγκεκρίτωσεν καὶ οὐκ ἥλθεν μᾶλλον ἰσόπολον ἢ ἥμοι, ὡς ἐμπνεύσεις τοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ πάντων ἐγενέσθαι καὶ διαταγμαῖς σαρκίς, καὶ θανάτον γενόμενοι σαρκίς, γεγονότα τέτοια σάρκις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθ’ ζωὴν τῇ ἐστὶ καὶ ζωοποιῆσας ἡ θείας, ὑ. ὁ. xii. Cyril’s own doctrine is most apparent from his second letter to Successor (Opp. v. li. 141). The Logos became a perfect man, but continued notwithstanding unaltered, one and the same. The two natures must be distinguished only as to the divine. P. 154: Ἐστοὶ δὲ ήμιν εἰς παρασείγονα ὁ καθ’ ήμας ἀνθρώπος. οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν νοούμεν τῆς φάσεως, μᾶν μὲν τῶν τῆς φύσεως, εἴπερ δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἀλλ’ ἐν φύσις διαλύσεις ἐνοίκαι· οὐκ ἔρει μέρος τῆς φύσεως· ἀλλ’ ἐνοίκει τῆς φύσεως· ὡς ἐνοίκεῖ τῇ πατρί, καὶ θανάτῳ γενόμενος σαρκὶς, γεγονότα τέτοια σάρκις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθ’ ζωὴν τῇ ἐστὶ καὶ ζωοποιήσας ἡ θείας, ὑ. ὁ. xiii. Ap. Marius Mercator, ed. Baluz. p. 142, 88. Baumgarten’s theol. Streitfick. ii. 774. 21 I. Si quis eum, qui est Emmanuel, Deum verbum esse dixerit, et non potius nobiscum Deum, hoc est, inhabitasse eam quae secundum nos est naturam, per id quod unitis est massae nostrae, quae de Maria virginis suscepit: matrem etiam Dei verbi, et non potius ejus, qui Emmanuel est, sanctam virginem nuncupaverit ipsumque Deum verbum in carnem subsumum esse, quae accipiat ad ostentationem Deltatia sua, ut habitu inventurit ut homo, anath. sit. II. Si quis in verbi Dei conjunctione, quae ad carnem facta est, de loco in locum mutationem divinae essentiae dixerit esse factam; ejusque divinae naturae carnes capaces dicerint, no partialiter unitam carni:: aut ilium in infinitus incircunscripserat naturae coextendior carni ad capitandum Deum, eaudemque ipsum naturam et Deum dicat et hominem, anath. sit. IV. Si quis eam voces, quae tam in evangelicis quae in epistolis apostolicis de Christo, qui est ex utraque natura, scriptae sunt, accipiat tamquam de una natura: ipsique Dei verbo tentat passiones tribuere, tam secundum carnem, quam etiam deitatem, anath. sit. VI. Si quis post incarnationem Deum verbum alterum quemquam praeter Christum nominaverit; servit sano formae initiata non habere a Deo Verbo, et increatam, ut ipso est, dicere tentaverit, et non magis ab ipso creatam confundatur, tamquam a naturali domino et creatore et Deo, quum et suscitatione propria virtute promit.
Hence Cyril’s anathemas were generally rejected as erroneous in the east. Andrew, bishop of Samosata, and Theodoret, bishop of Cyprus († 457), wrote refutations of them. Under these circumstances, Theodosius II. called a general council at Ephesus (431). Cyril hastened hither with a numerous band of adherents. The bold remonstrances of the honest

Solvite, dicas, templum hoc, et in trido suscitabo illud (Jo. ii. 19), anath. sit. VIII. Si quis servit formam pro se ipso; hoc est securum propriae naturalis rationem, colendum esse dixere, et verum omnium dominum; et non potius per societatem, quae bestae et ex se naturaliter dominicae noigenit naturae conjuncta est, veneratur; anath. sit. XI. Si quis unitam carnem verbo Dei ex naturae propriae possibileitate vivificatricem esse dixit; ipso Domino et Deo proununciante: Spiritus est, qui vivificat, caro nihil prodest (Jo. vi. 64); anath. sit. Spiritus est Deus, a Domino proununciatum est. Si quis ergo Deum Verbum carnaliter secundum substantiam carnem factum esse dixit (hoc autem modo et specialiter custodie: maximo Domino Christo post resurrectionem suam discipulis suis dicente: Palpat et videbite, quia spiritus ess et carnem non habet, sicut me videtis habere, Luc. xxiv. 39); anath. sit.


Isidore, abbot of Pelusium († 440), had no effect upon him; but listening only to the promptings of revenge he proceeded to condemn Nestor without waiting for the arrival of the eastern bishops. When they arrived, however, they assembled with John at their head, and deposed Cyril and his principal assistant, Memnon, bishop of Ephesus. The weak Theodosius had been incensed at Cyril till now, but the latter not only contrived to bring over to his side the impetuous monks at Constantinople, but also to make many friends at court by bribes and other artifices. The emperor at first confirmed the three depositions; but was afterward prevailed on to re-instate Cyril and Memnon in their offices. Nestor, on the other hand, was obliged to withdraw into his former cloister at Antioch.

The consequence of these measures was a division between the east and the other provinces, especially Egypt. The Orientals, however, were not sufficiently united to withstand their opponents, backed as the latter were by the court. Rabulas, bishop of Edessa, went over to Cyril's party, and even began to show
his zeal by also attacking the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, so much valued in the east, as the proper sources of Nestor’s error. Even John made peace with Cyril (433). The latter accommodated himself so far as to subscribe the Antiochene confession of faith; 29 the former sacrificed his friend Nestor. The

29 See Mansi, v. 305 (it was the creed put forth by Theodoret in Ephesus, and presented to the emperor by the Oriental party. Synodicon, c. 17 ap. Mansi, v. 783, comp. Alexandri Epist. ad Theodoret. in Synod. c. 96, ibid. p. 878): ‘Ομολογούμενον θυγατέραν τοῦ κύριου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς, θεοῦ τελείου καὶ ἀνθρώπου τελείου ἐκ φυσικής λογικής καὶ σώματος’ σφι αἰῶνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἑπὶ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ δὲ ἡμᾶς, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἴματον σωτηρίαν ἔχον τὴς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν θεότητα ὁμοούσιον τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμᾶς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· ὅποια γὰρ φύσεως ἐνώπιος γέγονεν· δεδ ἐνα Χριστῷ, ἐνα ἐνώπιον ὁμοούσιον ἔνωσεν. Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀνάγνωσιν ἐνώσεως ἅνων ὁμολογῶμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένου θεοτόκου, ὅτι τὸ τῶν δόγμαν σαρκικῶς καὶ ἐνανθρωποποιηθήκη, καὶ εἰς αὐτῆς τῆς συλλογῆς ἐνώσεις ἐναυτῷ τοῦ εἰς αὐτῆς ληφθῆναι μαθήματος· τοίς δὲ ἑναγγελισκοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς περί τοῦ κυρίου φωνᾶς ἐπανεις τοῦ θεολογοῦσιν ἀνθρώπος, τοῖς μὲν κοσμουθάρισται, οὐ δὲ ἐναρχᾶται, καὶ οὐ δυνατὸν. Many Egyptians were dissatisfied with this formula. Liberatus Breviar. c. 8: Culpeverunt Cyrilum, our susceperit ab orientalibus Episcopi durum confessionem naturaram, quod Nestorius dixit et docuit. To this must be referred Isidor lib. i. Ep. 324, ad Cyrilum, because the latter has been taken into the Synodicon (Mansi, v. 759): Χρις σε, θαυμάση, ἀγρεπτον μένειν δεί, οὕτω φόβῳ προδόθητα τὰ οἴρασιν, οὕτω σαυτῷ ἐνανθρωπώσουν· εἰ γὰρ τὸν γεγραμμένον ση σοι πρὸ τῆς ροῦ αὐτῆς ἀνατέστασις, ἢ κολακείας φανήη ὑπενθύνως, εὐχερείας ἡ μικροῦ, καὶ μαῖν μὲν δόξης ἰττώμενος, τῶν κύριον ἀλληγοροῦσαι τοῖς ἄγονας ὠμομάραμεν, οὐ τῶν ἀπαντάνεν οὗτος ὠπεμένη, ή κακοδομή φονείας καί μέχρις όταν ἐλέησαν. Against such charges Cyril defends himself at greatest length in the Epist. ad Acacium Episc. Molemitae (Opp. v. iii. 105. Mansi, v. 310 : besides in Epist. ad Eulogium Presb. Constantin. Opp. v. 123, ad Rufum Ep. Thessalonic. and ad Maximum Diacon. Antioch. in Majl Script. vet. nova coll. ii. 198). In the two latter he confesses he had accommodated himself to the prevailing notions. The orientals accordingly perceived in the adoption of that confession of faith a retraction on the part of Cyril. See also ibid. ad Marim. in Actis Conc. Chalc. act. x. Mansi, v. 347, especially Theodoreti Ep. ad Joanneum Episc. Antioch. a.d. 439 (Ep. 171 in Theod. Opp. ed. Saluize, iv. 1334, a complete copy in Latin in Synodico. l. c. v. 747): ἵνα κωνικὰν ἐνθρώπου τα ταύτα γράφαται, καὶ εξετάσαυτε αὐτῶν ἀκριβῶς τῆς διάκρισιν, ἐθεμένου οὕτως τοῖς εἰσήκοντες (ὑπὸ ἡμῶν) τὰ ἐκεῖθεν ἀπεσταλμένα, καὶ κατατηροῦσεν τὰ τοῖς ἀκαθάρτως ὡς ἀλλατιώς τῆς εὐσέβειας, πολεμοῦσας διελέσατος. Ἑκείνη μὲν γὰρ εἰχε, σαρκικάς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, κ. τ. λ. ἀναγόμενα δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῶν τῆς διάδρους. Τὰ δὲ νῦν ἀπεσταλμένα τῆς εὐγενείας εὐγενεία καλύπτει τὸν ὁδοῖς τοῖς ἀνθρώπως τοῖς Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς· ἔρα γὰρ τέλεους καὶ ἀνθρώπως τέλεους ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν· ἄναλεκτικά ἐν αὐτῶπος· καὶ ἀνθρώπως εἰς ἁλλοτρίας, καὶ ἀνθρώπως δὲ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, καὶ ἀγαθός, παθήσας δὲ τὸ νόσος, κ. τ. λ. Altera vero diffamata sunt quaedam, quae nos nimum turbaverunt. Dicunt eum, quod is, qui hic poenitendus nus sit, non solum dejectionis s. damnationis subscriptionem a vestra Sacritatit utiatur exigere, sed anathematismum quoque doctrinae sanctissimi et Deo sanctissimi episcopi Nestorii. Quodam id verum est—simile aliqulit factum, tantum quia vix tandem perductus ad consubstantialem Deo et Patri Filium confundendum, mox iterum santhematum forsit eos, qui hoc a principio sapuerunt atque docuerunt, etc. Cyril himself says, Cyriillus et Acaciam, ap. Mansi, v. 314, 315, that even the Nestorians considered that confession as consonant with their VOL. I.—23
unfortunate Nestor, who had never asserted aught inconsistent with that very confession of faith now signed by Cyril, was first banished to Oasis; then in Thebaïs was dragged from one place of banishment to another, till his death about 440. To justify his condemnation, his contemporaries were obliged to misrepresent his doctrinal system, and it was so handed down to posterity, till men of more enlarged and clearer views recognized the truth.

The Syrian bishops were now compelled to assent to the peace concluded between John and Cyril. The greatest opposition was made by the theological school in Edessa, which had long been the place of education for the Persian clergy, when Rabulas prohibited the writings of Diodorus and Theodore. Several of the teachers were interdicted, and betook themselves to Persia. One of them, Barsumas (Barsuma) became bishop of Nisibis (435–489) and confirmed the Persian Christians in their attachment

faith. It is certain that Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis the most violent opponent of Cyril, was also against that confession, because it had adopted the expression θεοτοκος (Ep. ad Theodoret. ap. Mansi, v. 878. Schulze, v. 750: Quis hoc est quasi arx totius quia haereses?); but he does not reject it absolutely, but merely expresses his disapproval of the doctrinal use of it under existing circumstances (Mansi, v. 875. Schulze, v. 748: post corruptionem totius orbis, et ex quo praeclari nunc coepit passibilis Deus ab impio Cyrilli captivus, dogmatice poni soleat vocem—θεοτοκον. abaque ilia—anthropotoxon, nihil est aliud, nisi ea quae Cyrilli sunt praeclari). Even the later Monophysites accused Cyril of apostatizing from his doctrine. See Timothei Aeburi fragm. ap. Mansi, vii. 841, and Majl Coll. nov. vii. i. 138, which fragment, if not belonging to Timothy (as Walch Ketznerhist. vi. 692, above), proceeded at least from a Monophysite. Hence when Vater (Kirchenhist. Archiv. 1825. ii. 211) and Baur (Drei eignigkeit. i. 786) deny the inconsistency of Cyril, they have, at least, the universal voice of that period against them.

20 See Nestor's own account, ap. Evagrius, i. 7.

21 Ex. gr. Cassianus above, note 18. Leo in Epist. ad Leocem Aug. (Quæser. 135, Buller. 165): Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatum virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo credidit genitricem, ut aliam personam carnis faceret, aliam deitatis: nec unum Christum in Verbo Dei et carne sentiret, sed separatia atque sejunctim alterum alium Dei, alterum hominis prae dicaret. Still more misrepresented is the appendix to Augustin. de Haeresibus, c. 91: Nestoriani a Nestorio episcopo, qui contra catholicam fidem dogmatizare ausus est, Dominum nostrum J. C. hominem tantum: nec id, quod mediator Dei et hominum effectum est, in utro virginis de Spiritu S. fuisse conceptum, sed postea Deum homini fusisse permixtum, etc. Such were the sources from which the middle ages drew their ideas of Nestorianism.

to the doctrinal system of Theodore, and their aversion to the council of Cyril at Ephesus. The successor of Rabulas in Edessa, Ibas, (bishop from 436 to 457) was indeed, though at peace with Cyril, a zealous friend of the views of the Antiochian theology, and even translated Theodore's works into Syriac; but persecution was afterward renewed against the adherents of these principles; the school of Edessa was destroyed (489); and its few remaining friends fled into Persia. The Persian church had now broken off all connection with the church of the Roman empire, and the kings of Persia from Pherozes onward (461–488) favored this separation for political reasons. These Christians, who had the bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon as their Catholicus (Jacobitish), were called by their opponents Nестorians, though they called themselves Chaldaean Christians, and in India Thomas-Christians. They have not only diffused themselves extensively in Asia, but have also acquired great merit by conveying much of the learning of Greece into that part of the world, as well as by founding schools and hospitals. At a later period they became the instructors of the Arabians.\footnote{33}

\section*{§ 89. EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.}

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{Sources:} Breviculus historiarum Eutychianistarum s. Gesta de nomine Acacii\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}} reaching to the year 486, according to the conjecture of Ballardus, by Pope Gelasius (ap. Mansi, vii. 1060).—Liberati breviriaram and the last pieces of the Synodicon (see notices prefixed to § 88).—Evagrius, i. c. 9, ss.—Collection of Acts of Councils, ap. Mansi, vi. and vii.

Notwithstanding the external union between Cyril and John, the internal schism between Egypt (which Palestine followed) and the east, as to the person of Christ, still continued. The Egyptians perceived Nestorianism\footnote{\textsuperscript{2}} in the doctrine of two na-
tures; while the orientals, in the doctrine of one nature discovered Apollinarianism. The former party, however, continued to be favored by the court; and of this favor Cyril's successor, the violent Dioscurus (bishop from 444 till 451) availed himself extensively for the purpose of putting down the most zealous oriental bishops as Nestorians, and of forcing the Egyptian doctrines on the east.  

On the other hand, a zealous adherent of Cyril, the old Archimandrite (abbot) Eutyches in Constantinople was accused of holding these very doctrines, and condemned at a σύνοδος ἐν δημοσίᾳ by his bishop Flavian (448). Leo, bishop of Rome,
not only approved of this proceeding, but in his Epistola ad Plauvianum, gave also a doctrinal development of the disputed point,

λοιδορίας. To the question, p. 711: Ὅμοιος τὸν πατέρα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοόσιον τῷ μητρὶ κατὰ τὴν ἄνθρωποτητά τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐναντίον οἱ κόμης ἡμῶν Ἰηροῦ Χριστοῦ. He answers: Ἐπειδή ἡ ἴμαλως θεῖον μας, καὶ κύριον σώμαν καὶ γῆς, ὡς σήμερον φιλοσοφοῦν ἐλέειτο αὐτοῖς ἐπιστήσατο, ὡς ἃν ἠλπίζει πρὸ τοῦτον, ἴμαλως. Ἐπεὶ σήμερον οὐκ εἶπον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὁμοόσιον ἡμῖν, τὸν ἐγὼ παρθένον ἴμαλως εἶναι ἡμῖν ὁμοόσιον, καὶ ὡς αὕτη ἤπατο κύριος ὁ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Ὅταν the remark was made upon this: Τῆς ἡμῶν ἱππὸς ὁμοόσιος ἡμῖν ὅσον, πάντως καὶ ὁ νόμος ὁμοόσιος ἡμῖν ἐστι, he rejoined: Ἐκεῖ σήμερον οὐκ εἶπον ἐπειδή γὰρ σῶμα θεοῦ αὐτὸ ἴμαλως (προσέχετε), οὐκ εἶπον σῶμα ἄνθρωπον οὗ τοῦ θεοῦ σῶμα, ἄνθρωπον δὲ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ὡς τῆς παρθένου ἰσάρκωθεν ὁ κύριος. Εἰ δὲ δὲν εἶπεν ὡς τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ὁμοόσιον ἡμῖν, καὶ τοῦτο λέγει, κέρα. To the question, p. 714: Ὅμοιοι, καὶ ὡς δυο φύσεως μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπωσιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν τὸν τῆς παρθένου λέγεις ἢ ὅ, he gave the reply in explanation: Ὅμοιος ἐκ δύο φύσεως γεγεννηθα εἰς τοὺς κύριους ἡμῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐνώσεως· μετὰ τῆς ἐνώσεως, μὲν φύσιν ἱμαλως. When he refused to acknowledge the two natures, and to anathematize the contrary opinion, the decision was passed, p. 748: Διὰ πάντων τεθύματι Ἐνώσεως ὁ πάλαι προσβάρτος καὶ ἀρχικολόγητος—τὸν Ὀσαλεντίου καὶ Ἀπολύσανος κακοδιαβόλον νοσοῦν. ἢν ἐπιθαλασσάζετε, καὶ στενάζετε ἐπὶ τὴν παντελὴ ὑπολειπὴν αὐτοῦ, ἵμαλως διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰηροῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ βλασφημηθέντος, ἄλλωστε αὐτὸν εἶναι παντὸς ἱερατικὸ τάγματος, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς κομωσίας, καὶ τοῦ προετύμαται μοναστικῶς. Comp. Epist. Euchelaitis ad Leonem Papam (in the Synodicon ap. Manvli, v. 1015. Schultze, v. 897): Expetobar duas naturas fateri, et anathematizare eae, qui hoc negarent. Ego autem mutuens definitionem a synodo, nec adimple ad addere verbum contra expositum fide a sancta synodo Nicæana (cf. § 88, note 27), sciens vero sanctos et beatos patres nostros Julium, Felicem, Athanasianum, Gregorianum sanctissimos episcopos refutantes durum naturarum vocabulum, etc. In the confession of faith annexed (ibid. c. 223): Ipse enim, qui est verbum Dei, descendit de coelo sine carne, et factus est caro in utero sanctae virginitatis ex ipso carne virginis incommissurabiliter et inconvertibiliter, sicut ipse novit et voluit. Et factus est, qui est semper Deus perfectus ante sacra, idem et homo perfectus in extremo dieum propter nos et nostram salutem. None but opponents have charged Euchelianism with the doctrine of an apparent body, or the transformation of the Logos into flesh. So Theodoret. Hær. fab. comp. iv. 13. Gelasius de duabus naturis in Christo adv. Euchelion et Nestorianum. Euchelion is defended by the Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez (Commentarii ad Thomae, Lugdun. 1606. fol. in part. iii. Thomae Disp. xiv. c. 1), Archibald Bower (History of the Popes, lib. ii. p. 31, 61, ss.) and others.

which was by no means favorable to the Egyptians. It is true that Dioscurus now procured the summoning of a general synod at Ephesus (449) and there, as president, compelled by violent measures the bishops to pronounce in favor of Eutyches and the Egyptian doctrines (σινώδος ληστρική, Theophanis Chronograph. p. 86.—Latrocinium Ephesinum, Leo ad Pulcheriam Ep. 75, ed. Quesnel); but the death of Theodosius II. († 450) altered at once the state of affairs. The new rulers Pulcheria and Marcian, who was elevated to the throne by marrying her, were as partial to Leo as they were hostile to Dioscurus. Hence, a new general council was called at Chalcedon (451), at which Dioscurus was deposed for many misdeeds, the persecuted eastern bishops, and with them Cyril, too, for the purpose of sparing the Egyptians, were declared orthodox, Leo's Epist. ad Flavianum, made the rule of faith on the point in dispute, and at the same time a more minute explanation of it given on the part of the council. But though the decrees of the synod re-

8 Lewald die sogen. Räubersynode, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. viii. 139.
9 The Alexandrian Sophronius even accused Dioscurus in Chalcedon of having opposed the acknowledgment of Marcian in Egypt (Mansi, vi. 1092), ἀντίθετος μὲν μᾶλλον βασιλείων ἤτοι τῆς Αἰγυπτίας δουλείας. No notice, however, was taken of this accusation by the synod, as there is more to it to be found elsewhere.
10 How little convinced the prevailing party was of Cyril's orthodoxy is clear from the fact that Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, after 458, wrote against his twelve anathemas. See Facundus pro defens. iii. capitolorum, ii. 4. Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen, p. 316.
11 Concerning the remarkable circumstances, and the opposition of the Roman legates,
ceived imperial confirmation and support by punitory laws, they were looked upon as Nestorian by many in Egypt and Palestine, and this proved, soon after, the beginning of the tedious Monophysite controversy.

§ 90.

OF THE THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY OF THE OECUMENICAL SYNODS.

In this period the utterances of the oecumenical councils, as the last and highest ecclesiastical decisions, began to assume an important place among the sources of theological knowledge. As all synods prior to the present time were supposed to be under the peculiar direction of the Holy Spirit, without on that account claiming infallibility, so also the doctrinal decisions of general councils were derived from a special co-operation of the Holy Spirit, but so far were men as yet from attributing to them see the protocol actio v. ap. Mansi, vii. 97, ss.—P. 108: Ὁρος τῆς ἐν Χαλεπώντω τετάρτης Συνόδου. P. 116: Ἐπείναις παίρνων τὸν ἄγιον πατράσιν, ἦν καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὑμαλογόνιν, νῦν τὸν κύριον ἅμα Ἱερον Χριστοῦ συμφώνως ἁπάντας ἑκκλησίασκομεν, τέλειον τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεοῦ ἁλρίδως καὶ ἀνθρωπῶν ἁλρίδως τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος. ὑμοῦσιν τὸ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὑμοῦσιν τῶν αὐτῶν ἢμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὑμιῶν ἢμιν χορίς ἀμαρτίας: πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγενηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐκ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τῶν αὐτῶν, δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, εἰς Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστοῦ, νῦν, κύριον, μονογενήν, ἐκ διὸ φίλους (λέγ. ἐν διὸ φίλους) ἀγαγίτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαμέρευς, ἀχώριστος, γνωρίζομενον, ὀδηγοῦν τῆς τῶν φίλων διαφορὰς ἀναφράξεις εἰς τὴν ἐνωσιν, σωζόμενος δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἴδιότητος ἐναίδευς φίλως καὶ εἰς ἐν πρόσωποι, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπίστασιν συντρέχοις, νῦν εἰς δοῦν πρῶσων μερίζομενον, ἡ διαμορφώμενον, ἀλλ' ἐναὶ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν νῦν καὶ μονογενὲς, ἥκε αὐτὸν, κύριον Ἱερον Χριστοῦ· καθάπερ ἐνδοθέν οἱ παρόντες περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν κύριος Ἱερον Χριστός ἐξεπαίδευσε, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἢμιν παραδόθωσε συμβολον. That the true reading must be ἐν διὸ φίλους (as all the Latins have in dubias naturam) is shown by Mansi, vii. 775. Walch. Bibl. symb. vetus, p. 106, to which we have also to add the testimonies of the Monophysite Severus Patr. Ant. (ap. Mansi, vii. 840), Evagrius, H. E. ii. c. 4. Leonitius Bys. de Sectis. Actio, v. c. 7. Agathonis P. Ep. ad Constantem II. (in the Act. Conc. oecum. vi. Act. 4, ap. Mansi, xi. 356). Baur's Dreieinigkeit, i. 820, defends the reading ἐκ' δ. φ.

1 The name σύνδος οἰκουμενική first in Conc. Constant. ann. 381, can. 6.
3 Constantini Epist. ad Eccl. Alexandr. (Socrates, l. 9): In reference to the Nicean council: Ο θύμω τούτως τριακοσίων ἤρεσσιν Ἑπισκόπωσις. οὐδὲν ἐκείνω σεταρα, ἢ τὸν θεοῦ γνώμην, μαλαττία γε ὑπὸ τὸ ἄγιον πνεύμα, τουτεύτων καὶ τηλικοῦτων ἀνθρώπων ταῖς διανοιαῖς
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an exclusive infallibility dependent only upon their conformity to certain external conditions, that they were put in the same rank with other orthodox synods, and in answering opponents, men did not endeavor to prove that the council was ocumenical, but that its decision was true according to Scripture and tradition.

Epist. Synodi Nicæni ad Alexandrinum (Theodoret. i. 8) in fine: ἔδειξεν δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ ἡμῶν ὑπάντων, ἵνα τὰ καλὰ ἔχων δόξαντα βεβαιά μοι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατ’ εὐθείαν γεγενημένα, ὡς γε πεπιστευκαμένα, τού θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐπὶ πνεύμα τοῦ ἁγίου. In Socrates, i. c. 9 this passage has been altered. Augustinus de Baptismo contra Donatistas, ii. 3: Quis autem nesciat, sanctum scripturam canonicam—omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita praeponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disciperti non possit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit: Episcoporum autem literas—per sermonem forte sapientiorem—et per aliorum Episcoporum graeviorem auctoritatem—et per concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in ea forte a veritate deviant est: et ipsa concilia, quae per singulas regiones vel provincias sint, plerorum conciliorum auctoritatem, quae sunt ex universo orbo christianno, sine ulla ambiguitate cedere: Ipsi eaque plebajus priora posterioribus emendari, quum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typo sanctagiae superioriae, sine ulla inflata servitate arrogante, sine ulla contentionibus vividzae vividzae, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum caritate christiana.

Constantinus Epist. ad Episcopos, qui Conc. Nicæum non interferunt (Euseb. de vita Const. iii. 90, and Socrates, i. 9) says generally: ὅπως γὰρ, ἐὰν τι δ’ ἡν τοῦ ἀγίου τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνελήφησαν πρᾶγμα, τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν θείαν βοᾶς ἐξή τῇ ἁγιότητι. Thus Athanasius places the Conc. Antiochen. A.D. 369, to which his opponents appealed in defense of their rejection of the term θρονίασιν, on an equality with the Nicæan in point of theological authority. De Synodicis, c. 43: Συγκρούσαν μὲν γὰρ τούτων πρὸς ἑκάστους ἄπειρας πάντως γάρ εἰσὶν πατέρες· ὑπερέχον δὲ παλίν, ὡς οὖν μὲν καλῶς, ἔξων ὑπὸ τοῦ καθάρου εὐφύσεως, οὐχ οὖν οἱ πάντες γὰρ ἱκανοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. Οἱ χρῆ δὲ φιλονικεῖται, οὐδὲ τῶν συνελήφθείσων τῶν ἁρτῷσων συμβάλλέτες, ἦν μὴ δικαίως οἱ τρικαλοὶ τῶν ἑλάσαντος ἐπικρίτες· οὐδ’ ἀν πάλιν τὸ χρόνον ἀιώνιον ἔμετρετον, ἦν μὴ δικαίως οἱ προλάβοντες ἀθανασίως τῷ μετὰ τάση γενόμενως· οἱ πάντες γὰρ καθ’ ἀυτοῦ προερχότατ’ πατέρες εἰσιν.

Augustinus contra Maximinum Arian. ii. 14, 3: Sed nunc nec ego Nicæum, nec tua debeat Ariminenses tamquam praecjudicatus proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tua illius denturis: Scripturarum auctoritatibus, non quomque propriis, sed utique communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet.
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THIRD CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.


§ 91.

GROWING IMPORTANCE OF THE CLERGY.

The Christian emperors enlarged the privileges already granted by Constantine to the church and the clergy (Div. I. § 56, note 30, ff.), by new tokens of their favor. They released church lands and the clergy from certain civil liabilities, but by no means from all taxes; gave a legal confirmation to the decisions which the bishops pronounced in ecclesiastical affairs, and which they also gave as chosen umpires in civil disputes.

1 Besides the municipal offices (see Div. I. § 56, note 30), both the clergy and church property were freed from the numeribus sordidis and extraordinaritis (cf. Cod. Theod. lib. xi. tit. 15, de extraordinariis sive sordidis numeribus et Gothofredi paritatione), from the metatis (Cod. Th. l. vii. t. 8, de metatis), the angarius and parangarius (Cod. Th. l. vii. t. 5, de cursu publico, angarius et parangarius), and finally the immunity of the clericis negotiantea from the lustralis coadiatio (Cod. Th. l. xiii. t. 1, de lustrali coaliatione comp. Hagedorn Hist. Versuch über die röm. Finanzen, S. 307, ff.). Comp. besides the works cited Cod. Theod. l. xvi. ii. 8, 19, etc. Comp. Bingham’s Orig. eccl. vol. ii. p. 227. Planck, i. 289.

2 Constantine had indeed at first, in the year 315, also released the church lands from the tributis ordinariis (Cod. Theod. xi. i. 1), but they were soon after again submitted to this tribute, and when the council of Ariminum (A.D. 359) applied to Constantius, ut juge, quae videntur ad Ecclesiam pertinent, a publica functione cessarent, inquietudine desistente, he flatly denied the request, Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 15. Gratian even subjected the church lands to the extraordinaritis coactionibus (Cod. Theod. xi. xvi. 15). So also Theodosius, l. c. l. 18. Honorius released them from the extraordinaritis, l. c. l. 21, 22. Theodosius II. subjected them again to the angarius and parangarius. Cod. Justin. i. ii. 11. Comp. Ambrosii Orat. de basilicis non tradendis haereticis: Si tributum petit Imperator, non negamus. Agri ecclesiae solvant tributum. Si agros desiderat Imperator, potestatem habet vindicandorum, nemo nostrum intervenit, etc. Rüffel, l. 133.

3 Euseb. de vita Const. iv. c. 27. See below, note 4. Comp. the law of Honorius A.D. 399 (Cod. Theod. xvi. xi. 1): Quotiens de religione agitur, Episcopos convenit judicare, caeteras vero causas, quae ad ordinarios cognitores, vel ad eum publicum juris pertinent, legibus operor audiri.

4 Respecting these episcopal arbitration-decisions comp. Div. I. § 69, note 6. It had been always reckoned unchristian to depart from them, and thus public opinion demanded for them the preference, so that they laid the foundation of an actio rei judicatae. This privilege has been usually ascribed to Constantine, with reference to Eusebius de vita Const. iv. 27: Τοις τὸν ἐπισκόπων δράσει, τοῖς ἐν συνόδωι ἀποφασθέντας ἐπεσφραγίζει.
allowed the clergy to be bound by these judicial decisions, and even put them in cases of discipline under spiritual courts, without however conceding to the bishops a civil jurisdiction.
But the old ecclesiastical rights of the clergy, particularly the right of superintending morals, and the duty of interference on behalf of all the unfortunate, received quite another importance after they had been recognized by the state, by the elevation of Christianity into the state religion. The persons of magistrates also now became subject to them as inspectors of the public morals; yea, even the emperors themselves, as far as they were Christians; and the duty of interference on behalf


6 Conc. Arelatense, ann. 314, c. 7: De praedius, qui fideles ad praediam proponant, placuit ut, cum promoti fuerint, litteras acipient ecclesiasticas communicatorias (Comp. Div. I. § 41, note 5): Ita tamen ut in quibusque locis gesserint, ab Episcopo eisdem loci cura de illis agatur, et cum coeperint contra dicilium agere, tum damnum eam comminione exclaudit. Similiter et de his qui rempublicam agere voluerunt. Gregor. Naz. Orat. xvii. p. 271, thus addresses the sacerdotes et ærænuntes: de ágno Xristio vómis ἐπιστήσθην ἕμα τῇ ἔμφυτη σειρῇ καὶ τῷ ἔμφυτον ἄρχην γὰρ καὶ αὐτόν, προσεῆν δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὸν μείζον καὶ τελωτέρων ἄρχην. ή δὲ τὸ πνεύμα ἐπισχωρήσατο τῷ σαιρα, καὶ τοῖς γενεῖς τὸ ἐπιστήσθη. Thus Athanasius excommunicated a governor of Libya on account of cruelty and excesses; and Basil the Great assures us (Ep. 61) after he had made known this excommunication in his church, ἂπορήσαντι αὐτῶν πάντες ἡγήσαντο, μή πυρος, μή έδαστο, μή σκέπτες αὐτή κοινωνίαν. Comp. the excommunication which Synesius bishop of Ptolemais, uttered against the prefect Andronicus, Synesii Epist. 58: ἄλεγχοικα καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν μηδέν ἀνορίσθη τί μεν τὸν θεόν; ἃς αυτώς ἔργον ἄποκλεισθα καὶ σημασία καὶ περίπτωσις: ἢ δέ τις τῷ Διαβόλῳ, μέρος ἐν Παραδείσῳ δὲ κἀν λάθη διαλέξει, ἠξελαθήσατο. Παραιτήθη μὲν οὖν καὶ ἰδιότητα παντὶ καὶ ἀρχηγεῖτα, μήτε ὁμορφόν τινα, μήτε ὁμορφόντος γίνεται; ἐπερευθείας δὲ διαφορέων, μήτε ἐξαταλλότας αὐτῶς μετατρέψατο, μήτε τελευτήσας μετατρέπατο, ἡ τ. l. Cf. Lassoion de Synesius. Hafn. 1831. 9, p. 139, ss. The bishops of Alexandria, in particular, made themselves feared of the officials of that place. Cyril obtained this see by fighting, although the leader of the army there was against him. Socrates vii. 7: Καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἡ Ἐπισκοπὴ Ἀλεξανδρείας παρά τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέιχων καταστράφηκεν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἔλαβε τὴν ιεράν. Comp. Socrates, vii. c. 13, on the disputes between Cyril and Orates, prefect of Egypt: ὁρίζεσθαι δὲ καὶ προτοῦ μὴν ἔλαβε τὴν ὑπαύλειαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων, διὰ τῶν διαφορῶν τῆς ἱερατικῆς τῶν ἐκ Βασίλειος ἱερεῖ τηταγγείων: μᾶλλον δὲ δὴ καὶ ἐπιστέφνει αὐτῶς τὰς διατάξεις. Κύριλλος ἐξελάτησε.—Theodosius I. was compelled to do penance by Ambrose (Rufinus, xi. 18; Sozom. vii. 25; Theodoret, v. 17. Comp. Neander's K. G. ii. 324). Of Theodosius II. Theodoret, v. 36, relates that a monk came to him, ἐπει δὲ τοῦτο δράσας πολλάκις οἰκὶ ἐπικήθη, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς αὐτῶν κοινωνίας ἐκάλυψε, καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν
of the unfortunate established a right of intercession with the
civil power,9 which often exhibited itself in a very stormy way
in cases where the punishment of death, which the Christians
of that time regarded with horror, was decreed.10 In like man-
ner the acknowledgment of this right of the clergy facilitated
the transfer of the right of asylum from heathen temples to the
Christian churches.11 All these rights had long since grown

9 (As the vestals had formerly exercised it, see Cicero pro Fontejo in fin. Sueton. Jul.
Caesar, c. i., Tiber. c. 2). Conc. Sardic. c. 8, below, § 92, note 11. Ambrosius de Offic.
ministr. ii. c. 31: Adjuvat hoc quoque ad profectum bona exstimationis, si de potentis man-
ibus eripias inopem, de morte damnatum eras, quantum sine perturbatione fieri potest,
ne videamus factam magis causam facere, quam si directe factam, et graviora inferro valueras,
dum leviorum mediocris desideramus. Cap. 29: Egredie hinc vestrum cmitesct ministerium,
si suscepta impressio potentis, quam vel vidis vel orphans tolerare non queas, Ecclesiae
subsidio cohibeatur, si ostendatis plus spud vos mandatuu Domini, quam divitis valere
graftam. Menemnsis ipsi, quoties adversus regales impetus pro viduarum, immo omnium,
depositis certamen subierim. Commune hoc vobiscum nihil. Cf. Thomasinin Vetus et
novae Ecclesiae disciplinae de beneficiis. p. ii. i. iii. c. 87, and c. 95, 98. Bingham. lib. ii. c. 8.
10 Macrobeus, vicar of the diocese of Africa, writes respecting it to Augustine (August.
Ep. 139): Officium acadetulim vestri esse dictis intuere pro rei, et nisi obisnecata, of-
foendi, quasi quod erat offici vestri, minime reportetis. Hic ergo vehementer ambigo, utrum
istud ex religione descendat. Nam si a Domino peccata adeo prohibebatur, ut ne posset
 condemn, quidem copia post primum tributum: quemadmodum nos possimus ex religione con-
tendere, ut nobis quaequecumque illud crimen fuerit, diminuat: quod utique, cum impuni-
tum volumus, probamus, etc. To this Augustine replies, Ep. 153, ex. gr. § 3: Morum corri-
gendorum nullus alius quam in hac vita locum est.—Ideo compellinur humani generis caritate
intuere pro rei, ne istam vitam sic financ per supplicium, ut ea finita non possit finire
supplicium. Noli ergo dubitare hoc officium nostrum ex religione descendere, etc. Comp. the
intercession for the Circumcelliones who were to have been executed for murders, August.
Ep. 133, ad Marcellinum Tribunum: Si non audis amicum potentes, audi Episcopum con-
sulentem. Quamvis quantum Christiano loquar, maxime in tali causa, non arroganter dis-
erim, audire te Episcopum convenit jubes. Against violent interferences of the clergy,
as they took place for example in Antioch (Chrysostomi Ep. ad Olympiadem et Orat. ad
pope. Antioch. 17.) Theodosius I. A.D. 393, and Arcadius, A.D. 398, enacted laws (Cod. Theod.
x. xi. 15 and 16.) The latter: Addictos supplicio, et pro crimini immemnate damnatos, nulli
Clericorum vel Monnochorum—por vina atque asperationem vindicare liceat ac tenere. Quis-
bus in causa criminali humanitatis consideranda, si temporar sufragatur, interpomenda pro-
vectionis copiam non negamus.—Reos tempore provocatoris emenso ad locum poenae sub
procuratione pergentes, nullus aut tenent aut defendat.—Si tanta Clericorum ac Monnoch-
orum audacia est, ut bellum potius quam judicium futurum esse existimetur, ad Clementiam
Nosstrum commissa referarunt, ut nostro max severior ulius procedat arbitrio. Ad Episco-
porum sanc culpam redunabat, si quid forte in ea parte regionis, in qua ipse populo chris-
tianiæ religionis, doctrinae insinuationem, moderantium, ex his quos fieri huc leges prohibebimus,
a Monachis perpetuum esse cognovinunt, nec vindicaverint.

11 At first merely through custom (examples Ammian. Marcell. xxvi. 3. Zosimus. iv. 40;
iv. 8. Gregor. Naz. Orat. xx. In landem Basilii, Opp. i. 333, etc.) which is referred to as
already in existence in the restrictive laws of Theodosius I. and Arcadius (Cod. Theod.
x. 45, l-3), and formally confirmed and strictly defined by Theodosius II. in the year 431
gesch. S. 1. Leipzig. 1778. 8.) § 189, ss.
naturally out of the old ecclesiastical notions before the emperors began to confirm them severally by laws.  

On the other side, ecclesiastical possessions became very considerable, partly by the liberality of the emperors, partly by the legal permission to accept of inheritances and gifts, which alas, was often abused by the clergy, so as to become legacy-hunting. All these external advantages attracted many to the spiritual profession, the number of clergy was swelled beyond measure, and to the already existing classes were added paraboli, copiatae. The emperors were obliged to meet this

12 So Constantini lex A.D. 329. (Cod. Justin. i. iv. 23): Quae de aera, sive ut vocant cottis, ac deorum prohibita nobis sancta sunt, ca licet Dei amicissimis Episcopos et persecutione, et cohieros, et sint, et flagitiosos per clarissimos Prasserides provinciarum, et Patres defensoresque civitatem ad modestiam reducere. Honorii A.D. 408. (Cod. Theod. xvi. x. 19), in reference to all kinds of idolatry: Episcopos quoque locorum haec ipsa prohibendi ecclesiasticae manus tribulam facultatem; A.D. 409 (Cod. Theod. ix. iii. 7), after the judges had been admonished to treat the prisoners more humanely: Nec decreti Antistitum christianum religionis cura laudabili quae ad observationem constitutis judicis haec ingerat mentionem. Cf. Cod. Theod. v. v. 2; v. vii. 2; xv. viii. 2; cf. C. W. de Rober Dissert. de effectu religionis Christ. in jurisprudentiam Rom. (Pasc. i. Groningae. 1776. 8) p. 94, 88.

13 Particularly out of the parochial property of the cities (see § 75, note 9), the property of the heathen temples (Cod. Theod. xvi. 20) and of heretical churches Cod. Theod. xvi. 43, 53, 53, 65, etc.). Hilarius contra Constantium jam vita defunctum, c. 10: Auro reipublicae sanctum Dei honoras, et vel detracta templis vel publicata edictis, vel exacta poenitis Deo ingeris.

14 So Gregory Naz. Ep. 80 remarks, while admonishing Leuci and Alysius to pay the legacy of their mother into the church, dti pollai eis deis octava epiphanian, ex Æ allowed to treat the prisoners more humanely: Nec decreti Antistitum christianum religionis cura laudabili quae ad observationem constitutis judicis haec ingerat mentionem. Cf. Cod. Theod. v. v. 2; v. vii. 2; xv. viii. 2; cf. C. W. de Rober Dissert. de effectu religionis Christ. in jurisprudentiam Rom. (Pasc. i. Groningae. 1776. 8) p. 94, 88.

13 Particularly out of the parochial property of the cities (see § 75, note 9), the property of the heathen temples (Cod. Theod. xvi. 20) and of heretical churches Cod. Theod. xvi. 43, 53, 53, 65, etc.). Hilarius contra Constantium jam vita defunctum, c. 10: Auro reipublicae sanctum Dei honoras, et vel detracta templis vel publicata edictis, vel exacta poenitis Deo ingeris.

14 So Gregory Naz. Ep. 80 remarks, while admonishing Leuci and Alysius to pay the legacy of their mother into the church, dti pollai eis deis octava epiphanian, ex Æ allowed to treat the prisoners more humanely: Nec decreti Antistitum christianum religionis cura laudabili quae ad observationem constitutis judicis haec ingerat mentionem. Cf. Cod. Theod. v. v. 2; v. vii. 2; xv. viii. 2; cf. C. W. de Rober Dissert. de effectu religionis Christ. in jurisprudentiam Rom. (Pasc. i. Groningae. 1776. 8) p. 94, 88.

13 Particularly out of the parochial property of the cities (see § 75, note 9), the property of the heathen temples (Cod. Theod. xvi. 20) and of heretical churches Cod. Theod. xvi. 43, 53, 53, 65, etc.). Hilarius contra Constantium jam vita defunctum, c. 10: Auro reipublicae sanctum Dei honoras, et vel detracta templis vel publicata edictis, vel exacta poenitis Deo ingeris.

14 So Gregory Naz. Ep. 80 remarks, while admonishing Leuci and Alysius to pay the legacy of their mother into the church, dti pollai eis deis octava epiphanian, ex Æ allowed to treat the prisoners more humanely: Nec decreti Antistitum christianum religionis cura laudabili quae ad observationem constitutis judicis haec ingerat mentionem. Cf. Cod. Theod. v. v. 2; v. vii. 2; xv. viii. 2; cf. C. W. de Rober Dissert. de effectu religionis Christ. in jurisprudentiam Rom. (Pasc. i. Groningae. 1776. 8) p. 94, 88.

13 Particularly out of the parochial property of the cities (see § 75, note 9), the property of the heathen temples (Cod. Theod. xvi. 20) and of heretical churches Cod. Theod. xvi. 43, 53, 53, 65, etc.). Hilarius contra Constantium jam vita defunctum, c. 10: Auro reipublicae sanctum Dei honoras, et vel detracta templis vel publicata edictis, vel exacta poenitis Deo ingeris.

14 So Gregory Naz. Ep. 80 remarks, while admonishing Leuci and Alysius to pay the legacy of their mother into the church, dti pollai eis deis octava epiphanian, ex Æ allowed to treat the prisoners more humanely: Nec decreti Antistitum christianum religionis cura laudabili quae ad observationem constitutis judicis haec ingerat mentionem. Cf. Cod. Theod. v. v. 2; v. vii. 2; xv. viii. 2; cf. C. W. de Rober Dissert. de effectu religionis Christ. in jurisprudentiam Rom. (Pasc. i. Groningae. 1776. 8) p. 94, 88.

In a one-sided way Athanasius Hist. Arian. ad Monachos, c. 78, designates only the Meletian clergy as όι μην εις ελθόντων ελθόντες, ει δε του βασιλευσαν, και της πρώτης πολειτειας, δε της ταλανατων ἀλεοφοριαν και προστασιαν. Basilius Ep. 34, blames his country bishops on account of their subservience to men, των πλείστων φόβω της στρατολογιας ελπισμονων εναυς της θηραιας.  

15 In the work entitled de Septem ordinibus Ecclesiis (Opp. ed. Martian. v. 100), ascribed to Jerome, the copiatae appear under the name fossarum as the lowest order of the clergy. According to a law of Theodosius II. A.D. 416 (Cod. Theod. xiv. ii. 42) no more than 500 paraboli were to be in Alexandria. In the year 418 he permitted 600
pressure, which became dangerous to the state, with stringent laws.17  

Under these circumstances the power of the bishops particularly rose. At the head of a numerous clergy completely subject to them, they alone had power to decide on the appropriation of the church estates,18 and controlled ecclesiastical legislation by their exclusive privilege of having a voice at synods. Hence they continued to make the country bishops more subservient to them;19 to the other churches in cities and in the country (ecclesia plebana, titulus), except the head church (eccl. cathedralis) they sent according to their own free choice, presbyters (parochus, plebanus),20 to conduct the worship of God, who were entirely dependent on them even in the matter of maintenance. The first person next to the bishop was the archdeacon,21 who helped him to manage the revenues. The arch-presbyters,22 an order which arose about the same time, were of far inferior rank. All the lower clergy and the presby-

(vid. i. 43). The same emperor reduced the number of copitae in Constantinople from 1100 to 930 (Cod. Just. i. ii. 4).  
17 Constantine's law to this effect before the year 320 (Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 3): Nullum deinceps Decrarium, vel ex Decrario progenum, vel etiam intractum idoneis facultatibus, atque obsequiis publicis numeribus opportuneum, ad Clericorum nomen obscuromque confecer: sed eum de eterno in defunctorum ducturum Clericorum locum subrogari, qui fortuna tenens, neque numeribus civilibus tenax parvus obstricti. Constantius allowed in 361 (Cod. Th. xii. i. 49) every curialia admission into the clerical office, curia promente consensus, maxime si totius populi vocibus expetatur: otherwise he should give over his property to his children, or relatives, or the senate. This resigning of goods became afterward a general law (Cod. Th. xii. i. 59, 99, 104, 115, 121, 123, 125, 172, etc.). Rüffel, i. 164.  
18 Rüffel, i. 128.  
19 See Div. I. § 68, note 2. Conc. Antioch. ann. 341, can. 10: Τοῦτο χιρεισισκόποις, el καὶ χιαροδητιαν εἰς ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, ἐδοξα τῇ ἄλγῃ συνόδῳ—καθιστὶν ἄνωντος καὶ ὑπολακσόνος καὶ διορθοπητὺς—μητρὶ δὲ πρεσβυτέροις μητὶ διάκονον χιρεισισκόπων τοῖς νῦν δικαίον τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπων, ἡ ὑπόκειται αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ χώρα, χιρεισισκόπων δὲ γίνεται ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως, ἡ ὑπόκειται, ἐπισκόπων. Conc. Laodiceni (between 320 and 372) Can. 57: "Ὅτι οὐ δεῦ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθιστασθῇ ἐπισκόποις, ἡ ἄλλα περιοδεύσατε τοὺς μένοις ἡγεῖ προκαταστασθῆναι μηδὲν πρώτην ἄνων γνώμης του ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει. Ἀλλ᾽ ὡσείς τε καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πρώτην ἄνων τῆς γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου." Probably it was not meant by this canon to do away with the existing country bishops, but only to prevent the establishment of new bishops. Accordingly we find frequent mention of country bishops long after. Basil the Great had fifty in his diocese (Gregor. Naz. de vita sua, p. 6). Theodor. Ep. 113, names two of his subdeacons, etc.  
20 Thomassini Vetus et nova eccles. disciplin. p. i. lib. 2, c. 21, ss. Bingham, lib. ix. c. 8, vol. iii. p. 590.  
22 Thomassini, p. i. lib. 2, c. 3. Bingham, vol. i. p. 301.
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ters too were now chosen by the bishop alone. The choice of bishops mostly depended on the other bishops of the provinces, except when the emperors interfered. Still, however, the consent of the people was required, and was not without weight, especially in the west.\(^{23}\)

Under these external advantages, it is not surprising that the prevailing notions of priestly dignity, and especially of the bishops’ authority rose higher and higher; and that the bishops externally enjoyed the highest demonstrations of respect, their claims as the vicars of Christ and the successors of the apostles being capable of indefinite development.\(^{24}\) Yet their overweening pride often gave just cause for complaint\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\) The bishop was chosen Επισκόπους συνόδοι, ψῆφο κληρικῶν, αἰτήσει λαῶν (Patri Alex. Epist. in Theodoret H. E. iv. 19). The person elected by the clergy was either accepted by the voice of the people crying out Λέγε, bene meritus, bene dignus; or they cried Ἄρειδος (Augustini Epist. 110. Philostorgius, ix. 10. Constitut. Apost. viii. 4). Leo Epist. 10. c. 3: Qui praefuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur. Thomassini, p. ii. lib. 2, c. 2 and 3. Bingham, vol. ii. p. 90, ss. Staudenmayer’s Gesch. d. Bischofszahlen, S. 24. Riffel, i. 374.

\(^{24}\) The assertion, so pregnant with consequences, that the priesthood stands above royalty, in which during the third century nothing but a secret pride could take delight (Div. I. § 63, note 1), was not only repeated (see Chrysost. Homil. 4, de verbis Isaiæ, de Saccrodoto, iii. c. 1, Homil. 15, in Epist. ii. ad Corinth. comp. Gregor. Naz. above, note 8), but was now also outwardly manifested in the conduct. Standing titles of the bishops were Dominus beatissimus (comp. Wiggers’ Augustinianiis, ii. 31) or sanctissimus, reverendissimus, deuspiétös deiásatös, aδεσποτοτος, Beatitudo, Sanctitas tua, ή σε χρηστότης, μοικομάτης σε αγάπης. Marks of reverence which were paid them even by emperors were the ὑπολίθειν κεφαλὰν and καταφτεῖλε τὸς χείρας. See Bingham, vol. i. p. 134. When Eusebia, spouse of the emperor Constantius, did not observe such things in receiving the salutations of the bishops, the Euselian bishop of Tripolis, Leonius, declared to her (Philostorgius, ap. Suidam, s. v. Δεσπότος), that he would appear before her only under the following conditions: Ίνε εἰσέλθωμε μὲν ἓν ἀγάπην, ἐκ δ’ αὐτίκη τοῦ βρῶν τοῦ ψυχήν κατάβασις, μετά αἰώνος ὑπαντήσεις ἔμαθε, καὶ τὴν κεφαλήν ὑπάρχῃ ταῖς ἑκατερίας χερέων, ἐκλογισμὸν ἀξιομενόν· κάπετρα καθεσθεῖν μὲν ἓν ἓν, ἐκ δ’ ἐν εἰκόσι αἰδωμένην, ὅποτε δὲ κτεῖτος, καθεῖδομένην, ἑκάστη δὲ καθίσμα τὸ σύνθεμα. Καὶ οὕτω καὶ ἀκούσῃ, ἀφικοίην παρὰ σε, κ. τ. ἔλ. Comp. the conduct of bishop Martinus at the court of Maximus. At table the emperor ordered the cup to be first presented to him (Sulp. Severv.de vita Mart. c. 29), expectans atque ambiens, ut ab illius dexterà populum suamaret. Sed Martinus ab ibid. patemar presbytero suo tradidit, nullum scilicet existimans dignorem, qui post se siberebet. At another time the empress waited on him at table (Sulp. Severv. Diale. ii. 6). Comp. generally: Chrysost. de Saccrodoto. The work of Dignate, found among the writings of Ambrose, is not by him, but by Gerbert (Sylvestr II. about 1000). See Mabilleau Anselacta, p. 103.

\(^{25}\) Hieronym. ad Tit. c. 1: De episcopatu intumescit, et putant se non dispensationem Christi sed imperium consecutus.—Sciatis episcopus et presbyter sibi populum conservum esse, non solum.

§ 92.

DEPENDENCE OF THE HIERARCHY ON THE STATE.

Notwithstanding these outward honors enjoyed by the hierarchy, they could the less escape from a dependence on the state in many ways,¹ as they presented a vulnerable side to it by their acquisition of property;² and as the government of the Roman emperors, since the removal of their residence to the east, began to assume an oriental despotic character.³

The first occasion of interference in ecclesiastical matters was offered by the hierarchy itself when involved in an uninterrupted series of controversies.⁴ The emperors wished, and also ought, according to the desire of the hierarchy, to tolerate only the catholic church;⁵ but as this name was claimed exclusively by so many parties, the emperors were obliged to decide to which it belonged, and what doctrine accordingly should be considered the catholic doctrine.⁶ To this end they summoned councils, allowing them to consult under the superintendence of their commissioners;⁷ and then gave imperial confirmation to their


² Faustinus and Marcellinus, I. c. p. 654, respecting the bishops who had fallen away under Constantius (see § 82, note 14): Non dignantur pro Christo Filio Dei exiendum perpetui, cum propriis sedibus et Ecclesiaram perniciosas possessionibus oblectantur. —Episcopi puer iram regis terreni timuerunt quam Christian.

³ C. W. de Rhoer Dissert. de ecstet. relig. christ. in jurisprudentiam Romanam, p. 40, ss.

⁴ First by the Donatists. See Div. I.

⁵ Constantine's law, A.D. 326 (Cod. Theod. xvi. v. 1): Privilegia, quae contemplationis religiosis inducabant, catholicae tantum legis observatoribus prodesse oportet. Haeretrices antem, atque schismatics non tantum ab his privilegiis alienos esse volumus, sed etiam diversis numeribus consuetudineribus subjeci.

⁶ Comp. the law of Theodosius I. A.D. 380, Cod. Theod. xvi. 1, 2, see above § 83, note 32.

⁷ Ensebius de vita Const. 1. 44: 'Εξώπρος την ἐκκλησίαν του θεου την παρ' αυτου νυμον φροντίδα, διαφορεμένου των προς ἄλληλως κατα διαφόρους χώρας, οτα της κοινῆς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θεου καθεστάτως, πανω των του θεου λειτουργῶν συνεργάτει. Constant. Epist. in Syn. Tyriam (ibid. iv. 42): 'Ἀποτέλεσται προς ους ἐβοληθήσεται τον ἐπίσκοπον, ἵνα παραγινύμεναι, κοινωνησίας ἐμαυ τοις ἐπίσκοποις. —Ἀποτέλεσται Διοικήσιον του ἀπ' ὑπατικών, ὡς καὶ τους ὑπηρετούς εἰς τον σύνοδον ἀνέκυψας μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐνομολογίας, καὶ τοῖς πραπτομένοις, ἑξαρτώμας ὑπ' ήθος τον κατάσκοπον παρέστατοι· ἔναν γάρ τις, ὡς ἐγὼ σέκι ἀιώνια, τὴν ἱμητέραν κέλευσιν καὶ νυν διακρούσασθαι πειρόμενοι.
decrees. But when the controversy was not terminated by this means, as usually happened, the emperors were often led by political, often by religious motives, often by court cabals, to step in with new decisions, sometimes taking a middle course, sometimes giving the superiority to the party formerly condemned. The party favored by the emperor then appeared to look upon the civil power as exercised only for the protection of the church, and none but the defeated maintained that matters of faith should not be submitted to the emperor’s decision, but to the bishops. Besides these great party questions, individuals among the clergy had also many particular cases in which the interference of the emperors was solicited, although councils soon forbade
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such supplications to the emperor. The clergy indeed endeavored, backed as they were by imperial privileges, to make themselves as independent as possible of the other authorities of the state, but they still acknowledged the emperor to be their highest judge, so much so that the Roman bishop regarded it a distinction to be judged only by the emperor. None ventured to call in question the supreme authority of the emperor, as far as it did not violate the rights of conscience; and the imperial laws, even when they touched the church, were received by the bishops with implicit obedience. The great influence exercised by the emperors, partly in filling up the most

12 Conc. Antioch. ann. 341. c. 12 : Εἰς τις ἑπὶ τοῦ ἱδίου Ἐπισκόπου καθαρωθείς πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ καὶ Ἐπισκόπου ὑπὸ συνόδου, ἐνοχλήσας τολμήσας τὸς βασιλέως ἱκανοὶ, δόθη ἐπὶ μείζονα Ἐπισκόπου σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι, καὶ ἡ νομίζει δικαια ἑπεξ ἀποστάξεως καὶ ἐπικράτεισεν καὶ ἐπέστρεψέν τον τῆς εἰκός ὕπατον εἰκόνα καὶ ἔκτισεν. οἷος ἦ τοῦ ἑνὶ ἐνοχλημένος, τοῦτον ἄνευ ἐκλογῆς ἔχει, μηθύ ἑσώθη ἄποκαταστάσεως προσδοκήσεις. This is repeated by the Conc. Constantin. ann. 381. c. 6.—Conc. Antioch. c. 11, forbids all the clergy to go to the emperor ἄνευ γνώμης καὶ γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀποστολήν. Conc. Sardic. can. latinitas 8 (grace 7): Quidam non cessant comitatum ire Episcopi, et maxime Afri:—ut non solum ad comitatum multas et diversas Ecclesiae non profuturas fieri non causas, neque ut fieri solet aput uerum, aut videant, aut pupillae subveniuntur: sed et dignitates saeculares et administrations quibudam postulent. Hanc itaque pravitas olim non solum murmurationum, sed et scandala excitavit. Honestum est autem, ut Episcopi intercessionem his praestent, qui iniqua vi oppressum, aut si videns affligatur, aut pupillae expoliaret: si tamen ista omnia justam habeat causam, aut petitionem. Si ergo vobis fratres carissimi, placet, docentiam, no Episcopi ad comitatum accedant, nisi forte bi, qui religiosi Imperatoris litteris vel invocati, vel evocati fuerint.—Universi discrivunt: Placeat, et constituantur.

13 See above, § 91, note 5.

14 Thus Athanasius asked of Constantine (Athanass. Apol. contra Arianos, c. 9), νόμων ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον συγκροτήσωμεν, ἢ καὶ αὐτὸν (βασιλέα) δέχομαι τὸν ἀπολογοῦμεν, ὃς ἐπέστρεψεν εἰς τῷ, and came for this purpose after the synod of Tyre in person to Constantinople. Socrates, l. 33, ss.


17 To the law Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 20, ad Damasum Episc. urbis Rom. [see above, § 91, note 14] the remark is annexed: lecta in ecclesia Rom. (comp. the ovasive remarks of Baronius, ann. 370, no. 123). Goethefredus ad h. l. gives several examples of the reading of the imperial laws in churches.
important episcopal sees, partly in even deposing and appointing bishops without farther ceremony,\textsuperscript{18} naturally secured to them the obedience of the clergy, and with it the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. The slavish Greeks now began to attribute to them a priestly character.\textsuperscript{19} A strict theory respecting the limits of the ecclesiastical and civil power was not yet laid down.\textsuperscript{20}

§ 93.

ORIGIN OF PATRIARCHS, ESPECIALLY IN THE EAST.


In the preceding period it has been already seen, that the three great metropolitans of Rome, Alexandri, and Antioch,

\textsuperscript{18} Especially in Constantinople. Thomassini Vetut et nova Eccl. discipl. p. ii. lib. 2, c. 6. Rißel, i. 889.

\textsuperscript{19} Assent at the synod of Constantinople in the year 418 (Mansi, vi. 733): Ἡπόλλα ταῦ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ βασιλεί. The later emperors seriously laid claim to the priestly dignity by virtue of being anointed. Thus the abbot Maximus in Constantinople 655, is asked (Mansi, xi. 6): Ergo non est omnis christianus Imperator etiam sacerdos? To which indeed he replies, Non est. Leo the Isaurian about 730 writes to Pope Gregory II. (Mansi, xii. 976): Βασιλείῳ καὶ ιεραρχίᾳ έλει. The throne of the emperor in the church was at first beside that of the bishop at the choir, till Ambrose assigned it a place close to the choir. Sozom. vii. 25). Yet the emperor ventured to lay his obligations on the altar himself. Cons. Quinisext. a.d. 692, can. 69.

\textsuperscript{20} Eusebius de vita Const. iv. 24, relates the following, after he had spoken of Constantine's activity against Paganism: Ἐδεικνύεις ἐκείνους αὐτούς ἐν ἑκατερής ποιεί δεξιότης ἐπίσκοπος, λόγον ἄρμαν, ὡς ἄρα εἰπέ καὶ αὐτός ἐπίσκοπος. ὡδὶ πι ἄρα πι λόγω διαμομοίρας, τοίς ἀρχιμαγαίς ἡπιείς ἐπίσκοπος, προστίθεται τε δει περ ἄν ἡ δύναμις τῶν εὐσεβῆ μεταβολῶν βιῶν. Different explanations of these words of Constantine may be seen in Ch. G. F. Walch de τοῖς εἰς Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς τοῖς ἑκάτοι Constandιi M. in the Commentationes Soc. Gottingensiis, vol. vii. p. 81, ss. Heinichen Excurs. iv., annexed to his edition of Euseb. de vita Const. p. 537. Since an expression like ἐπίσκοπος πραγμάτων cannot be pointed out, and there follows immediately after ἐπίσκοποι ἀρχιμαγόνων, Constantine probably did not mean τοῖς ἑκάτοι, but τοῖς ἑκάτοι. Οἱ ἑκάτοι and οἱ ἀρχιμαγαίς ἡπιείς must be the same, and thus we obtain the following explanation: "Be ye the overseers of those who belong to the church, and so far as they belong to it; let me be the overseer of those without the church, and so far as they are out of it (whether it be wholly as heathen, or partly, i. e., Christians in their civil relations)."
were distinguished from the other metropolitans by having several provinces under their oversight. This institution came up for discussion at the council of Nice, probably on occasion of the Meletian schism in Egypt; and was confirmed by the 6th can. At the same time provincial synods were still acknowledged at this council as the highest ecclesiastical authority.

But during the subsequent Arian commotions, the provincial synods were too weak to be able to withstand, in the eternal party-strife, powerful opponents who were often supported by state authority. By this means the bishops were induced to form still larger hierarchical associations by which they might individually obtain greater security. In the political, often

1 Can. Nic. vi. : Τὰ ἄρχα τὰ ἐθνικὰ κρατεῖται, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Διοίκησιν καὶ Πενταπόλεις, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρατος ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τοῦτον ἀπέλευσεν τὴν ἐξοντισθεὶς ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπῳ τούτῳ συνῆθες ἥκεν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντίοχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ προσβεβλήθησαν ταῖς ἑκάσταις. Καθόλου δὲ πρόδρομον έκλειν, ὅτι εἰ τὶς χώρις γύρως των μητροπολίων γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τοῦ τοίνυν ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὑπὲρ μὴ δείν ἐπίσκοπον. The Romans made what they inferred from this canon in favor of their church the superscription of it in their oldest Cod. omnium (see it ap. Mansi, vi. 1126; comp. Labbei observ. ap. Mansi, ii. 688), which afterward was incorporated with the canon. So the Roman legates cited it at the council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vii. 444): Ecclesia Romanorum semper habuit primatum. Tenet autem et Aegyptus, Libya, et Pentapolis, ita ut Episcopus Alexandriæ harum omnium habet potestatem: quoniam et Romano Episcopo haec est consuetudo, etc. But on the other hand, in the Priscan, which dates immediately after the council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vi. 1127): Antiquò moris est, ut urbis Romae Episcopus habet principatum, ut suburbicaria loca et omnem provinciam summa sollicitudine gubernet. Quae vero apud Aegyptum sunt, Alexandriæ Episcopi omnium habet sollicitudinem. Similiter autem et circa Antiochiam, et in caeteris provinciis præliagia propria serventur metropolitanis ecclesiis, etc. Nicolaus I. (A.D. 863) Ep. vii. ad Michaelem (ap. Mansi, xv. 306) explains the canon thus: Denique si instituta Nicolaee synodi diligenter inspicientur, invenietur profecto, quia Romanæ Ecclesiæ omnium cadem Synodos contulit incrementum: sed potius ex ejus forma, quod Alexandriæ Ecclesiæ tribuerit particulariter, sumpsit exemplum. On the other hand Bellarmine de Romano Pontifice, lib. ii. c. 13: Alexandriam debere gubenerate illas provincias, quia Romanus Episcopus ita conceivit, id est, quia Romanus Episcopus ante canem Conciliorum definitionem concevavit permittere Episcopo Alexandrino regimine Aegypti, Libyae, et Pentapolis, sive concevit per Alexandriam Episcopum illas provincias gubernare. In later times, the only point of dispute has been whether in this canon, as the Greek canonists Johannes Scholasticus, Theod. Balasmon, and Zonaras assume, patriarchal rights (so Sirmond, Em. Schelstrate, Natalis Alexander, etc.), or metropolitan rights (so J. Lamoy, Sam. Basnage, etc.), are spoken of. The copious literature on the subject may be seen in Sagittarii Introduct. in Hist. Eccl. ii. 1324, ss.

2 Can. Nic. 4 confirms to the provincial synod its influence in the election of bishops. Canon 5 recognizes it as the highest court of appeal in cases of excommunication. Conc. Antioch. ann. 341, c. 15: Εἰ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐπὶ τιαν ἐγκλήμαναν καταγγελθείς, κριθηθεί ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἑταρχῇ ἐπισκόπων, πάντως τα σύμφωνα μίαν κατ’ αὐτοῖς ἐξενέχειςς ψήφον· τοῦτον μικρά παρά τέρον δικαίωσος, ἀλλὰ μένεις βεβαίαν τὴν σύμφωνίαν τῶν ἐπὶ ἑπάρχῃ ἐπισκόπων ἀπόφασιν. In case of division among the provincial bishops, the metropolitan, according to canon 14, is empowered to summon bishops from the neighboring provinces.
ecclesiastical separation of the east and west, this new hierarchic development proceeded in a different mode in the two empires.

In the east, the political division of the provinces had been followed from the first in the development of the metropolitan institution, and the fundamental principle became more and more established, that the ecclesiastical should constantly follow the political division of provinces.3 Accordingly, in the formation of larger hierarchical bodies,4 they adhered to the political distribution of the realm into dioceses, which had been made by Constantine.5 The bishops of every diocese became more closely connected with each other; the bishop of the chief city in the diocese was their common president, and was elevated by this means above the other metropolitans. Yet his rights were defined according to earlier ecclesiastical relations, and for this reason were not alike in all dioceses. In Egypt, the bishop of Alexandria had almost monarchical power;6 the power of the bishop of Antioch in the east was less;7 less still was that of


4 The first appearance of such larger synods, Conc. Antioch. ann. 341, can. 12, see above, § 92, note 12.

5 Zosimus, ii. 33. Notitia digitationum utriusque impedi, probably written in the reign of Theodosius II. (cum G. Panzioili. Comm. in Graevii The. antiquit. Roman. vol. vii. p. 1309, ss.) I. Praefectura Orientis, 1. Dioecesis Orientis (chief city Antioch); 2. Aegypt (Alexandria); 3. Asiae (Ephesus); 4. Ponti (Caezarea Cappadociae); 5. Thrace (Heraclea, then Constantinople). II. Praef. Illyrici orientalis, after 379 separated from the west, with the chief city Thessalonica. 1. Dioec. Macedoniae; 2. Daciae. III. Praef. Italicae, 1. Dioec. Romae (Rome); 2. Italiane (Mediolanum); 3. Illyrici occidentalis (Sirmium); 4. Africae (Carthage). IV. Praef. Galliarum, 1. Dioec. Galliae (Augusta Treviri); 2. Hispaniae; 3. Britanniae. Over the prefectures were placed Praefecti Praetorii; over the dioceses or vicariates Vicarii; over the provinces Rectores, with different titles, as consules, correctores, usually praefides.


the bishop of Ephesus in the Asiatic, and that of the bishop of Caesarea Cappadociae, in the Pontian diocese. In the Thracian diocese, Constantinople had become the political capital instead of Heraclea, and as it was also the chief city of the empire, the power of the bishop of Constantinople, supported by his influence with the emperor, and the consent of the numerous bishops who were always assembled at court (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα),\(^8\) soon extended far beyond the Thracian diocese; but the degree of power depended very much on the personal relations of the reigning patriarch. Such was the state of things when the second general council (381), approved of those relations between the bishops of one diocese (can. 2), elevated the diocesan synods above the provincial synods so as to be the highest ecclesiastical court (can. 6), and gave the bishop of Constantinople the first rank after the bishop of Rome (can. 3).\(^9\)

Thus in the east the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, and Caesarea, had obtained an important elevation above the other metropolitans, for they had subjected to themselves the other metropolitans of their dioceses. They received the distinctive names: Ἠσαρχος, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος;\(^10\) and shortly before the council of Chalcedon, the appellation Πατριαρχη.

---

\(^8\) Anatable, bishop of Constantinople, says at the council of Chalcedon, actio iv. (ap. Mansi, vii. 93): Συνήθεια ἁπάντων κεκράτηκεν, τοὺς ἐνδημοῦσας τῇ μεγαλώνῳ πόλει ἀγιωτάτων ἐπισκόπως, ἤρικα καθὼς καλέσας, περὶ ἀνακυπτόντων τινῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων συνείναι, καὶ διατυπών ἐκαστα, καὶ ἐπικρίσεως ἐξέδον τοὺς ὁμολόγους.


\(^10\) According to the Canon Sardic. vi, every metropolis is Ἠσαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας. On the other hand, shortly before the council of Chalcedon, the bishop of Antioch is called Ἠσαρχος τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως (Conc. Chalcedon. actio xiv.). Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος first applied to the bishop of Alexandria, ap. Athanas. Apol. ii. Epiphan. Haer. 68. In the acts of the first council of Ephesus it is very frequently given to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria.
Chapter III.—Hierarchy. § 93. In the East.

ἀρχης ἦν was appropriated to them exclusively. But political relations and hierarchical ambition soon altered this arrangement. The bishops of Constantinople, favored by their position, soon gained an influence over the affairs of other dioceses also, which manifested itself decidedly in the neighboring dioceses of Asia and Pontus in particular. At first, indeed, they met with resistance; but since it was moment of the emperors of the eastern Roman empire to make the bishop of their chief city powerful, as being their principal instrument in ruling the church and to make him equal in rank to the bishop of the capital of the western Roman empire, the council of Chalcedon formally invested the patriarch of Constantinople with the same rank as the bishop of Rome, the superintendence over those three dioceses, and the right of receiving complaints from all


13 Comp. Ziegl. l. c. 8, 184, ff.

14 Can. Chalced. 29 (Actio xv. ap. Mansi, t. viii. 369): Παντογεύτοι τῷ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων δρόμοι ἐπάνων, καὶ τῶν ἀγίων ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀποφθεγμάτων ἐπισκόπων γνωρισμένης, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὥριμοι, καὶ ψυχικά μεθαυτές περὶ τῶν πρεσβειών τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς προσευκτοράς Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύει τῇ πόλιν ἐκείνην, οὐ πατέρες εἰκόνα ὑποδοθήκης τὰ πρεσβεία, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ Ῥωμαίαι ἀποφθεγματικοὶ τῷ ίδιῷ προσευκτικῷ ἀπένεκα τῷ νέᾳ Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῃ θρόνῳ, εὐλογίας κρίνοντες, τὴν βασιλεία καὶ συγκέλατο τιμηθέσσαν τόλμην καὶ τῶν Ἰσων ὑπολαύσαν πρεσβείας τῶν προσευκτῆρας ὑπασταλίθη Ῥώμη (cf. lex Theodos. II. ann. 421, below, § 94, note 47), καὶ εἰ τῷ ἑκκλησιαστικῷ, ὡς εὐκείνην, μεγαλύνθησαν πραγματευσαν, διευθύνοντο μὲτ' εὐκείνην ὑπάρχοντας· καὶ ὡστε τοὺς τῆς Πιοτικῆς, καὶ τῆς Ἀσκληπίου, καὶ τῆς Θράκεως διοικήσεως μητροπολιτῶν μοναχόν, ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ βουκάρικα διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπων τῷ προικημένῳ διοικήσος χειροτονείλθη τῶν προικημένων ἐπισκόπων τῆς κατά Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας· ὁλαθή ἐκάστοτε μητροπολίτων προικημένων διοικήσεως, μετὰ τῶν τῆς ἑπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων, χειροτονοῦντος τοὺς τῆς ἑπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους, καθὼς τοῖς θείοις κανόνις διηγόμενον· χειροτονοῦντες δὲ, καθὼς εἴρηται, τοὺς μητροπολίτας τῶν προικημένων διοικήσεως παρὰ τῷ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἅρχοντες, ψυχικῶν συμφοράς, κατὰ τῷ θρόνῳ, γενομένων, καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων. O. Edm. Richeri Hist. Concill. general. lib. i. c. 8, § 37, ss. Even here the Grecian principle ruled that the rank of their bishops should be determined by the political rank of the cities (see above, note 3). Rome was always basileia or basileiōn, as being Roma Nova, received with the same privileges, but was yet second in rank, ἡ δευτέρα βασιλεία (Themist. Orat. iii. p. 41). In accordance with this, the Council of Constantinople, 381, determined the rank of the two bishops (see note 9). But after the division of the empire, the east Roman emperors would not allow their chief city to stand behind in any respect (Cod. Theod. xvi. ii. 45, A.D. 421: urbs Constantiopolitana, quæ Romae veteris praerogativa laecatur). Agreeably to that opinion the position of its bishop was determined at Chalcedon. Cf. Spanheimus de Usu et praestantia
the dioceses against metropolitans. Thus the exarchs of Ephesus and Caesarea were put back into the middle rank between patriarchs and metropolitans. The bishops of Antioch endeavored likewise to draw over Cyprus into their ecclesiastical diocese, as it belonged to the political diocese of Asia; but the Cyprian bishops received from the Alexandrian party at the council of Ephesus the assurance of their independence. The bishops of Jerusalem, supported by the precedence which had been conceded to them at the council of Nice, after having long endeavored in vain to shake themselves free of their metropolit in Caesarea, succeeded at last in rising to the rank of patriarchs, by an edict of Theodosius II., and by the synod of Chalcedon, the three Palestines were assigned them as their ecclesiastical domain. At the close of this period, therefore, we have four patriarchs in the east, viz. of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem. In their dioceses they were looked upon as ecclesiastical centers, to which the other bishops had to attach themselves for the preservation of unity; and


15 Can. Chaled. 9: Εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχει πράγμα πρὸς τὸν ἱδον ἐπίσκοπον, ᾧ πρὸς ἔτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέω, εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπον, δὲ κληρικὸς ἀρμοδιοτής, καταλαμβάνει χωρὶς τοῦ ἐξαρχομενος, ἢ τῶν τῆς βασιλείας Κωνσταντινούπολεως θρώνον, καὶ επ αὐτῆς δικαζέω. Repeated for a particular case, can. 17. An ecclesiastical overnight of the west was bestowed on the Roman bishop by Valentinian III. 445. See below, § 94, note 65.


17 Concerning their rights see Ziegler, S. 275, ff. Planck, i. 610, ff.

18 Thus Gregorius Naz. Epist. 22 ad Caesarienses says of the church of Caesarea in Cappadocia (at the time in the highest rank of hierarchical dignity): Ἡ μήτηρ σχεδὸς ἀπασῆς τῶν Ἑκκλησιῶν ἦν τε ἡ ἄρχης, καὶ νῦν ἐστι καὶ νομιζόμεθα, καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινόν βλέπει, ὡς κέντρον κύκλου περιγραφόμενον. When the Egyptian bishops at the council of Chalcedon, after the deposition of Dioscurus, were without a council, and yet required to subscribe Leo’s Epist. ad Plaviani (Conc. Chaled. act. iv. ap. Mauz. vii. p. 53, 55) they declared: Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐπίστολῆς τοῦ ἀγωνίατος—Λέωντος, Ἰσαία πάντως σὺ ἀγωνίατο ἡμῶν πατέρες, δι’ ἐν ἀπασίᾳ ἀναμένομεν τὴν γνώμην τοῦ παρ’ ἡμῖν διοικητοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου.—τούτω γὰρ καὶ τοῖς τῆς Νικαίας ἄγοι πατέρες συναγγειρόμενοι ἐκανόνισαν τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν Ἀρχιεπισκόπων, καὶ μὴν ἔχασαν τὸν πάντως καὶ τὸν πάντως τὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἐπισκόπων.—περὶ πόντων ἄτινά ἰ ἀγών.—παρὰ γνώμην ἀρχιεπισκόπου σὺ ὑπογράφω. And the council allowed them a respite, Can. 30 (Mauz. vii. 372), ἄχρει ἐν ζευγάρισθη ἡ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου.
constituted, along with their diocesan synod, the highest court of appeal in all ecclesiastical matters of the diocese; while on the other hand they were considered as the highest representatives of the church, who had to maintain the unity of the church-universal by mutual communication, and without whose assent no measures affecting the interest of the whole church could be taken.  

§ 94.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN PATRIARCHS; AND OF THE HIERARCHY IN THE WEST.


The bishop of Rome stood pre-eminent above all his brethren at the very commencement of this period, inasmuch as he was bishop of the only apostolic congregation of the west and of the richest church, metropolitan of several provinces, viz. the ten

20 Liberati Breviar. c. 4. Quod audacia (namely, the heresy of Nestor) Cyrillus Alexandrinus Episcopus, cui tunc dabatur primatus de talibus agendi, veniunt ad eum aequi de populo Constantinopolitano, etc. So Eustiches at the Concil. Constantinop. (Mansi, vi. 817) ἀναγινωσκόμενης τῆς καθαρότητος, ἐπεκαλέσατο τῷ ἀγίῳ σύμβολῳ τῶν ἐγγενῶν ἕκαστον ἥγηση, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρεία καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ Θεσσαλονίκης. Hence he complained at the second synod of Ephesus that Flavius had communicated him on his sole authority, κατὰ μᾶλλον ὑπερήφανον πρὸς πάντων τοῖς ἅγιοι πρεσβύτεροι ἐκπαιδεύειν, ὅπερ καὶ ἐπεκαλεσάμην, namely, the bishops of Rome and Alexandria (Mansi, vi. 641). Hence flattery invented for them in the fifth century the title universalis Episcopus (the bishop who has oversight of the entire church), which Olympius Episc. Evaxensis first gives Dioscurus at the Concil. Ephes. ii. (Mansi, vi. 835).

1 Order of succession: Sylvester I., from 314, t 335; Marcus, t 336; Julius I., t 332; Liberius, banished 355; the Arian Felix, till 358; Liberius returns, 358, t 366; Damasus, t 384; Siricius, t 398; Anastasius I., t 402; Innocent I., t 417; Zosimus, t 418; Boniface I., t 422; Celestius I., t 432; Sixtus III., t 440; Leo I. the Great, t 461.

2 Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. c. 3: Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapientem Episcopatus sedem ardentes, scissis studii asperiorne conflictabant, ad usque mortis vulnerantque discrimina aduentibus urbi aere progressis: quae nec corrigere sufficiens Iuvencianus (Praef. urbi) nec mollire, coactus vi magna secessit in suburbaeum. Et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte quae ci savelat instante. Constatque in basilica Sicilini, ubi ritus Christiani est conventualum, uno de cxxxvii. reperta cadaver peremtorum: efferatamque die plebem aegre postea delinatam. Neque ego absum, ostentationem recurv considerans urbanorum, hujus rei cupidos ob impetrandum, quod appetunt, omni contentione laterum jurari debebre: cum id adepti, futuri sint a securi, ut dientur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insipientes, circumspecto vestiti, opulas
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suburbicarian ones,3 and at the same time, on account of his residence in the principal city of the world. The easterns, according to their political principle, could not but concede the first place among the bishops, and afterward among the patriarchs, to the bishop of the chief city; while the westerns estimated the dignity of the episcopal seat by another principle, viz. the grade of its apostolic descent; and considered the apostolic seats as the heads and centers of the whole church.5
curantes profusius, adeo ut eorum conuivia regales superent mensas. Qui esse putentur beati revera, si magnitudine urbis despecta quam vicis (conviciis?) opposunt, ad imitationem Antistitum, quorumandum provinciale vivereat; quos tenuitas edendi potandiique puritatem, bilias illam induamentorum, et supercilia humum spectantia, perpetuo numini versique eorum cultus ut prorsus commendant et verecondos. Hieronymi Ep. 38 (et 61), ad Pamachum: Miserabilis Praeextatus, qui designatus consul est mortuis, homo sacrilegus, et idolorum cultor (respectibus huius se § 78, note 6, § 79, note 1), solvet ludens beato papa Davmaso dicitre: "Facite me Romanae urbis episcopum, et ero protinus Christi Christianus." Hence the arrogance of the Roman bishops as the stewards of such rich possessions, complained of even by Jerome Epist. 101, ad Evangulum, see Psalms-Augustinus perhaps Hilarii Diaconii (about 380) Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test. (in August. Opp. t. iii. P. ii. Append.) Quaest. 101: Quia Romanae Ecclesiae ministri sunt, idcirco honorabiliores putantur, quam apud ceteras Ecclesias, propter magnificentiam urbis Romae, quae caput esse videtur omnium civitatum. Si itaque sic est, hoc debent et sacerdotes suis vindicare: quia, si il, qui inferiores sunt, crescent propter magnificentiam civitatis, quanto magis, qui potiores, sublimnandì sunt? 2

2 Suburbicaria loca in the verso Priscan of the 6th Nicene canon, see above § 93, note 1.

Rufinus Hist. Eccl. x. 6, gives this canon as follows: Et ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma vetusta conueniando servetur, ut vel ille Aegypti, vel hic suburbicarianum ecclesiaram solicitudinem gerat.—Eccles. suburbic. max. according to Baroniuss and Bellarmine, Eccl. totius orbis; according to Perronius, Valesius, J. Morinus, Natalis Alexander, Eccl. occidentalis; according to J. Gothofredus (Conjectura de suburbicariis regionibus et ecclesiis. Francof. 1617), Claud. Salmasius, J. Lamoijus, the two Bannages, etc., only the four provinces which were under Praef. urbi (infra centesimum ab urbe lapidum). On the other hand Jac. Sicmon (Censura Conjecturarum anonimi script. de suburb. regg. et eccl. 1618) has justly asserted that the provinces subject to the Vicarius urbis, or the Diocesae Romae, were, 1. Campania. 2. Tuscia et Umbria. 3. Picenum suburbicarium. 4. Sicilia. 5. Apulia et Calabria. 6. Bruttii et Lucania. 7. Sannium. 8. Sardinia. 9. Corsica. 10. Valeria. That these constituted the Roman diocese is also evident from Conc. Sardic. synodice ad Julium P. (Mansi, i. p. 41): Tuis autem excellent prudenter disponere debet, ut per tua scripta, qui in Sicilii, qui in Sardiniae, et in Italia sunt fractes nostri, quae acta sunt et quae defunt, cognoscat (cf. Syn. Arelat. Epist. Div. I. § 68, note ii). Comp. du Fin. de Ant. eccl. discipl. p. 87, ss. Zeigler’s Gesch. d. Kirchl. Verfassungsformen, S. 113, Ann. The numerous ancient works on this subject are enumerated in Sagittariano Introduct. in hist. eccl. ii. 1233, ss. Fabrici Saint. lux Evangelii, p. 358, ss.

4 See Canon Constantinop. iii. and Chalcœd. xxviii. above § 93, notes 9 and 13.

5 The fundamental principle of Augustine is given by Pelagius, i. ad Episcopos Tuscine, A.D. 556 (ap. Mansi, ix. 716; also in Agobardæ de comparatione utriusque regimini, c. 2): Beatissimum Augustinum dominicae sententias memor, qua fundamentum Ecclesiae in apostolici sedibus collocavit, in echamaste esse dicte, quicumque se a praesulis [Agob. praesulam] earundem sedum nautoritate vel communione suspenderit; nec aliun manifestat esse ecclesiæ, nisi quæ in pontificibus [Agob. pontificialibus] apostolicorum sedum est solidata radicibus. Hence against the Donatists Augustinus Epist. 43 (et 169), § 7: Non de Presbyteris aut diaconibus aut inferioris ordinis clericis, sed de collegis agebatur,
Hence, even according to this principle, Rome stood pre-eminent, being a church founded by the two chief apostles, and the only apostolic community of the west.  

The same need of security which led the bishops of the dioceses to unite with one another during the Arian controversy in the east, procured to bishop Julius of Rome decisions in the synod of Sardica (347), giving him the privilege of appointing qui possent aliorum collegarum judicium, praesertim apostolicarum ecclesiarum, causam suam integram reservare. Idem contra litteras Petiliani, ii. 51: Verumtamen si omnes per totum orbem tales essent, quos quiessimae criminalis, cathedra tibi quid facit Ecclesiae Romanae, in qua Petrus sedet, et in qua hodie Anastasius sedet: vel Ecclesiae Hierosolimitanae, in qua Jacobus sedit, et in qua hodie Ioannes sedet, quibus nos in catholica unitate connectimur, et a quibus vos nefario furere separatis? In connection with these passages the following can only be rightly explained: Contra duas Ep. Polag. ad Bonific. Rom. Eccl. Episcopum, i. 2: Communis omnibus nobis, qui fungimur Episcopatus officio (quamvis ipse in ea praecominus celsiori festivit) speculatæ Pastoralis Epist. 43, § 7: Romana Ecclesia, in qua semper apostolicæ cathedrae viguit principatus.  


7 On the double origins of the canons of this council, a Greek and a Latin one, see Bellerini de Ant. collect. can. P. i. cap. 5. Spittler in Meusel’s Geschichtsforscher, iv. 33.—Can. iii. (from the Dionysius Exig. cod. can. ap. Mansi, iii. 29): Ostius Episcopus dixit: Quod si aliquis Episcoporum judicatus fuerit in aliqua causa, et putat se bonam causam habere, ut iterum concilium renovetur; si vobis placet, sancti Petri Apostoli memoriae honoremus, ut scribatur ab his, qui causam examinanunt, Julio Romano Episcopo: et si iudicaverint renovandum esse judicium, renovetur, et det iudices. Si autem probaverint, talen causam esse, ut non refricentur ea quae acta sunt; quae decreverint confirmata erunt. Si hoc omnibus placet? Synodus respondit: Placet. Can. iv.: Guadentius Episcopus dixit: Addendum, si placet, huio sentientiae, quam plenam sanctitate protulit; ut, cum aliquis Episcopos depositus fuerit eorum Episcoporum judicio, qui in vicinis locis commonorunt, et proclamaverit, agendum sibi negotium in urbe Roma: aut Episcopos in ejs cathedra, post appellationem ejus qui videtur esse depositus, omnino non ordinaret, nisi causa fuerit in judicio Episcopi Romani determinta. Can. vii. (in Graeco v.): Ostius Episcopus dixit: Placuit autem, ut, si Episcopus accusatus fuerit, et iudicaverint congregati Episcopi regionis ipsius, et de gradu suo eum dejectorint; si appellaverit qui dejectus est, et confergerit ad Episcopum Romanum ecclesiam, et voluerit se audiri: si justum putaverit, ut renovetur examinum, scribere his Episcopis dignetur, qui in finitima et propinqua provincia sunt, ut ipsi diligenter omnia requirant, et juxta fidem veritatis definiant. Quod si is qui rogat causam suam iterum audiri, deprecatione sua moverit Episcopum Romanum, ut de latere suo Presbyterum mittat, erit in potestate Episcopi, quid velit, et quid aestimet. Et si decreverit, mittendo esse, qui praestantes cum Episcopis judicent, habentes ejus auctoritatem, a quo destinati sunt, erit in suo arbitrio. Si vero crediderit Episcopos sufficere, ut negotio terminum imponant, facult, quod sapientissimo consilio suoe judicavit. Comp. de Marca de Concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. vii. c. 3; de Pin de Ant. eccl. disc. p. 103, ss. That this privilege was only granted to Julius personally, is shown by Richeéri Hist. concill. generall. t. i. c. 3, § 4. Doubts of the authenticity of the canons of this council, see Mich. Geddes Diss. de Sardecenibus canone, in his Miscell. tract. ii. p. 415. Sarpi, in Le Bret’s Magazin fur Statten und Kirchengesch. Th. i. (Ulm. 1771) S. 429, ff. Comp. Le Bret’s remarks on the same point, p. 435, ff.
judges to hear the appeals of condemned bishops, should he look upon them as well founded. But when the divided choice between Damasus and Ursicinus (366),⁸ although Valentinian I. decided in favor of the former,⁹ gave rise to a tedious schism which spread into other provinces also, and to the greatest bitterness between two parties; Gratian gave Damasus the right of judging in the case of condemned bishops,¹⁰ in order that the schismatic clergy might not be at the mercy of worldly, and for the most part as yet, heathen officers.¹¹ At the same time the emperor, at the instance of a Roman synod (378), assured him of the support of the civil power as far as it might be necessary for the bishop’s purpose.¹² Both privileges conferred on Julius and Damasus were transitory, as well as the relations which gave rise to them.¹³ The rights of provincial synods remained

⁹ See the imperial edicts in Baronius 366, no. 2; 369, no. 3.
¹⁰ So Maximin, a heathen (Amm. Marcell. xxviii. 1), had been enraged, ita ut causa ad clericorum usque tormenta duceretur (Rufin. H. E. ii. 10).
¹² The synod (see the epistle referred to in note 11) proposed no new regulation: Statuti imperialis non novitatem, sed firmatudinem postulabat. Hence the following rescript, like the earlier one, referred only to the peculiar relations of the time. In this rescript appended to the epist. already alluded to, Gr. et Val. ad Aquilinum Vicar. Urbis, we find these words, c. 6: Volumus autem, ut quicunque judicio Damasi, quod illae consilio quinque vel septem habuerit Episcoporum, vel eorum, qui catholici sunt, judicio vel conciliai condemnatus fuerit, si injuste voluerit ecclesiam retentare: ut qui evocatus ad sacerdotale judicium per contumaciam non iuvasset, ait e illustribus viris praestitoris praetorio Galliae atque Italic, sive a proconsulisus vel vicarii, auctoritate adhibita, ad episcopale judicium remittatur, vel ad urbem Romanam sub prosecutione perveniat: aut si in longinquis partibus ulterioribus non esset insumis, omnis eum causae dictum de Metropolitae in eadem provincia Episcoporum dederetur, examine, vel si ipsa Metropolitana ost, Romanam necessario, vel ad cos, quos Romanus Episcopus judicio decedit, sine delatione contendat, ita tamen, ut quicunque defleti sunt, ab eis tantum urbis finibus segregatur, in quibus fuerit sacerdotes. Minus enim graviter meritos coerescamus, et sacerdolum pertinaciam lenius quam meretur ulciscimur. Quod si vel Metropolitani Episcopi vel cujusque sacerdotis iniquitas est suspecta, aut gratia: ad Romanum Episcopum vel ad concilium quindecim Episcoporum finitimum accensum licet provocare: modo non post examen habiitum quam definitum fuerit integretur.
¹³ That the canons of the council of Sardica were never applied in practice is shown by de Marca de Conc. Sac. et Imp. libb. vii. c. 11 and 12.
still inviolate, and their decrees were considered as binding even by the bishop of Rome.\textsuperscript{14}

A permanent kind of influence was opened up to the latter by the custom of referring questions about apostolic doctrine and practices to the bishop of the only apostolic and common mother-church,\textsuperscript{15} which happened all the more readily\textsuperscript{16} as similar questions were also referred to distinguished bishops in the east.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{14} So Siricius replied (399) to Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, and to the other bishops in Ilyria, when they had asked advice from him respecting Bonosus (Siricii Ep. 9, ap. Constant., erroneously among the epistles of Ambrose, as Ep. 79, and also falsely ascribed to Damasus, see Constantii monitum) : Cum hujusmodi fuerit concilii Capuaensis judicium, ut finitimis Bonosoe atque ejus successoribus judices tribuenterent, et praeipue Macedones, qui cum Episcopo Thessalonicensis e ejus factis vel cognoscere darent; advertimus quod nobis judicandii forma competere non possit. Nam si integra esset hodie synodus, recto de iis, quae comprehendit vestrorum scriptorum series, decernendis. Vestrum est iigitur, qui hoc receptissimum judicium, sententiam ferre de omnibus, nec refugiendo vel elabendo vel accessoribus vel accusat ordop copiam dare. Viciem eum synodi receptissimum, quos ad examinandam synodas elegist. Ambrose repit ad Bonosus: Omnia modesta, patienter, orline gerenda, neque contra sententiam vestrum tentandum sibi liquid ; ut quod videretur nobis justitiae convenire, statueretis, quibus hanc synodam dederat auctoritate. Ileo primum est, ut iis judicent, quibus judicandii facultas est data: vos enim totius, ut scrupimus, synodi vice decernitis; nos quasi ex synodi auctoritate judicare nos convenit.

\textsuperscript{15} Comp. the epistolae canonicae, Div. I. Preface to § 71, as similar ones were also issued in this period by the Alexandrian bishops, Athanasius, Timothy, and Theophilus, and by Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea.

\textsuperscript{16} But not exclusively, cf. Conc. Carthagini. iii. (ann. 397), c. 48 (Mansi, iii. 891); De Donatistis placuit, ut consules et consacerdotes nostros Siricium (bishop of Rome) et Simplicianum (bishop of Milan) de solis infantibus, qui baptizantur penes eodem, nun —parentem illos error impediat, ne proventur sancta altaris ministri. We have here at the same a proof of the fact that they considered themselves bound by such opinions, as well as by a decision given by arbiters. The two bishops had answered in the affirmative; but when afterward the deficiency of priests in Africa made another rule desirable, the Conc. African. ann. 401 (Mansi, iv. 462), resolved previously to send an embassy ad transmarinas Italiae partes, ut tam sanctae fratris et consacerditoris nostris, venerabilis sancto fratri Anastasia, sedis apostolicae Episcopo, quam eum sancto fratris Venerio, sacerditi Mediolanensis Ecclesiae, necessitatem ipsum ac dolorem atque inoptam nostram valet intimare (ex his enim sedibus hoc fuerat prohibita): quod noster comuni pericolo providendum, maxime quia tua indigentia clericorum est, etc.

\textsuperscript{17} Innocentii I. Ep. 25, ad Decentium, A.D. 416, ap. Constant., ap. Mansi, iii. 1028: Quis enim nesciat, aut non adversat, id quod a principi Apostolorum Petro Romanae Ecclesiae traditionem est, ac nunque custoditur, nb omnibus debere servari; nec superducit aut introducit aliqua, quod auctoritate non habeat, aut aliunde accipere videatur exemplum? Praesertim cum sit manifesto, in omnem Italian, Gallias, Hispanias, African atque Siciliam, et insulas interjacentes, nullum instituisse Ecclesias, nisi cos, quos venerabilis Apostolus Petrus aut ejus successores constituerint sacerdotes. Aut legat, si in his provinciae alius Apostolorum inventur, aut legitur docuisse. Qui si non legat, quia nusquam inventum, oportet fac hoo sequi, quod Ecclesia Romana custodit, a qua cos principiam acceptis non dubium est; ne, dum peregrinius assertionibus stantem, caput institutionem videantur omittere. Ambrose, however, says of the practice of feet-washing, which did not prevail at Rome, but in Milan most probably, de Sacramentis, iii. 1: In omnibus capio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam: sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus: idem quod aliis rectius servatum, et nos recte custodimus.
If it was usual in the latter case, so much the more would it occur in the former, especially as it was customary before this time to consider the current laws of Rome as a standard in doubtful cases of civil jurisprudence. Hence the Roman bishops took occasion to issue a great number of didactic letters (epistolae decretales), which soon assumed the tone of apostolic ordinances, and were held in very high estimation in the west, as flowing from apostolic tradition. All these circumstances had the effect of bringing about such a state of things, that in the beginning of the fifth century the Roman bishops could already lay claim to a certain oversight of the western church.

The eastern bishops, it is true, would not allow the least interference of the western in their ecclesiastical affairs. They gave a decided repulse to Julius I., when, at the head of the western bishops, he wished to interfere on behalf of the persecuted Athanasius. The fundamental principle of the mutual

18 Digest. i. tit. 2, l. 32: De quibus causis scriptis legibus non utimur, id custodiri oporet, quod moribus et consuetudine inductum est: et si qua in re hoc defeceret, tunc quod proximum et consequens ei est: si nec id quidem apparet, tunc jus, quo urbs Roma utitur, servari oporet.

19 The first existing decretal is Siricii Epist. ad Himerium Episc. Tarraconensem, a.D. 355, but it refers to missa ad provincias a venerandae memoriae praesecessore meo Liborio generalia decreta. The expression epist. decretalis first appears in the so-called decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis et non recipi. about 500. The original designation is decretum, afterward statutum, or constitutum decretalo. Decretali, in the original sources of Roman law, means the decision of a college (decretum Pontificum, Senatus, etc.). So also in the Christian church it denotes the decision of a synod (ex. gr. Conc. Carthag. ann. 307, in fine) or of a presbytery. These decreta are also to be considered as such decisions of the Roman presbytery, or of Roman synods. Comp. Spittler’s Geschichte des kanon. Rechts bis auf die Zeiten der falschen Isidorus. Halle, 1778. S. 157, ff.

20 Innocentii i. Ep. 2, ad Victricium, § 6: Si majores causae in medium fuerint defectiones, ad sedem apostolicam, sicut synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigat, post judicium episcopalem reforantur. Epist. 29, ad Carthag. Concil. (among Augustine’s Epistles, Ep. 181), § 1: Patres non humana sed divina deceree sententia, ut quidquid quamvis de disjunctis remotisque provinciis agetur, non primus decrevit Hilarius; nisi ad hujus sedis nostrae perveniret. The text to which these places refer is Epist. Syn. Sardic. ad Juliam above, note 6. That the interpretation extends the sense very much is obvious, doubtless in consequence of the progress and development of new circumstances.

21 The synod of Antioch (341) had first complained to Julius of his conduct in not regarding the synod of the eastern church. Extracts from this letter are found in Sozomen, iii. 8. Among other things they had said: Theresin meu yar tais philotimias tiri 'Romanos ekklésias, ós apóstolos fousostóthron, kai ekkábeias vótrótopolivn 1i arhiké génevnon. —o o para toov tó de tiva devnekría ferein diona, óti m névebbei Í plthei ekklésias plëxotéjón, ós iroté kai pròoúttai nevontes, k. t. l. The answer to this Julii I. Ep. ad Syn. Antiochenam (ap. Athanasius Apol. contra Arian. c. 21, ss. Manu, ii. 1211. Constant-Schoenemann, p. 210, ss.): After having shown the irregularity of the proceedings against Athanasius and Marcellus, he says at the conclusion: El yar kai olow, ós ða, vénvne tî eli adouz ãwmatvma, ëdes kata tîn ekklésiastikon kanvna, kai ùh
independence of the occidental and oriental church, was universally maintained in the east. Still the period of the doctrinal controversies had a very important influence in promoting the power of the Roman bishop. The speculative questions which split the east into factions excited little interest in the west. On this very account the westerns united very soon and easily in the opinion to be embraced, in which they chiefly followed the bishop of Rome, who was almost the only organ of communication with the east, and by means of whom they also be-

οὖτως γεγενήσθαι τὴν κράσιν· ἐδει γραφῆται πάσιν ἡμῖν, ἵνα οὖτως παρὰ πάντων ἀριστῇ τὸ δικαίον. Ἐπισκόποι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πάσχοντες, καὶ οὐκ αἱ τιμωθαί ἐκκλησίαι αἱ πάσχοιαν, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦν ἀριστῆ τὸ δικαίον καθήγησαι. Διατε ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐκκλησίας μᾶλλον ὅσι ἀγάφητο ἡμῖν; ἡ ἠγωνίζεται ὅτι τοῦτο ἠδον ὑπὲρ τὴν ἑαυτὴν διάκονον, ἐν μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτον ἄν ὁποτενεθήν πάσχοις τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τὴν ἑαυτῷ, ἐδει πρὸς τὴν ἑναρθίαν ἐκκλησίας γραφῆσαι. Ἰουλίος, therefore, did not pretend to pronounce judgment on Athanasius and Marcellus alone, but in conjunction with all the bishops (comp. below, note 20). This demand grew out of the western notions respecting the superior dignity of the bishops of apostolic communities (see above, note 9), as those two were. See de Marca de concord. Sac. et Imp. lib. v. c. 4, § 5, 6, 8. On the other hand the orientals reply in the epist. synodalis Sardicis (Philippopoli habitae) ad Donatum (in Hilarii Pragm. lib. ii. ap. Mansi, iii. 136): Hanc novitatem moliebatis inducere, quam horret vetus consuetudo ecclesiae, ut in concilio orientalibus Episcopi quodquid forte statuissent, ab Episcopis occidentibus reficaritur: similiter quodquid occidentalium partium Episcopi, ab orientalis solum vellet. Sed hoc ex illo suo praevissimo sensu tractabatur. Verum omnium conciliorum justius legitimique auctor corcora firma, majorum nostrorum gesta consignant. Nam in urbe Roma sub Novato et Sabellio et Valentinum haeretici factum concilium, ab Orientaliis confirmatum est: et iterum in oriente sub Paulo a Samosatis quod statutum est, ab omnibus est signatum. — Nos vero nulli injuriam facimus, sed leges praecessa servavimus. Nam injuriati et male tractati sumus ab ipsis qui vellebat ecclesiae catholicae regulam sua pravitate turbare: sed ante octos habentes timorem Dei, judicium Christi, verum et justum considdentantes, nullis personam accepermus, necque alicui pepercirmus, quos minus ecclesiasticam disciplinam servaverimus. Unde Julius urbis Romae, Osianum et Protogenem, et Gaudemium et Troveris damnavit cunio concilii secondum antiquissimam legem: Julius vero urbis Romae, ut princeps et duces maiorum, qui primus jamnum communions secerulatas atque damnatas aperuit, ceterisque aditum fecit ad solvenda iura divina, defendebatque Athisaniam praesumentar atque audaciter, hominem, cujus nec testes noverat, nec accusatores.


23 Augustina contra Cresconium, iii. 34: Ad Carthaginis Episcopum Romano praetermissis, tamen orientalis catholica scrivit.
came acquainted with its controversies. Thus in all these controversies the west stood united and steadfast, with the bishop of Rome at its head, in contrast with the east split into parties and waver ing; and when matters came to a final decision, it turned the scale in the balance of parties, when merely as a heavy weight. This phenomenon, which was constantly reappearing, was first manifested in the final victory of the Nicene faith. When these doctrines began to spread in the east likewise, under Valens, it is true the new Nicene orientals could not entirely unite with the west, and believed that they had much reason to complain of the arrogance of the westerns; but yet the west was their only stay and support in opposition to all other parties. And though the council of Constantinople (381), afterward arranged the affairs of the oriental church without any reference to the west, and even openly took the part of the Miletians, whom the occidentals had rejected; though not long after the interference of the Italian bishops, in the matter of the rival bishop of Constantinople, Maximus, was entirely disregarded; yet it could not but be seen, that in the great theological question of the day occidental steadfastness had obtained the victory over the wavering east. But whatever influence the west gained in the east, it gained only for the reputation of the Roman bishop, who, at the head of the west, was the only

24 Basil respecting the duæ chirôç above, § 83, note 34. 25 See above, § 83, note 34.


2 The κοροφάσ εἰς τῶν δυτικῶν, § 83, note 20, comp. Theod. xvi. 1, 9, § 83, note 32.
organ of direct communication with the east. From this time forth there was no important ecclesiastical controversy in the east in which each party did not endeavor to gain over the bishop of Rome, and through him the west, to its side, for which purpose both flatteries were applied, and a presumptuous tone submitted to. At the councils, his legates were treated with peculiar deference. Chalcedon was the first general council where they presided.

As the west was accustomed to estimate the dignity of the episcopal seat according to its apostolic derivation, and since the decrees of the council of Sardica imparted certain privileges to the Roman see out of deference to the apostle Peter; so also the Romish bishops derived all their claims to distinction from the position that they were the successors of Peter. At the same time, they opposed the opinion universally adopted in the east, that they and the other patriarchs owed their elevation merely

28 Socrates, ii. 8, says that there was no Roman legate at the council of Antioch κατ' ἑκκλησίας τῆς Καππαδοκίας καλλιέργειαν κελεύοντος. μὴ δὲιν παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ὡμηρίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν. He borrows this sentence expressly, ii. 17, from Eup. ap. Syn. Antioch. (see above, note 21), and therefore found it in these words of his: τοῦτον ἦσον ἥγεν, πρότερον γράφοντα λέειν, καὶ οὕτως ἦν τινι ὑπέξεθαι τὰ ἄκακα, in which Sozomen, i. 10, also finds too much when he gives as its sense: εἶναι γάρ νῦν εἰρηνευτικὸν ὡς ἀποφαίνει τὰ παρὰ γνώμην πραττόμενα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου ἐπισκόπου (de Marc., lib. v. c. 12, § 1). Still the practice of the church in the fifth century must have given rise to such an amplifying mode of interpretation. That there was no law in existence such as these two writers refer to, is plain from Can. Constant. 3 (above, § 93, note 9), and Chalced. 33 (§ 93, note 14): the mystery is explained by the connection already pointed out in § 93. Moreover, we have here a remarkable proof of the manner in which interpretations, very much extended and heaped upon one another, have obtained an influence over the constitution of the church as progressively developed and formed. That passage of Socrates is translated in the Historia tripartita, iv. 8, ap. 19: Non debeere absque sententia Romani Pontificis Concilia celebrari. Hence Pseudo Isidore has borrowed this sentence from him countless times, and at length introduced it into the practice of the church.

29 Comp. the Commissorium (instructions) of the Roman legates at Ephesus, 431, ap. Mansi, iv. 556: Ad fratrem et coæscipiculum nostrum Cyrillum consiliu vestrum omne convertite, et quicquid in ejus videritis arbitrio, facietis. Et auctoritatem sedis apostolicae castodiri debere mandamus.—Ad disceptationem si fuerit ventum, vos de eorum sententia judicare debetis, non subire certamen.


31 See above, note 5.
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to the importance of the cities in which they resided; and therefore they set themselves so much against the privileges of the bishop of Constantinople, which rested only on this ground. But though, on tracing back their claims, they supported the normal authority of their church on the basis of its apostolic origin, and its parental relation to the whole western church, they acknowledged notwithstanding, that the peculiar privileges of their see did not originally belong to it, but had been granted by the fathers. On the idea of Peter having been the first apostle they could hardly found any particular pre-eminence in the fourth century, since there was conceded to him only a primum honoris, in so far as Christ had first given him alone those rights which he afterward transferred to all the apostles, and through them to all bishops equally. And as, according

---

33 Epist. Innocentii ad Alexandrum Episc. Antioch. about 415 (ap. Constant Ep. Innoc. 24): Revolventes itaque auctoritatem Nicenea synodi, quae una omnium per orbem terrarum mentem explicat sacerdotum, quae consuit de Antiocheno eclesia cunctis fidibus, ne dicerim auctoritatis, esse necessarium custodire, quae super diocesis suam praedictam ecclesiam, non super aliquam provinciam recognoscimus constitutam. Unde advertemus, non tam pro civitatibus magnificentissima hoc eidem attributum, quam quod prima primi apostoli sedes esse monstratur, ubi et nomen accepti religio christianæ, et quae conventum Apostolorum apud se fieri celeberrimum meruit, quaecumque urbis Romae sedi non cedere, nisi quod illa in transitu meruit, ista suceptam apud se consummatumque gauderet. The same principle was applied in Rome itself to the Metropolitans. Ibid. Quod scilicet, utrum divinis imperiis iudicio provincii, ut duae metropolitae episcopi deebant nominari; non esse e ro visum est, ad mobilitatem necessitatum mundanarum Dei ecclesiam commutari.

34 Innocent. I. Ep. 25, ad Deaconum, see above, note 17.


36 In the passage Matth. xvi. 18, πέτρα was usually explained as meaning the confession of Peter (Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Chrysostom, etc.), or Christ (Jerome, Augustin), less frequently, the person of Peter (Hieron. Ep. 14, al. 57, ad Damasum), Cf. Casauboni Exercit. ad Brev. xv. num. 13, s.n. Suicer Thes. ecle. s. v. πέτρα. Du Pin. de Ant. eccl. discipl. diss. iv. c. 1, § 1. But as to St. Matthew, xvi. 19, the old view was universally maintained (see Div. I. § 68, note 10). Optatus Milev. lib. vii.: Præferri Petrus caeteris Apostolis meruit, et claves regni caelorum communicandas caeteris solus accepti. Ambrosii de incarnatione Domini, c. 4: (Petrus) ubi audivit: vos autem quid me dicitis? statim loci non immemor sui primatum egit: primatum confessionis utique, non honoris, primatum soli, non ordinis. Hoc est dicere: nunc nemo me vincat, nunc meae partes sunt, debeo commensare quod tace, etc. Augustini de diversa Serm. 108: Has enim claves non homos unus, sed unius accepti ecclesiae. Hinc ergo Petri excellentia praedicitur, quia ipsius universitas et unitas ecclesiae figuras gessit, quando ei dictum est: tibi trado, quod omniis traditum est. Nam ut noveritis, ecclesiam accepsi claves regni caelorum, audite in alio loco, quid Dominus dicit omnibus Apostolis suis: acceptis Sp. S. et continuo; si cui dumseritis peccata, dimittentur ei, si cui teneeritis, tenet eum.
to this view, men did not scruple to attribute precisely the same dignity and authority to several of the other apostles, 37 the bishop


37 Especially Paul: Ambrosii Sermo ii. in festo Petri et Pauli (Sermo 60, is also met with as Augustini de Sanctis Sermo et Maximii Taurinensis Sermo 54): Ergo beati Petrus et Paulus eminenter inter universos Apostolos, et peculiariter quadam praecipuam praecellunt. Verum inter ipsos, quis cui praeponatur, incertum est. Puto enim illos aequales esse meritis, sed aequales sunt passione. Et in quo tandem loco idem martyrium portaretur? In urbe Roma, quæ principatum et caput obiit nationum: siccedet ut, ubi caput superstitionis erat, ille caput quiesceret sanctitatis; et ubi gentilium principes habebantur, ille ecclesiæ principum moerocernt. So, too, idem de Spirit. Sancto, ii. c. 12: Nec Paulus inferior Petro, quamvis ille Ecclesiæ fundamentum (Matth. xvi. 18), et hic sapiens architectus scientiae vestigia credentium fundare popularem (1 Cor. iii. 10). Nec Paulus, inquam, indignus Apostolorum collegio cum primo quoque facile conferendaris, et nulli secundis: nam qui se imparem nescit, faciliter aequalem (Gal. ii. 7, ss.). Augustinus de Sanctis Sermo 25: Et si Petrum priorem, tamen ambos ditavit honore uno. Gaudentius Serm. de Petro et Paulo: Quem cui praeponere audacium nescio. Ambrosiaster ad Gal. ii. 11: Nam quis eorum alterum Petro primo Apostolo, cui claves regni caelorum Dominus dedit, resistenter, nisi aliquis talis, qui fiducia electionis suae scientiae se non imparem, constanter improbabat, quid ille sine consilio fecerat? In Theodoret's Comm. in Epist. Pauli, the commentary on Gal. ii. 6-14, has been erased in the Codices hitherto in use, without doubt, by Latiniænæs Greeks (see Nossellii corollaria to the proef. in Theodoreti Opp. t. iii. Halle edition). Out of these and similar passages arose the remarkable view of Antone Arnauld, that Peter and Paul were alike the head of the church (see de l'autorité de St. Pierre et de St. Paul, résidant dans le Pepe leur successor. Paris. 1645. 8, and de la grandeur l'église Rom. établie sur l'autorité de saint Pierre et salut Paul. Paris. 1645, the first work by Arnauld, the second by Martin de Baroces, a doctrine which the Romish inquisition, 1647, condemned as Jansenite. See Itigi Diss. de origine controversiae circa aequalem Petri et Pauli primatum in his heptas dissert, annexed to the Dissert. de hacresinchronia aevi apostolici, p. 401, ss. Other apostles, however, were also made equal to Peter. Hieronymus in Psalm Iviii. calls Petrum et Andrem Apostolorum principes. Cyrilli et Syn. Alexandr. Epist. ad Nestorium, § 5 (in Actis Conc. 
of Rome could the less pretend to have inherited from Peter a peculiar spiritual power reaching beyond that of the other bishops.  

But after the rights of the Romish bishops had become older in the west, and their authority had been so much increased in the east likewise since the end of the Arian controversy, they began at Rome in like proportion to enlarge the notion of Peter's primacy, and to regard all the honors and rights of the Romish bishop as inherited from Peter, a view which appears first to have been fully developed by Leo. In the east they could not concur with this representation, because there they were accustomed to attribute the primacy to the church of Jerusalem and James, at least during the first century. In Jerusalem itself they endeavored even now to establish hierarchical claims on the ground of its being the mother congregation of the whole church; but in


30 Thus the Roman legates at the Conc. Ephesin. ann. 431, ex gr. actio iii. (Mansi, iv. 1996): Οὐδέπερ ἀριστολογος οὕτως, μάλλον δὲ πάσι τοῖς αἰῶναις ἐγγύεσθαι, ὅτι ὁ ἄγιος καὶ καθημερινάτης Πέτρος, ὁ ἐξόρισας καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀσπαστῶν, ὁ κύριος τῆς πίστεως, ὁ διάκονος τῆς καθολικῆς εκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—τὰς κλίσεις τῆς Βασιλείας ἀδέσποτε: καὶ αὐτῷ δέδοτα εὐσεβία τοῦ δεσμευτικὸς καὶ λυτῶν ἁμαρτίων: ὅτι αὐτὸ τῶν νῦν καὶ αἰώνια διδάσκαλος καὶ εἰρ., καὶ δικαίως.

the external insignificance of this see little stress could be laid on these claims, especially since the authority of churches generally, in the east, was not determined according to their original importance, but the political rank of the cities in which they existed.\textsuperscript{12}

High as was the dignity which the Roman bishops enjoyed in the west, their influence was yet very different in the different provinces. They had the full rights of patriarchs only in the diocese of Rome. In the dioecesis Italice, the bishop of Milan exercised quite independently of them a hierarchical power similar to that of the patriarchs; in addition to whom the bishop of Aquileia also,\textsuperscript{13} and at a later period the bishop of Ravenna,\textsuperscript{14} raised themselves to the rank of more independent hierarchs. In the mean time, the Roman bishops, by a skillful use of opportunities, succeeded in attaching East Illyria to their patriarchate.\textsuperscript{45}

During the Arian disputes, Illyria had belonged to the western empire, and the Illyrian church had continued true to the Nicene council,\textsuperscript{46} attaching itself to the bishop of Rome for its defense, as did the whole west. When, therefore, Gratian, a.d. 379, divided Illyria, and annexed Illyricum orientale to the eastern empire, the bishops of East Illyria, who had for so long a time maintained no communion with the east, could not have much inclination to attach themselves ecclesiastically to the

1\textsuperscript{12} Even Dioscorus sought to elevate the see of Alexandria by appealing to St. Mark. Theodoretus Ep. 86, ed Flavianum Ep. Constantinop. : 'Αυτος κατω των μακαριων Μαρκου των ρωμων προβαλλεται και των σαφως ειδος, ως των μεγαλων Πετρου των ιδρων η Αντιοχεων μεγαλοπολις έχει, ως και των μακαριων Μαρκου διδασκαλος ην και των χρηφ των Αποστολων πρωτος και κορυφαιος. 'Αλλη ημες του μη ρωμων το δοξο επισταμεθα ικανον ω και γυνωσκομεν και μετροβε. την γαρ ιπεσταλην ταπεινοφοραν έτωθεν μεμιδικαμεν.'

1\textsuperscript{13} Even Dioscorus sought to elevate the see of Alexandria by appealing to St. Mark. Theodoretus Ep. 86, ed Flavianum Ep. Constantinop. : 'Αυτος κατω των μακαριων Μαρκου των ρωμων προβαλλεται και των σαφως ειδος, ως των μεγαλων Πετρου των ιδρων η Αντιοχεων μεγαλοπολις έχει, ως και των μακαριων Μαρκου διδασκαλος ην και των χρηφ των Αποστολων πρωτος και κορυφαιος. 'Αλλη ημες του μη ρωμων το δοξο επισταμεθα ικανον ω και γυνωσκομεν και μετροβε. την γαρ ιπεσταλην ταπεινοφοραν έτωθεν μεμιδικαμεν.'


1\textsuperscript{15} Since, Honorius, fleeing from the Goths, had transferred his residence to Ravenna, Zosimus, v. 30.

1\textsuperscript{16} See especially Baluzius in de Marca de Concord. Sac. et Imp. v. c. 19, c. 29, and Boehner's Appendix observ. 15, ss.

1\textsuperscript{17} When Theodosius was baptized (380) by Ambrosius, bishop of Thessalonica, Sozom. Hist. 4: 'Ητιθη σε (Θεοδοσιου) και Ἴλληριος άπασι μη μεταχυκουν των Ἀρχων δοξης τον άνθρωπον αυτων των ἄνθρωπων, μέχρι μην Μακεδονίων έγχω τως Εκκλησίας των θεων των Αρχων 'περεθης έν τω πρως εις εστασίας, a. t. l.
east, during the strife of parties by which it was then distinguished; while the bishop of Thessalonica, the ecclesiastical head of East Illyria, must have been averse to a union of this kind, which would have made him subject to a superior so near, viz. the bishop of Constantinople.

Under these circumstances, it was easy for the Roman bishops to persuade the bishop of Thessalonica to exercise the patriarchal rights, in the new prefecture of East Illyria, as vicar of the Roman see. Damasus and Siricius made this arrangement; Innocent I. looked upon it as already fixed. The East Illyrian bishops, indeed, who by this means were entirely at the mercy of the bishop of Thessalonica, remote as they were from Rome, soon found cause of dissatisfaction; but their attempt to procure the ecclesiastical union of their province with the patriarchate of Constantinople by an imperial law was frustrated.

Another favorable opportunity for extending their power presented itself to the Roman bishops in Gaul. When metropolitan relations began to be established here at the end of the

---

47 Innocentii I. Ep. 13, ad Rufum Ep. Thessal. Divinitus ergo haec procul occurrentia statua sanctissima, ut prae- dictione gravitatis turba committendam curam causasque, si quae exorsitur per Achaia Thessaliam, Epiri veteris, Epiri novae, et Cretae, Daciae Mediterraneae, Daciae Ripensis, Moesiae, Dardaniae et Praevali Ecclesiae, Christo Domino muniente conseunt (leg. cen- scenam).—nam primitus haec in statucenta, sed praecores nostros apostolici imitati, qui beatissimae Aschilo et Ansylo injungi pro eorum meritis ista voluerunt.—Arrupe itaque, dilectissime frater, nostra vice pro supraprocriptas Ecclesias, salvo curam primatum, curam: et inter ipsos primatum primus, quidquid eos ad nos necesse fuerit mittere, non sine tuo postulat arbitratu. Ita enim aut per tuam experimentation quidquid illud est finitor: aut tuo consilio ad nos usque perveniendum esse mandatum. The relation was similar to the political one of a vicar to his praefectus praetorio (see § 93, note 5).


49 Concerning the Vicariatus Arelatensis see de Marca (Baluzias) l. c. lib. v. c. 30–c. 44.
fourth century, the political principle of the orientals had obtained at first in the distribution of them. The bishop of Arles long endeavored in vain to make the principle of apostolic origin tell in his favor in opposition to the oriental principle. At last he applied to Rome. Zosimus, seizing on the opportunity (417), declared Patroclus bishop of Arles his vicar in Gaul, and invested him with metropolitan rights in Vienne, Narbonensis, Prima and Secunda. The offended metropolitans of Vienne, Narbo, and Massilia, refused, however, to accede to this arrangement in spite of all threats; and when, soon after, the bishop of Arles (418) began to strive after ecclesiastical dominion over the seven provinces (Septimana), of which his city had been made the chief, the Roman bishops also found it their interest to take part with the old metropolitan. Hilary

41 Conc. Taurinense, ann. 491 (according to Baronius erroneously ann. 397), can. 2: Illud deinde inter Episcopos urbium Aralatensis et Vienne, qui de primatus apud nos honore certabant, a S. Synodo definitum est, ut qui ex eis approbaverit suas civitatem esse metropolitam, est totius provincie honorem primatus obtinat.
42 Zosimi Epist. 1. ad Episcop. Galliae: Placuit apostolicae sedis, ut si quis ex quilibet Galliarum parte, sub quilibet ecclesiastico gradu, ad nos Romanam venire contendit, vel alio terrarum loci disponat, non alter proficiat, nisi metropolitani Aralatensis Episcopi formati formaret.—Quisquis igitur praetermissa supradicti formata, ad nos venit, sciat se omnino suscipi posse.—Jussimur autem praecipuiam, sicuti semper habuit, metropolitam Episcopum Aralatensis civitatis in ordinandis sacriotibus tenant auctoritatem. Vienne, Narbonensis primum et Narbonensem secundam provincias ad pontificium suum revocet. Quisquis vero posthac contra apostolicae sedis statuta et praecepta majorum, omissa metropolitana, omnino metropolitana Episcop, in provincias supradictis quique ordine praecumserit, vel is qui ordinari se illicite siverit, uteque saccudito se carere cognoscat.—Sane quoniam metropolitanae Aralatensis urbi vetus privilegium minuere derogandum est, ad quam primum ex hac sede Trophimus summum multas, ex cuius fonte totae Galliae illici rivales acciperant, directus est; idcirco quascunque parochias in quibuslibet territoriis, etiam extra provincias suas, ut antiquius habuit, internema auctoritate possideant. Ad cujus notitiam, si quid illic negotiorum emerserit, referri censemus nisi magnitudine causae etiam nostrum exquisiat examen. Epist. 5. ad Episc. Prov. Vienne et Narbon. reductus the decision of the Syn. Taurin. as surreptitiously obtained: Indecons susus et in ipso vestibulo rescedans, hoc quod Episcopi ob certas causas concilia agitantibus extorquere, quod contra patrum et S. Trophimi reverentiam, qui primus metropolitans Aralatensis civitatis ex hac sede directus est, concedere vel nutare ne hujus quidem sedis possit auctoritate. Against this assertion of the rights belonging to the church of Arles, see below, Leo, I. note 56.
43 After Treves had been plundered by the Germans, Arelate became the residence of Praefectus praetorio of Gaul, whose dominion extended from this place to seven provinces. Sue Honori consitutio ap. Simond. in notis ad Sidoniam Apoll. and in Codici Theodosiani, lib. v. priores ed. C. F. Ch. Wenck. Lips. 1835, p. 375, ss. Cf. p. 373, ss.
44 When the clergy and people of Lotaba complained to Boniface I. that Patroclus had forced a bishop upon them, he wrote Epist. 12 ad Hilarium Ep. Narbon. a.d. 422: Quod necquam possimus forre patienter sanitocum diligentes esse castos. Nulli etiam
bishop of Arles finally forgot his duty as vicar so far that he would not allow the sentence of deposition pronounced by him and his synod against Ceditonus bishop of Vesonio to be submitted to a new examination in Rome.\textsuperscript{55} On this account Leo the Great (445) withdrew from him all the privileges which had been granted by the Roman see,\textsuperscript{56} though he could

\textsuperscript{55} Vita Hilarii Arelat. by Honoratus Ep. Massil. (about 400, ap. Surin's and Acta SS. ad. d. 5. Maji § 22: Hilary went himself to Rome and reminded Leo, aliones (Celdionius, etc.) apud Gallias publicam merito exceptisse sententiam, et in urbe sacris altaribus interesse. Rogat atque constrigit, ut si suggestionem suam libenter excepti, secreto judice remanere; sed ad officia, non ad causam venit, protestandi ordine, non acceperit, quae sunt acta judicis remanere: porro autem si alii velit, non futurum esse molestum.


\textsuperscript{54} Leoni M. Ep. 10 (ad. 89) ad Episc. provinciae Vienneusis, c. 4: Quid sibi Hilaris quaerit in aliena provincia: et id quod minus decessorum ipsius ante Petrocium habuit, quid usurpat? cum et ipsum, quod Petrocle a sede apostolica temporaliiter videbat esse concessum, postmodum sit sententia meliore sublatum? Cap. 7: Suis uacuaque pro vincia sit contenta Concilia, nec ultra Hilaris adeunt conventus indicere synodalibus, et sacerdotum Domini judicia se insolenscom tibicab. Qui non tantum noverit se ab alieno jure depravum, sed etiam Vienneusiae provinciae, quam male usurpaverat, potestate privatum. Dignum est enim, fratres, antiquitates statuta reparari, cum is, qui sibi ordinacionem provinciae indebitina vindicabat, talis in praesenti etiam probatus fuerit eicitisse, ut—suae tantum civitatis illi sacerdotum, pro sedis apostolicae pietate, praecipio nostra servaverit.
not prevent Hilary and his successors from asserting their primacy. 57

The Roman bishops were least successful in obtaining influence in Africa, where the ecclesiastical relations had long been firmly fixed, and there was on this account an aversion to the new development of the hierarchy. 58 Their ecclesiastical legislation, too, had been all along cultivated with an evident predilection. 59 As early as the Pelagian controversy, Zosimus had learned by experience how little his decision was respected in Africa (§ 87, notes 12-16). It is true, he procured restoration to his office for the presbyter Apiarius who had been then deposed by appealing to the canons of the Sardican council as Nicene; but his successor, Boniface I. (418-423), was reminded on this account of the humility suitable to him under such circumstances. 60 But when Caelestinus I. (323-432) wished to have the two-deposed Apiarius restored, 61 the Africans in the

58 Conc. Carthag. iii. ann. 398 can. 26 (Cod. Canonicum Eccl. Afric. c. 39): Ut prima sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid injusmodi, sed tantum primae sedis episcopus.
59 On the so called Codex Canonicum Ecclesiæ Africanæ (Voëll et Justell. Bibl. jur. can. vet. i. 390, II. Th. Bruus Biblioth. ecclesiast. i. 155) compiled by Dionysius Exiguus from the acts of the Syn. Carthag. ann. 419, by which the decrees of former councils were confirmed, and new ones added: Gallandii de Vetustis canonum collectionibus sylloge, and the treatise of Constant, c. 6 (ed. Mogunt. i. 103), P. de Marcia, c. 4 (ibid. p. 180) Ballerini, P. ii. c. 3 (ibid. p. 334).
60 Conc. Afric. Ep. ad Bonifac. a.D. 419 (ap. Constant Epist. Bonif. ii.): § 5. Haece (namely, the decrees of the Sardican council given out as Nicene decrees) utique usque ad adventum verissimorum exemplarium Nicaseni Concilii in certa gestis sunt. Quae si ibi—contra orientem, coque ordine vel apud vos in Italia custodierunt; nullo modo nos talia, quia commenoream jam nolumus, vel tolerare cogeremus, vel intolerabilia pateremur. Sed credimus—quod tuta Sanctitate Romanae ecclesiæ praeidente non sumus jam istum typum passuri; et servavitur ega nos, quae nobis etiam non dissensivis custodiri debant cum fraterna caritate, quae secundum sapientiam atque justiam, quam tibi donavit Altissimus, etiam ipsa perspicisc esse servanda, nisi forte alter se habeant canones Concilii Nicaseni. This mistake was caused by the form of the collection of canons then in use, in which those of later synods were appended to the Nicene without distinction. Quesnell has published such a collection annexed to the Opp. Leonic.; also Mansi, vi. 1183. Hence later canons are often cited as Nicene. See Ballerini de Ant. collect. cann. P. ii. c. 1, § 3 (in Gallandii Syll. ed. Mogunt. i. 311). Spittler in Meussel’s Geschichts-forscher, iv. 72. The same author’s Gesch. d. kan. Rechts, S. 106.
most express terms forbade all interference, and interdicted appeals to foreign bishops. 62

At the close of this period Leo I. the Great was bishop of Rome (440–461), 63 who endeavored theoretically to establish the rights of the Romish see by enlarged ideas of the primacy of Peter, 64 and the inheritance derived from that source, 65 and


62 Concil. Miletiani ii. (ann 416) can. 22 (the canon of a later council, also contained in Cod. can. eccl. Afric. cap. 28 and 125): Item placuit, ut presbyteri, diaconi, vel exenteri inferiores clericis, in causis quasi babecrint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum quattuor fuerint vicini episcopi eos audiant, et inter eos qui quisquid est, finiant, adhibitis ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab illos provocandum putaverint, non provocarent nisi ad Africani concilia, vel ad primates provinciarum suarum (for this Cod. Can. c. 98: nemo pro- vocent ad transmarina judicium, sed ad primates suorum provinciarum, aut ad universa concilia, sicut et de Episcopis saepe constituunt est). Ad transmarina autem qui putaverint appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communione suscipiunt. For the genuineness of the addition: sicut et de Episcopis saepe constituunt est, see de Marcus, lib. vii. c. 16, § 5. Similar decrees were also issued by other African councils. Comp. the citations of them in Conc. Carthag. ann. 325 (Mansi, viii. p. 644): Conc. decimo, ut episcopi ad transmarina pergerit non facile debant; Conc. undecimo, qui in Africa non communicat, si ausus fuerit in transmarinis, damnetur; Conc. sextodecimo, ad transmarina qui putaverit, etc. same as the above Can. Milev.; Conc. vigesimo, ut nullus ad transmarina audent appellare.

63 Leo d. G. u. s. Zeit von W. A. Arendt, Mainz. 1835. 8 (a Catholic apologetic work).


64 Comp. the characteristic expression of Auxiliaris regarding the tenueriis aurium of the Romanus at this time, note 55, above.

65 Leoni Ep. 10 (al. 59), ad Episc. provinciae Vicennensis: Divinae cultus religionis —ita Dominus nostor—institut, ut veritas—per apostolicam tabum in salutem universitatis exsit.—Sed hujus numeris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium Apostolorum officium pertinere voluit, ut in beatissimo Petro, Apostolorum omnium summo, principaliter collo- caret; et ab ipso, quasi quotum capito, dona sua velit in corpus omne manare: ut exser- tem se mysterii intelligeret esse divini, qui ausus fuisse a Petri soliditate recedere. Hunc enim in consortium individuae unitatis assuntum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari, dicen-
also considerably extended the power of that see, both by his own personal qualities and good fortune. The controversy with *Hilary*, bishop of Arles, led him to obtain a law from *Valentian III.* (445) by which the Romish bishop became the supreme head of the whole western church. 66 The catholic bishops of *Africa*, now oppressed by the Arian Vandals, attached themselves the more closely on this account to the Roman see, and allowed Leo to act as a patriarch in their dioceses without opposition. 67 At the council of *Chalcedon*, Leo, whose legates had the presidency there, hoped to make good his claims as head of the whole church; but he met with much opposition among the orientals, 68 which at last manifested itself decidedly


68 In the very beginning of the council the legates had to declare (actio, i. ap. Mansi, vi. 579): Beatissime atque apostolici viri Papae urbis Romae, quae est caput omnium Ecclesiæ, praecipue habemus prae manibus, quibus praecipere dignatus est eum Apostolatus, ut Dioscorus, Alexandrinorum Archiepiscopus, non sedeat in Concilio, sed audientibus intromittatur. Hoc nos observare nescendo est. Si ergo praecipit vestra magnificentia, aut ille egrediatur, aut nos eximus. Judicis sui necesse est eum dare rationem, qua eum persamnon judicandam non haberet, praesumpset, et synodum aures esse facere (the Robber synod) sine auctoritate sedis apostolicae, quod nunquam licuit, nunquam factum est. They were, however, foilled in this proposition by the imperial commissioners, since they could not be accusers and judges at the same time. Dioscorus accordingly took his seat, and the legates remained.—Subsequently, the Romish legates withstood the first drawing up of the decree respecting the question of faith, desiring either that it should be made to agree more closely with the epistle of Leo, or that this epistle should be mentioned in it.
in decreeing the bishop of Constantinople to be on an equality with the bishop of Rome. This measure Leo had foreseen, and in vain attempted to avert. He protested against it; and Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, was actually obliged to send an humble letter to him, for the oriental emperor's sake. Still the decrees of the synod continued in force; and thus began the days of jealousy that lasted for centuries, between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.

It is worthy of remark, that the Romish bishops were distinguished by no peculiar titles in the west. In the east, the honorary appellation of patriarchs was certainly given them; but these titles were as yet common to all bishops in the west.

---

On this so fearful an outcry arose, that the Ilyrian bishops called out (actio v. ap. Mansi, vii. 105): Oi άντιλέγοντες Ναστομανοί σιναν: oι άντιλέγοντες εις Ρώμην άκατλογην.

69 Comp. above, § 93, note 14. The Romish legates withdrew, actio xv. was adopted, and they protested (act. xvi.) against it, producing the instructions given them by Leo (Mansi, vii. 443). Sanctorum quoque patrum constitutionem prolatum nulla patimini tementire violati vel immuni, servantes omninodi personae nostrae in vobis—dignitatem: ac si qui forte civitatum suarum splendore confusi, aliquid sibi tentarentur usurpare, hoc qua dignum est constantin retundat. They appealed, moreover, to the sixth Nicene council, with the Romish addition, Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum (see § 93, note 1), but were immediately obliged to have the council read to them in its original form, and were thus repudiated with their protest.


72 In the west the names Papa Apostolica, Vicarius Christi, Summus Pontifex, Sedes Apostolica, were applied to other bishops also, and their sees (Thomassini, P. i. lib. i. c. 4. Brascage præf. ad Canisii Lectt. ant. t. i. p. 37. G. S. Cyprian's Belèvrun vom Uebr. und Wachsthum des Papsthums, S. 506, f.). So also Patriarchi, especially to the Metropolitans. (du Pin Diss. i. § 5).—Gregory I. (Epist. lib. v. 18, 20, 41, viii. 30), was mistaken in believing that at the council of Chalcedon the name universalis Episcopus was given to the bishop of Rome. He is styled oikoumenikos archiepiscopos (Mansi, vi. 1006, 1012), only in the Complaints of two Alexandrian deacons against Dioscorus; other patriarchs have the same appellation (see above, § 93, note 20). But in another place the title was surreptitiously introduced into the Latin acts by the Romish legates. In the sentence passed on Dioscorus, actio iii. (Mansi, vi. 1049), the council say, o άγιωτατος και μακαριωτατος άρχιεπισκοπος της μεγής τατ πρεσβυτερας Ρωμης Λεων: on the contrary, in the Latin acts which Leo sent to the Gallic bishops (Leonis Ep. 103, al. 82), we read: Sanctus ac beatissimus Papa, caput universalis Ecclesie, Leo. In the earlier editions the beginning of Leo's Epist. 97 (ap. Quæst. 134, Baller. 165), runs thus: Leo Romæae et universalis catholicæque ecclesiæ Episcopus Leonis semper Augusto salutem Quesnul et Ballerini, however, found in all the Codices only: Leo Episcopus Leonis Augusto. The false, which is repeated even by the Catechismus Romanae, p. ii. c. 7, qn. 24, § 4, that Cyril, at the Council of Ephesus, styled the bishop of Rome, Archiepiscopum totius orbis terrarum Patriarchi, first proceeded from the St. Thomas (§ 1574) Catena aurea in Evang. ad Matth. xvi. 18, who also, in his Opus. contra errores Graeci, falsely attributes many similar passages to the Greek fathers. See Launoy, Epist. lib. i. Ep. 1-3.
FOURTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF MONACHISM.


§ 95.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF MONACHISM IN THE EAST.

Solitude and asceticism were universally looked upon in this age as means of approximation to the Deity. The New Platonists recommended them. Thus Anthony (Div. I. § 73),


2 Still in the time of Nilus, who lived as monk on Sinai, a.d. 430. See Nili tractatus ed. J. M. Suaresius, Romae. 1672. fol. p. 279, and de Monast. exercit. c. 3. (I. c. p. 2), where they are called 'Isodio.
appeared to have set forth the ideal of a Christian wise man; he soon found many imitators, and other hermits fixed themselves in his neighborhood. Many more were concealed in inaccessible places, of whom one, *Paul of Thebes* († 340), who had lived in the desert ever since the Decian persecution, is said to have become known to Anthony shortly before his death. After a number of hermits had been brought into a kind of connection with one another by Anthony, *Pachomius* founded a place of habitation where they might dwell together (κοινόβιον, μάνναρα, κλαστρων.—Κοινόβιος, Συννόβιος), on the island Tabenna in the Nile (about 340), with a system of rules for the government of its inmates, by which strict obedience to the president (‘Αββᾶς, ‘Διοικητής, ‘Αρχιμανδρίτης) was particularly enforced. At the same time *Amun* founded a society of monks on the Nitrian mountain (τὸ τῆς Νιτρίας ὅρος) ; and *Macarius* the elder in the neighboring wilderness of *Skeitis*. Both were soon peopled by the monks, and became the most celebrated resorts. *Hilarion* assembled in the desert near Gaza, a company of monks, and from thence the system spread through Palestine and Syria. The *Eusebian Eustathius*, afterward bishop of Sebaste, introduced it into Armenia and Asia Minor. The peculiarities of the monkish life of this period consisted in solitariness, manual labor, spiritual exercises, restraint of the bodily appetites for the pur-

---

3 Vita Antonii by Athanasius, see Div. I. § 73, note 22. Vita Panii by Jerome.  
5 Coptic Schiël, Greek Σκίητης, Σκίτης, ap. Ptolemy *Sylloge*, Latin *Scithus*, Scytida, Scythiam, means chiefly the hill on which Macarius settled, then the surrounding desert. Et. Quatremère Mémoires géograph. et hist. sur l'Egypte. (Paris. t. 2, 1811, 8.) i. 431.  
6 Vita Hilaris by Jerome.—Λαόσα in Palestine.  
8 Even Tertullian (de Orat. c. 25, et adv. Psychios, c. 10) and Cyprian (de Orat. domin. p. 134) recommended the hora tertia, sexta, and nona, as times of prayer, while every day, morning and evening, church service was performed. (Const. apost. ii. 59.) Among the monks different usages arose at first. The Egyptians had, on every day of the week, only two meetings for prayer (Cassianus de Inst. coecub. iii. 2, vesperinas et nocturnas congregations), and in their cells carried on manual labor, and prayed almost incessantly; those of the East came together for the purpose of singing psalms, hora tertia, sexta, et nona (i. c. c. 3), the matutina hora was first introduced at a later period into the monastery at Bethlehem (i. c. c. 4). Athanasius de virginitate (Opp. i. 1051, ss.), marks out for the nun six seasons of prayer, viz., the third, sixth, ninth, twelfth hours (a more solemn assembly in the church at the last hour), μεσονίκτιον and πρὸς ὥραν. So also Jerome,
pose of mortifying the sensual nature, and allowing the spirit with less disturbance to be absorbed in the contemplation of divine things. The rules of the monasteries made, indeed, more moderate demands on the abstinence of the inmates; but the majority of the monks did more than was required, of their own free choice, and many even withdrew from the cells of the vents into the desert (Ἀναχωρήσατε), that they might suppress sensual desires by the most ingenious self-tortures, and attain the highest degree of holiness. In many cases these measures had only the contrary effect, and temptations increased; many

Epitaph. Paulae Epist. 27, 10, Epist. 7 ad Laetam; according to Chrysostom. in 1 Tim. Hom. xiv. the monks had the same hours. Basil also, de Institut. monach. serva, prescribes these six; but that there may be seven, agreeably to Psalm cxix. 16, the prayer of noon is directed to be divided into that before and that after eating. When six public hours for prayer are prescribed to the churches in the apostolic constitutions, viii. 34, the writer follows the view which arose in the fourth century, viz., that in the apostolic churches for which he pretends to write, a monastic institute prevailed. Even in his day there were daily but two religious services, as at an early period (ἐν ἐσπέρα καὶ ἐν πρωῒ, Chrysost. in 1 Tim. Hom. vi.).


monks were driven to despair by a sense of the hopelessness of their efforts; in the case of others, complete madness was superinduced by that excessive asceticism, and by the pride associated with it, under the influence of a burning climate. From that diseased excitement of the imagination, and that spiritual pride, arose also those strange miraculous occurrences which befell the monks only in solitude. The lesser marvelous things which they wrought in the circles of enthusiastic admirers must be explained by the impression they made on the feelings of reverence entertained toward the persons of the monks, and by the magnifying nature of tradition.

"Εστι δ' ὅτε καὶ ἐν πλῆθυ μετανόων ἐρημῷ τὴν διάνοιαν, τῶν ψυχικῶν ὄχλον σκοτάςαστος θεοῦ, καὶ διδάχαςάτο με, ὅτι οὐ τῶν διάφορων τῷ τε εὐ καὶ χείρον εἰγώνται, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐγών, ἦν ὑποικίαςται, τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὀχυρῷ. 

Zimmermann on Solitude, part 3, chapters 6 and 7.

12 So that some, like the circumceoliones (see § 86, note 9), put an end to their life, see Nihils, lib. ii. Ep. 140: "Τινὲς μὲν αὐτῶν ξενοθέστες, καὶ θεοκράτεστες τῶν νοστῶν ἐξ ἀρρενωπίας καὶ ἀδιακρίσεως ἐκείνως ἐφόδων μαχαίρως, τινὲς δὲ κατακράτησεν ἐκεῖνος ἀφόφητα λήπτη καὶ ἀπογνώσεις συνέχεστες, ἔτηρε δὲ τὰ γενετικὰ μόρια κύματι, καὶ αὐτοφρονοῦντας ἔκαστον τὴν προαίδευτα γεγονότας αἱ τάλανες, ὑπέκεισαν τῇ ἀποτελεσματικῇ ἄρῃ,-ἡ ἐκεῖνος καὶ γναθοῖς ἔλαβον συναρπασθέντας ἀπὸ τῶν Σατανᾶ. 

Gregor. Narr. Carm. xlvii. v. 100, ss. (Opp. t. ii. 107):

Οὐχὶ δὲνον ἐπολλοὶ παρορναίας ἀναίτοις,
Αὐτὸι ὑπὸ σφετέρις παλάμης, καὶ γαστρὸς ἀνάγαγη,
Οἴ δὲν κατὰ σκοτεῖνοι βίονες ἡδή βρόχοι,
Μάρτυρες ἀτραχνίας πολέμοιον οὗ ἀπὸ καὶ στενώτος
Χαλκοῖ τικόνων τοῦθ᾽ ἀπανατάκτεινον,

'Ελανθ Ἰεροί ἀναζέ πισταίς ἔρειν αἱράβενονες!

Pachomius says, Vita Pachomii, § 61 (Acta SS. Maij. iii. 330, the Greek original is given in the app. p. 41): "Ἡ δὲ τῆς βλασφήμίας ὑποβολῆ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τινὰ μὴ νυφᾶλω, εὰν ἃ γὰρ ὁποῖον θεοῦ,-τοῦτον ἀπολῆσαι. Καὶ πολλοὶ θανάτωσαν ἐκείνος, ὃ μὴ ἐπιώνουθ' πέτρος ἑαυτοῦ ἔρφας ὡς ἐκτάτησις, καὶ ἄλλοι μιχαίροι ἀπέτυπον τὴν κολλην ἀυτοῦ καὶ ἀπέθανον, καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλοι. 

Cf. Chrysostomi ad Stagirium, lib. iii. (Opp. i. 153) to a monk who believed that he had been tempted by Satan to commit suicide. Others sought assistance in their struggle against desire in immoderate sleep. Nīlī, lib. iii. Ep. 204.

13 Hieronymi Ep. 95 (al. 4), ad Rusticum: "Sunt, qui humore cellarum, immorimataque jejuna, tædio solidinii ac nimia lectione, dum diebus ac noctibus auribus suis persanent, vertuntur in melancholiam, et Hippocratis magis fomentis quam nostri moniti indigent.

Ep. 97 (al. 8) ad Demetriodem: "Novi ego in utroque sex per nihilum abstinentiam cerebri suuidate quibusdam suisse vexatam: praecluque in his, qui in humecto et frigido habitaverunt cellulas, ita ut nescirent quid agerent, quove se verterent: quid loqui, quid tacere deberent. Hence his disapproval of extreme fasting in Ep. 57 (al. 7) ad Luctanam et Jo. Cassian. Inscit. v. 9.

14 Several hints on this subject may be found in the following passages: Hieron. Ep. 52, ad Rusticum: "Quosdam ineptos homines daemonum pugniantium contra se portenta confingere, ut apud imperitos et vulgi homines miraculum sui faciunt, et exinde lucea sectentur. 

Sozomenus, i. 14: "Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ θεσπίσται ἐπ' αὐτῷ ('Αμον) συμβεβηκαν, ὡς ῥάλλοτα τοῖς καὶ 'Αγίου του μνησίου ἡμέρα, περὶ πολλῶν ποιημένων, διάδουχοι παραδόσεως"
Very soon in the east monachism was received with enthusiastic admiration, and the number of monks swelled to an enormous extent. Since there were no more persecutions, and no more opportunities of martyrdom; since Christianity had even acquired external dominion; the erroneous notion was spread abroad that there was no longer an opportunity in the world for the full exercise of Christian virtue. The general corruption or consciousness of individual guilt caused many to seek solitude. Many sought escape from the oppressive circumstances of life. Others wished to make a figure and obtain an influence. Others were attracted by sloth; and lastly, others were drawn away

Chap. IV.—Monachism. § 95. In the East.

ἀγρόφον ἐπιμελητὴς ἀπομνημονεύειν τῶν τῶν παλαιστρῶν ἁσκητῶν ἁρετῶς. Sulpiicius Severus, dial. ii. 4, relates that St. Martin often told him, nequaquam sibi in episcopatu eam virtutem gratiam suppedites, quam prius se habuisse meminisset. Quod si verum est, immo quia verum est, conicercare possumus, quanta fuerunt illa, quae monachus operatus est, et quae teste nullo solus exsecutum, cum tanta illum in episcopatu signa fecisset, sub oculus omnium viuerimus. For the physiological explanation of the frequent visions seen by these anchorites comp. D. Joh. Müller über die phantastischen Gesichterscheinungen. Coblenz. 1896. 8.

13 Pachomius had in his convent 1300 monks, and in all upward of 7000 under his superintendence (Sozom. iii. 14). In a monastery at Thebais were 5000 monks (Cass. de Institut. iv. 1); in Nitria were fifty convents (Sozom. vi. 31), etc.

14 A kindred notion may be found in Origen, see Div. I. § 70, note 19.

17 Chrysostomus adv. oppugnatores vitae monast. i. 7: Ἐξοντλαμμένων καὶ αὐτῶ—τῶν μοναστηρίων ἀναπερίβλητων τὴν χρείαν, καὶ τοσατέραν ἐν ταῖς πόλεις γενέσθαι τὴν εὐνοιάν, ὡς μηδένα διερχῆται ποτὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν ἐρημὸν καταφύγιον· ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ ἄνω κάτω γέγονε, καὶ αἱ μὲν πόλεις—πολλῆς γέμουσα παρανομίας καὶ ἁδίκειας, ἡ δὲ ἐρημία πολλῶν οἴρει τῷ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καρπῷ οὐχ οἱ τῆς ζήλευσα ταύτης καὶ τῆς ταραχῆς τοὺς σοφίζει θουλουμένους ἔξαγοντες, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅτι ἁστυχίας ἀδιόγονθα λεμένα, δικαλῶς ἐν ἐγκαλοία παρ' ὅμοις.

18 Isidorus Pelus. (see § 88, note 25) lib. 1. Ep. 262. Ἐστήβιος (a bishop) and τοῦτο τῇ παρακείμενοι Παλαιστρῶν παρέχετο, βοινώσως τις, καὶ αὐτολόγως, καὶ δραπέτας οἰκείως ἐπιτρέπετο μοναχικά συμπήγγεισα παλαιστρία, οὐδὲν μαθητεύει τὴν μοναχικὴν, ἢ μεταλθώντως, ὥς ἄγαφαντον, αὐτῆς ἀγάπωντον, ὥς ἀληθεῖς τῆς φιλοσοφίας ταύτης ἡ ἁστυνομία, ἡ μέχρι σχήματος δισχάζεται.

19 Respecting the reputation which the monks possessed, compare what Chrysostom says to the heathen father of a monk, adv. oppugnatores vitae monast. ii. 4: Ὑδὲ μὲν οὖν τῶν σαντον κύριος εἰ μόνων, ἐκεῖνος (ὁ υἱός σου) δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκομένην ἦπατοσ. εἰ δὲ ἀπιστεῖς, πιστεύειν αὐτῶν κατελθόντα ἀπὸ τοῦ δρόνος—σημαίνει τῶν τῶν σφόδρα πληθοῦσιν καὶ εὐλαβοῦσι, πήματα χρυσοῦ σταθμοῦ, ἄκουες ἑλέους, καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖτε ὅπει τὸν πλουτὸν ὑπακούντων καὶ ἐκκοιμίζων, ἡ τῶν οἰκομένων τόι τῶν σων. C. 6: Ἐξιόρεσαι αὐτῶν (τῶν υἱῶν σου) ὁ μόνως λαμπρότερον ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλλα καὶ δὲ ἐκεῖνα τιμωρητῶς, ὡς ἄρῃς ὅπειραν ὅς εἰς ἅπαν παραγενομένοι ἦν τῶν. C. 7: Τῆς μετὰ πλασμον ἔξωσίας διαλέξεται βοισίλει, καὶ ἐπιτίθεσθε; ὅ τοσάτα σὲ κεκτημένος, καὶ ἐπεθυμῶς ὅν δὲ ταύτα τὰς ἐκείνου δοῦλος,—ἡ ὅπος ὁ τῶν ἔκεινοι χειρῶν ἀνώτερος ὑν; βασιλεύει μὲν γὰρ ὁτοί μαλημα διελέξθησαν μετ’ ἔξωσίας πολλῆς, ὡς τῶν πάντων ἐγένοτο τῶν βιωτικῶν ἐκτός. C. 8: Εἰ ταπεινω, καὶ ἐκ ταπεινῶν ὡντες τινες ἀγρόφ.
by mere imitation.20 The measures taken by the emperor Valens21 against the excessive tendency to this state of things were attended with no lasting consequences, since the following emperors only showed the more respect for monachism. The most distinguished teachers of the church, Athanasius, Ambrose, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine, were the most zealous panegyrists of the new mode of life (φιλοσοφία, ἀγγελικὴ διαγωγή).22 Examples in favor of it were soon discovered even in the Old Testament;23 and by new

καὶ νεότερον ἐπὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν πατητὴν ἐλθὼντες, ὁτις ἐγένετο τῷ ὁμοίῳ τῆς σοῖς ἡμέρας. Ἐφεσοί τοῖς ἐπὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ αὐτῶν ἀμφιθυμίῳ ἀληθεύοντα πρὸς τὸ καταγγείλειν τοῦτων ἔλεγεν, καὶ λόγων μεταφέρεται καὶ τραπέζης—πάλλα λάβετε, ὅταν ὑπὸ λαμπρὸν μὲν ἐρωμένον γένος—πρὸς ἑκάστην ἰδιώματι ἐλθόντα τὴν ἅρπην, τοῦτο εὐχαριστοῦνται. Nils làco ὁσιοτάτους, c. 7 (Opusc. ed. Saarelli, p. 8). The striving of many monks was even at that time so much directed toward the attainment of possessions, ὅταν λαμπρὸν τοῦς πάλλα παραμένει, ἡγεῖα η ἐπισκέψεως, καὶ ἡ ἐπισκέψεις παρασκευασμένη, ἀκκόλουθος ἐπὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἡ ἐπισκέψεις, ἡ ἐπισκέψεις καὶ θρησκευτικὴ ἡ ἐπόμενη παρασκευασμένη. Καὶ ἐκ τοῦτο εἰπώμενοι καὶ ἐπισκέψεως τοῦ ἐνώπτων βίων εἰναι γεμίζοντας. Καὶ τὸ τοῦτο καὶ πάρα τῶν σεβόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκείνων ὡς εἰκασία ἧχος ὀρθομέθον, καὶ μιμοῦμεν,—οὐκ ἐκ πολιτείας, ἀλλ' ἐκ σχήματος γεωργίας βοηθοῦμεν.20 Comp. the judgment of Synesius, at that time still a heathen, afterward bishop of Ptolemais, in his Dion: Ὁ θεῖος πάντως ἡ αἰσχρὴ ἐκκαίρισας, ἵππη ἄλλο τι τῶν ἐνδοκομίσασα ἡ γεννιότατος ἄρεσις ἐνέργησα, παντοτάποτε τό ἄρεσις τό γένος, καὶ τὰ ἀνόητα ἐκάνατο συνιστάμενοι.21 Cod. Theodosii. xii. 1, 63 (A.D. 365): Quidam ignavnæ sectatores desertis civitatum numeribus captant solitudines ac secretas, et specie religionum coeptibus monzacont congregantur. Hos initium atque laborum, intra Aegyptum depressos, per omnes orientem eruit excepit mendacium, atque ad munia patriarum subeuntia revocari, aut pro tenore nostrae sanctissime familiaremmur carere illicebant, quas pro eos cessimus viudicandos, qui publicarum essent subiuntris rebus functionum. After the death of his milder brother (Orsiiit Hist. vii. 33: Illice post fratris obitum), Valens became more violent against the monks, see Hieron. Chron. ann. 357: Multa monachorum Nitarot per tribunos et milites caesti. Valens eum lega data, ut monachi militarent, tenentes fustibus interserent. This raised the courage of the numerous opponents of monachism, and therefore Chrysostom wrote at that time πρὸς τοῦτο τοῦτον ἐκάνατο συνιστάμενοι.22 Ο τῶν ἀγγέλου ἔσοδος, τὸν ὁμαλὸν πολιτεύετα, ἀποστολικὸς βίου (Epiph. Haer lxi. 4, ἡ ψυχὴ φιλοσοφία, ἡ ψυχὴ ἐργασία ἢ λόγῳ καθημερινόν (Gregor. Nyss. Orat. catech. c. 18), ἢ κατὰ θεόν φιλοσοφία (Nils de Monast. exercitatio, c. 8). Serapiion, bishop of Thessana, about 350, writes in the Epist. ad monochos (Mep學ion Romanum, iv. p. liv.) to them: Ἡ ἀγάλημα ἢ τῆς τῆς πολιτείας· δυσμα ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν ὡς γεμισάς ἢ ἀναρίζετε τοῦ ἀγάλημα τῶν ἐνῶπτων βιῶν εἰς γεμίζοντας. Αλλ' ἐκ ἀγάλημα εἰς ἢ ὡς ἐκαίρια οἱ δικαιοφρονοῦσα, ἢ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν ἂν ἀναρίζετε πρὸς τῷ ἀγάλημα τῶν ῥυθμῶν. Entering on the life of a monk is called by Jerome, Ep. 22 (al. 25), ad Paulam: Secundo quodammodo propositi se baptismo lavare. Subsequently Dionys. Aecop. de Eccles. hierarch. c. 6, reckons the vow of monks (μυστήριον μυστικῆς τελείωσε) among the sacraments.

20 Hieronymus in vita S. Pauli (about 365): Inter multos sepe dabitum est, a quo
explanations of detached passages and the help of supplementing legends, the original condition of the early Christians was shown to be a completely monastic state.\textsuperscript{24}

For a long time the monks appeared to have been able to dwell only in deserts. Individuals, indeed, sometimes showed

...
themselves in cities to oppose heathens and heretics, but they always withdrew again very soon into their solitude. 25 Basil the Great was the first who established a company of monks in the vicinity of Caesarea in Cappadocia, in order to suppress Arianism, by their influence with the people. 26 From this time monasteries became more frequent in the neighborhood of cities; but since there were as yet no strict rules, wandering companies of monks were also found. Thus their influence in Church and State became stronger, but, at the same time, more dangerous.

It is true that the monks made a strong moral impression by their strict life, dedicated to God in solitude. Even heathens frequently repaired to them in numbers, for the sake of receiving their blessing, and were converted by them. 27 But the honor and power they possessed not unfrequently caused the passions within them, which were suppressed in regard to their sensual manifestations, to break forth still more strongly in the form of spiritual pride, 28 and wild fanaticism, against those who thought differently from themselves. From the time of Theodosius I., they opposed heathenism with fury and barbarousness; 29 and they

25 Antony said: Τοὺς μὲν ἱζότας τὴν ἑγρονίαν σφάδιαν τρέφειν· μοναχοῖς δὲ κόσμῳ φέρειν τὴν ἔρημον· ἐπίσπει τὸ τοὺς μὲν ἱπποὺς ἀπομεῖναι τὸ ἐξ ἐντολήν, τῶν δὲ τὴν μοναστηρίαν συμπότα ἀπολλάνεις τὸ ἀκαταστάτον ἐργασίαν. Sozom. i. 13.

26 Socrates, iv. 21. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xx. in laudem Basilii, p. 359: Τοῦ τούτον ἐρημικοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ μεγάδος μαχημάτων πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὡς τὸ πολέμημα, καὶ διαστατέων, καὶ αὐθεντήρων πάντως ἢ τὸ καλὸν, ἢ τὸ φαύλον ἀνεπίκουτον ἐξοντος· ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὲν ἱεροχώριον μὲν δυτὸς μᾶλλον, καὶ καθαστήσατος, καὶ ὦς συνάγωντος, οὐκ ἄριστον δὲ διὰ τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀξίζων ἀξίας καὶ ἀνέγκριτον· τὸ δὲ πρακτικότερον μὲν μᾶλλον καὶ χρησμωτέρον, τὸ δὲ βοηθεῖς ἢ φεύγοντος· καὶ τούτως ἄριστα κατηλλαξαν ἀλλήλοις καὶ συνεκτέτον· ῥήματα καὶ μοναστήρια δειμμόμενοί μὲν, ὁ δὲ ἀληθείας τινών μέσῳ ταῦτα διαλογίζει, καὶ ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων χωρίας, ἀλλ’ ἄλλους συνάφες καὶ διαζεύκτης· εἰναὶ μέχρι τὸ φιλόσοφον ἀποκεφαλικόν ἢ μέχρι τὸ πρακτικὸν ἡμιλόσοφον. On the Asceticca of Basil, the chief parts of which are ὄροι κατὰ πλάτος and ὄροι κατ’ ἐπιτομᾶν (monks’ rules), see Garnier in praef. ad Basil. Opp. i. ii p. xxxiv, 85.

27 See Möhler’s Schriften u. Aufsätze, ii. 219.


also mingled in ecclesiastical controversies in a manner no less violent. Since they despised all learning, and founded their judgment of orthodoxy merely on an obscure feeling of what looked like piety, and what did not, it was seldom difficult for a superior head to excite their fanaticism in favor of a certain view. Thus the ambitious bishops of Alexandria, Theophilus, Cyril, and Dioscorus, knew well how to make use of them, partly to work upon the people, partly to overpower their opponents by acts of violence. The rude mass were as easily excited, in a fanatical manner, against a Chrysostom, at the point of death, as against idolaters and Arians. The limits of civil law, and the dignity of magistrates, appear to have been disregarded by them. In them religious fanaticism was united with a cynical indifference to propriety or duty; and too often indolence and vice also were concealed under this mask of piety.

Contemplation, which was regarded as the most important duty of the monk, as though it led him to an internal union with God, was usually, in the absence of mental cultivation, either a suffering resignation to feeling, without a distinct consciousness of it, or a play of anthropomorphic images of the fancy. Hence anthropomorphism was very common among them. But incessant occupation with religious subjects, over- 

ēπισαγόν τή καὶ ἐπαίσον μυρία κακά καὶ ὕραστα. Ἐλλή ὑμως τοῦτο μὲν ἐνεβεβελ ἐδόκει τῷ καταφορείν τιν θείον τυραννικὸν γὰρ ἔχειν ἔξωσαν τότε πᾶς άνθρωπος, μέλαιναν φορόν γήγειται, καὶ δομομία βολόμενος ἄνεμοισκείν.

30 Sosusenius, B. 12: Ἡ τοιαύτη ὕγια μισθημάτων μὲν πολλάκις καὶ διαλεκτικής τεχνολογίας ἁμελεί, ὡς περίμεργος, καὶ τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἁμελεῖ σχολὴν ὑφαινομένη, καὶ πρός το μία ἄδην ὀδὴν συλλαμβανομένης μόνη δὲ φυσικὴ καὶ ἀπεριέργη φρονήσει παιδεῖται τὰ παντέλες κακίαν ἀναιροῦντα, η μείζονα ἔργαβην. Synesius, in his Dion, designates them by the names of τῶν ἁμοίων, τῶν μυσαλογικῶν, τῶν ἂρετῶν, τῶν ἀστερεύων καὶ ἐπεροτων βαρτούντων καὶ τοιχήσεως, see Clausen de Synesio, p. 48.


34 Comp. Neander's Chrysostomus, Bd. 2, S. 108, §§.

35 Yet Anthony said (Cassian Collat. ix. 31): Non est perfecta oratio, in qua se Monachus, vel hic ipsum quod orat, intelligit.

36 Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, rejected the anthropomorphism of the monks, in his Easter letter, 399. Cassian Coll. x. 2: Quod tanta est amaratudine ab universo propemodum generis Monachorum, qui per totam provinciam Aegypti morabantur, pro simplicitatis errore suscipiemt, ut e contrario memorandum pontificem, velut laeures gravissima depravatum, pars maxima Seniorum ab universo fraternitate corpore decerneter detestan-
strained views, and self-conceit, joined with the want of culture, occasionally led them to other aberrations also from the doctrine of the Church. 37 Audius in Mesopotamia was still worthy of respect, who separated from the Church on account of its corruption, and founded a sect of monks (Audiani) about A.D. 340. 38 But the Messalians (Ἰὼνίων) or Εὐχεταῖοι, 39 who also arose in Mesopotamia (about 360), were mere fanatics, wandering hordes of beggars, who supposed that incessant prayer could alone blot out all sins while they undervalued public worship, and were led into the most absurd notions by their coarse imagination. Even Eustathius, the founder of monachism in Armenia, came to reject marriage absolutely, and was, on this account, condemned with his followers by the Synod of Gangra (between 362 and 370). 40 In the mean time monachism was developed in forms the most various. Many monks (Rhemoboth or Sarabaitæ), 41 still continued to live in society 42 like the old ascetics, but were less

---

37 Thus some were led to entertain contempt for public worship and the sacraments, as Valens and Heron (Palladii Hist. Lausiaca, c. 31 et 32), and the Messalians. One Ptolemy went even so far with his brooding and dreaming over divine things, as to arrive at last at Atheism (Palladius, l. c. c. 33).


40 The acts of this synod (ap. Mansi, i. 1092) are the chief source for the knowledge of his doctrines. Socrat. ii. 43. Sozom. iv. 24. Walch, iii. 536. In the synodical decree it is also reckoned among their errors in doctrine: Προσβεβτέρων γεγαμικτών ύπερφοροντες, καὶ τῶν λειτουργίων τῶν ἐπι αὐτῶν γινομένων μὴ ἀπίστως. On the contrary, can. iv.: Ἐι τις διακρίνειται παρὰ προσβεβτέρων γεγαμικτός, ὡς μὴ χρῆσαι λειτουργείαν ἀυτῶν προσφορὰς μεταλλάξαντες, ἀνάθεμα ἀστο. On the time of the synod of Gangra, see Bellerini de Ant. collect. canonum, P. 1, cap. 4, § 1.


42 Also with the συνεδριά in Ambros. Sermo. 63. Gregorii Naz. Carm. in several passages. See Walsh, l. c. p. 23, s. Moreover, there were still ascetics who abstained
highly esteemed. Others wandered about in companies (βοσκῶν) in Mesopotamia. Those who lived together in convents were called coenobites, each convent having its peculiar constitution, among whom the most distinguished since the fifth century, were the ἀκοιμητοί, watchers, for whom Studius, in 460, founded one of the most celebrated convents in Constantinople (Studitae). But among the people, the anchorites were reckoned the most holy, for they carried their artificial self-tortures the farthest, and vied with each other in inventing new modes of cruelty against their own persons. The highest point in this art was reached by Simeon, who, from the year 420, dwelt on a pillar in the neighborhood of Antioch. In this he was imitated by others, and although at first the example was found by individuals to be doubtful, yet it was wondered at by the mass. Even so late as the twelfth century, similar pillar-saints (στυλιτῆς or στηλιτῆς) appeared in the east.

The female sex could not imitate the men in all these kinds of asceticism, though there were convents for them as early as for the male sex (Asceptriae, Monastriae, Castimoniales, Sanctimoniales, Nonnæ).


47 Nili lib. ii. Epist. 114, to the Stylite Nicander: Ο θυών έκαστόν ταπεινωθήσεται. Σε δὲ βασίλεις καταγωγάς ἐπαινούμενον πράγμα, καὶ τῆς ἔφοιτος σεαντόν έββ ἐπήλυθο τοῦ στύλου, καὶ βοήλει μεγάλων τυχάνισιν εὐφήμωσιν άλλα πρόσεχε σαντό, μέστοτε ἑνταῦθα παρά αὐθάρανθον φθοράν άκραιάς ἐπαινοίεσι, ἠρώτως τὸ τηρικάδα σαρᾶ τοῦ αὐθάρανθος θησεταναθής οὖν παρά ἐπίδαιρον ἂντερ τῆς ἑνταύθα εὐφήμορῆς τῶν αὐθάρανθων κρώστων. Ep. 115, to the same: ΑΤώποιν ἄν εἰπέν να ήθελον μόνο τοῦ κίνοντος ἠμυατάζει τὸ σύματα τοὺς πάντας φαναμόν τοῦ έδοξον, κάτω δὲ τοῖς λογισμοίς σώψεσαι, μόνον ἠξέν ὑπὲρ τῶν οὐρανίων πραγμάτων διανοεῖσαι θυναμόντας, μόνον τὰς γυναῖκες ἁδίως προσαναθοῦντα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύτας. Πρώτον μὲν γὰρ τοὺς αὐθάρανες καὶ προθύμησα εὐφήμον, νῦν δὲ ἐκπάν τοῦ πλείστου τὰ γύναια προσδέξῃ. 48 Pachomius in like manner founded the first. Pallad. Hist. Luv. c. 34, et 38.—Nonnus (Hieron. Ep. 18, ad Eustoch.), νονίς (Pallad. l. c. c. 46), were names of honor, as among the monks Nonnus, according to Arnobius jun. in Psalm. ov. and ext. the Egyptian

It is true that the resolution of devoting themselves to a monastic life was now to be declared, and penance was imposed on those who drew back; but yet the teachers of the Church looked upon this retraction not merely as possible, without farther permission, but even advisable under certain circumstances.  

§ 96.

MONACHISM IN THE WEST.


Monachism was first acknowledged in the west by Athanasius, although it was generally looked upon as an excrescence of oriental fanaticism, with a surprise which not unfrequently amounted to contempt and hatred. Yet it also found numerous warm friends, many of whom went as far as Egypt and Palestine, for the purpose of being initiated into the new mode of life. Ambrose and Jerome were the influential promoters of it in Italy. The former established a monastery at Milan. At

for sanctus, castus, or according to Benedicti regula, c. 63, paterna reverentia; according to Jablonski Opusc. ed. te Water, t. i. p. 176, properly Emmench or Naenech, i.e., quae non est hujus saeculi, quae saeculo renunciat.—The lady president was called mother, ἀμμᾶς (Pallad. l. c. c. 42).

49 Epiphani. Haer. 61, § 7: Κραίττον τοῖνε ἦχεν ἀμαρτίαν μίαν, καὶ μὴ περισσότερος. κραίττον πεσότα ἀπὸ δρόμων φανερῶς ἐκτὸς λαβέτε γνώσαστα κατὰ νόμων, καὶ ἀπὸ παρθένιας πολλῶν χρόνων μετανοῶντας ἐπαχθῆναι πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς κἀκεῖ ἐργασσόμενον, ὡς παραπεσόντα, καὶ κλασθήντα, καὶ χρείαν ἔχοντα ἐπιδήματος, καὶ μὴ καθ’ ἐκκλησίαν ἡμέρας βέβαιοι κρυφοὶ κυκτιτρώσκεναι. Hieronym. Ep. 97 (al. 8), ad Demetriadem: Sanctum virginum propositum et coelestis angelorumque familiae gloriam quorumdam non bene se agentium solum infamati. Quibus aperte dicendum est, ut aut nonnulli si se non possunt continere, aut continent, si nolunt nubere (see above § 73, note 6). Augustinians de Bono viduit. c. 10: Quí dicunt talium nuptias non esse nuptias, sed potias adulteria, non nisi videntur satis acute ac diligentiter considerare qui dicit.—Fit autem per hanc minus consideratam opinionem, qua putante laparum a sancto proposito seminari, si nuperint, non esse conjugia, non parvum multum, ut a maritis separarent uxoros, quasi adulterae sint, non uxoros: et cum volunt eas separatas roddere continentiae, faciant maritos carum adulteros veros, cum suis uxoribus vivis alteras duxerint. Concil. Chaled. can. 16: Παρθένων ἐκτὸς ἀναθείσαι τῷ δισεύθῳ διὸ ὁσαίτως δὲ καὶ μοναχάτως, μὴ ἐξείναι γάμῳ προσομιλεῖν· εἶ δὲ γε εὑρεθείς τούτο ποιοῦντες, ἥσσωσας ἀκοινώντος· ὡράσας δὲ ἦχεν τῇ ἁθετίαν τῆς ἐκ’ αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπίας τὸν κατὰ τόπον ἔπασαν.  

1 On this account Jerome translated the rule of Pachomius into Latin, as he says in the preface (Luc. Holsteinii Codex regularum, l. 59), propter eam quod plurimi Latinorum habitant in Thébaldis coenobii et in monasterio Metanoeae, qui ignorant aegyptiacum graecumque sermonem.

2 Augustini Confess. viii. 6: Erat monasterium Medioliani plenum bonis fratibus extra.
the same time convents for both sexes were founded in Rome, notwithstanding the unfavorable opinion of the people; and the small islands near the coast, Gallinarum (Galina), Gorgon

urbis moenia sub Ambrosio nutritore. Id. de Moribus eccles. cath. i. 33 : Vidii ego diver-
sorium sanctorum Mediolani non pancorum hominem, quibus unus Presbyter praeeert, vir optimus et doctissimus.

Hieron. Ep. 96, ad Principiam de laudibus Marcellae, A.D. 412 : Nulla eo tempore nobilium feminarum voerat Romae propositum Monachorum, nec audebat properi rei
novitatem ignominiosum, ut tune putabatur, et vile in populis nomen assumere. Hac-
ne (Marcella) ab Alexandriis sacerdotibus, Paphage Athanasio et postea Petro, qui per-
secutionem Arianeae haereceos declinantes, quasi ad tuitissimum communium suas portum
Romam confugerant, vitam besti Antonii adhaec tune viventis, monasteriorumque in
Thebaide Pachumii et virginiis ac viduarum didicit disciplinam.—Hanc multos post
annos imitata est Sophronis, et aliae.—Hujus amicitiae fruita est Paula venerabilis. In
hujus cubiculio nutrita Eustochium, virginitatis decus, ut facilis aestimation sit, quals
magistra, ubi tales discipulae.—Audivimus te illius adhaesisse consortio, et numquam ab
illa—recessisse.—Suburbarum ager vobis pro Monasterio fuit, et rus electum pro solitudine.
Multoque ita vivissimi tempore, ut, ex imitatione vestri, conversatione multarum gaudere-
mus Romam factam Jerusalam. Crebra virginiis monasteria, Monachorum innumerabilis
multitudine, ut pro frequentia servientium Deco, quod prius insigniores fuerat, esset
postea gloriae. Epist. 54 ad Pammachium, A.D. 398 : Pammachius meus—姝χριστιανηγος
Monachorum. Augustin. de Moribus eccl. cath. (388, written in Rome) i. 33 : Romae plura
(diversoria sanctorum) cognovi, in quibus singuli gravitate atque prudentia et divina
scientia praepollentem ceteris secum habitabantis praesent, christianae caritate, sanctitate
et libertate viventibus. Ne ipsi quidem cuique omnino sunt, sed Orientis more et
Apostoli Pauli auctoritate, maibus sui se transignant. Jejunia etiam prorsus incredibili-
mente exercere dixi, non quotidie semel sub noctem reficiendo corpus, quod est usque-
quaque usitassimam, sed causticae triduum vel amplius saepe teneo sine cibo et pota
ducere : neque hoc in viris tantum, sed etiam in foeminis, quibus itum, multis viduntus et
virginiis simul habitabantis, et lana ac tela victum quern tantum, praesunt singulis
gravissimae probatiassimoque, non tantum in institui et componendique moribus, sed
etiam institutioe mentibus peritius atque paritatis. These facts which were manifestly
prejudicial to the health, stirred up the people. At the burrying of Blasilla, a daughter
of Paul, a young nun, supposed to have been killed by fasting, A.D. 384, the people cried
out (Hieronymi Ep. 29, al. 25, ad Paulam) : Quousque genus detestabile monachorum non
urbe bellitur? non lapidibus obruitur? non praecipitatur in fluctus?

Ambrosii Hexaxemeron, iii. c. 5 : Quid enumerem insulas, quas velut monilia plerumque
praetecta, id quibus iis, qui se abdicant intertemporantiae saecularis illecebris, fido contin-
entiae proposito, eligunt mundum latere, et vitae hujus declinare dubios anfractus? Hioronymus Ep. 84 (al. 30), de Morte Fabiolae about 400 : Augusta missericordiae ejus
Roma fuit. Paragrabat ergo insulas et totum Etruscum mare, Voicorumque provinciam
et conditores curorum littorum sinus, in quibus monachorum consistant chorii, vel proprio
corpo, vel transmissa per viros sanctos ac fideles misericordia circumbat. Comp. the
Itinerarium of the heathen Restili Numantiani (A.D. 417), i. 420, ss.: 

Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tolit,
Squallet lucifargis insula pleba viris.
Ipsi se monachos Grajo cognomine dicit, etc.

and respecting Gorgon, ibid. v. 517, ss.: 

Averber scopulis, cænni monumenta recentis:
Perditus hic vivo funere civis erat.
Noster enim nuper, juvenis majoribus amplius,
Nec censu inferior, conjugiore minor.
Impulsus furios, homines duxque reliquit,
(Gorgona), Capraria (Capraia), Palmaria (Palmarola), on the west coast of Italy and the islands on the Dalmatian coast, became important seats of monastic establishments. Martin first established in Gaul a monastery at Poitiers; and afterward, when he became bishop of Turonum (375–400), another in that city. About 400, Honoratus founded the celebrated monastery on the island Lerins (now St. Honorat). Others rose on the island Ler (St. Marguerite), and the Stoechades on the south coast of Gaul. John Cassian, who was educated among the Egyptian monks, founded two cloisters in Massilia (after 410). He died after 432. In Africa, notwithstanding Augustine's most zealous encomiums on monachism, it found acceptance almost entirely with the lower classes alone; and the hatred of it was kept up there longer than in any other place.

7 Magnus monasterium (Marmoutier).
9 Plinius Nat. Hist. iii. 5, calls the two islands Lerina and Lerco, Strabo, iv. 1, 10, Πλαναίας καλὰ Άγιοι. In later authors (Sidonii Carm. xvi. 104, Emodius in vita Epiphaniij they are called Lerinum and Lerus.
10 To the founders of Monachism on these islands, viz., Jovinianus, Minervius, Leontius, and Theodoretus, Cassian dedicated his last seven Collations, as he had done the preceding seven to Honoratus and Eucherius. Cf. Praecl. ad coll. xi. et xii.
11 Respecting him see § 87, note 48.
12 Augustin. de Opere Monach. c. 22: Nunc autem veniunt plerunque ad hanc professionem servitutis Dei et ex conditione servil, vel etiam liberti, vel propter hoc a dominis liberati sive liberundi, et ex vita rustica, et ex opificem exercitacione et plebético labore. Neque enim apparat, utrum ex proposito servitutis Dei venerint, an vitam inopem et laboriosam fugientes vacui pasci atque vestri voluerint, et insuper honorari ab eis, a quibus communi centuriisque consueverant.
13 Salvianus Massiliensis (about 450) de Gubernat. Dei, viii. 4: Ita igitur et in monachia. -Afrorum probatur odium, quia iuridicabunt sicilicet, quia maledicent, quia insectabuntur, quia detestabuntur, quia omnia in illis paene fecerunt, quae in salvatorum nostrum Judaeorum impietas. Intra Africam civitatis, et maxime intra Cartaginiae muros, palliatum et pallidum et recidis comarum fluentium jubis usque ad cutem tonsum videre tam infelix ille populus quam infidelis sine convito atque excratione vix poterat. Et si quando aliquis Dei servus, aut de Aegeotyporium coenobii, aut de sacris Hierusalemm locis, aut de sanctis cremi venerandisque secretis ad urbem illum officio divini operis accessit, simul
The mode of life of the western monks was far less strict than that of the eastern; partly in consequence of the climate, and partly out of regard to the general feeling of the people. Another important point of difference was that the monks in the west soon abandoned mechanical labor. Here also there was not uniformity among them. Besides the monks and nuns who lived in convents, some wandered about, others led an ascetic life, occasionally at considerable expense, in the cities; others imitated the most striking asceticism of the orientals, frequently indeed only in appearance.

ut populo apparuit, contumelias, sacrilegia et maledictiones excipit. Nec solum hoc, sed improbissimis flagitiosorum hominum cachinnis et detestatibus ridentium sibiis quasi tauraeis caedebatur.

Sever. Sulp. Dial. i. 8: Edacitas in Graecis gula est, in Gallis natura. Cassian de Institut. coenob. i. 11: Nam quaeque caligis nos, quaeque colobis, seu una tunica esse contentious hiemis permittit asperitas: et parvisimis cuculli velamen, vel melotes gestatio deriium potius, quam aedificationem ullam videntibus comparabit.

Sev. Sulp. Vita Mart. c. 10, of the monastery at Turovum: Ars ibi excipit scriptoribus nulla habebatur: cui tamen operi minor aestas deputabatur: magiores orationi vacabant. Yet Augustine de Opere monachorum (cf. Retractii. ii. c. 21), and Cassian de Institut. coenob. lib. x. recommended the monks to resume manual labor.

As in the east, so there were also in the west, tot propemodum typi ac regulae, quot cellae ac monasteria (Cassian. Instit. ii. c. 9). After Rufinus had translated the rules of St. Basil into Latin, they were observed in many monasteries.

Cassianus de Institutione coenobiorum, x. 23: In his regionibus nulla videmus monasteria tanta fractrum celebritate fundata (as in Egypt), quia nec operum suorum facultatibus fulcuntur, ut possint in eis jugiter perdurare: et si eis suppeditari quoquomo valent sufficientia victus alterius largitiae, voluptas tamen ostii et pervagatio cordis diutius eos in loco perseverare non patitur. Augustin. de Opere monach. c. 28: Callidissimam hostis tan multis hypocritas sub habita monachorum usqueque disperdit, circumcunctas provincias, nasquam missos, nasquam fixos, nasquam stantos, nasquam sedentes. Alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrums, venditant, aliis fingiis et phylacteria sua magnificant: et omnes petunt, omnes exigunt aut summas lucrosae egestatis, aut simulatas pretium sanam titatis. C. 31: Ilili venalem circumfrentes hypocrisin, timent ne vilior habeatur tonsa sanctitas quam comata, ut videelicet qui eos videt, antiquos illos quoque legimus cogitum, Samuelis et caeteris qui non tondabant.


§ 97.

RELATION OF THE MONKS TO THE CLERGY.

The monks, as such, belonged to the laity, the convents forming separate churches whose presbyters were usually abbots standing in the same dependent relation to bishops as did the other churches with their people. As monachism was considered the perfection of Christianity, it was natural to choose clergymen from the monks. At first the stricter monks were much dissatisfied with this arrangement; but the aversion to it soon ceased, and even at the end of the fourth century, monastic life was considered to be the usual preparation, and monachism the nursery for the clergy, especially for bishops.

The idea of transferring monachism, as much as possible, entirely to the clergy, was natural in these circumstances; and it was especially adopted in the west. The venerable Paphnutius had prevented the celibacy of the clergy from being enacted as an ecclesiastical law, in Nicæa; 4 but now this regulation took

1 Altesse. Ascutic. ii. 2. iii. 8. viii. 2.
4 Socrates, i. 11: 'Εδάκει τοις ἐπισκόποις νόμον νεαρόν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εισέρχειν, ὥστε τοῖς ἱεραμένοις, λέγω δὲ ἐπισκόποις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις, μὴ συγκατέθειν τοῖς γαμάτοις, ὅπερ ἔτι λαίκοι οὕτως ἡγάγοντο (just as Can. Illibert. 33, see Div. I. § 73, note 14, and therefore proposed probably by Hosius). Καὶ ἔπειρα προκεῖ τούτον βουλευθῆναι πρὸ κατασκευῆς, διανοοῦντον ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ συλλαγόν τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὁ Παφνοῦτος, ἔβαλεν μικρά, μὴ βαρῶν ζυγῶν ἔπειραν τοῖς ἱεραμένοις ἀνθρώποις, τίμων εἰς καὶ τὴν κοιλίν καὶ αὐτὸν ἅμα τοῦ τούτον τοὺς ſαμονί τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσβλάψῃσιν: ὃ γὰρ πάντας δύνασθαι φέρεις τῆς ἀπελής τῆς ὁπελή-
root in the west, first by the influence of Siricius, bishop of Rome (385),4 whom several councils soon followed. Eusebius, bishop of Vercellae († 371), and Augustine went still farther, and united with their clergy in adopting a strictly monastic life.6

4 Epistolae ad Humerum Episc. Tarraconensem, c. 7: Il vero, qui illiciti privilegii excusatone mititur, ut sibi assenter veteri hoc leghe concessum: noverint se ab omni ecclesiastic o honore, quo indigne usi sunt, apostolicas sedes auctoritate dejectos.—Quilibet episcopus presbyter atque diaconus, quod non optamus, dieceps fuerit talis inventus, jam nunc sibi omnes per nos indulgentiae editum intelligent observatum: quia fero necesse est excludantur vulnera, quae fomentorum non senserint medicamentum.—C. 9: Quicumque itaque se eccliae vocit obsequi a sua iunfania, ante pubertas amos baptizari, et lectorum debet ministerio sociari. Qui ab accessu adolescensus usque ad tricennium actatis annum, si probabilit experit, una tanta et ea, quam virginitem commoni per sacerdotem benedictione percepit, utrique contentus, acolythos et subdiaconos esse debebit; postque ad diaconii gradum, si se ipse primitias continentiae praecense digam probabit, sacexit. Unde si ultra quinque annos landhabilis ministretur, congrue presbyterium consequatur.

Exinde, post decessum, episcopalem cathedram poterit adhibere, si tamen per haec tempora integritas vitat ac fidei ejus fuerit approbata.—C. 13: Monaches quoque, quos tamen morum gravitas et vitae fidei instituto sancta commendant, clericorum officiis aggregari et optamus et volumus. In the middle ages it was constantly admitted that this lex Ecclesiastica had been unknown to the primitive church. See Calixtus, l. c. p. 3, ss. 304. Many, however, believed it to be the meaning of Conc. Nicanii, can. 3 (according to Dionys. Exig. translation: Interdixit per omnia magna synodus, non episcopo, non presbytero, non diacono, nee aliqui omnino qui in clero est, licere subintrodutam habere ministerium, nisi forte aut matrem, aut sororem, aut amantem, vel eas tantum personas, quae suspicionem effugiantem). Cf. Aelfrici canones, a.d. 970 (Wilkins. Concil. Magn. Brit. i. p. 250), c. 5: At the Nicon synod statuerunt omnem unanimitatem, quod neque episcopus, neque presbyter, neque diaconus, nee ulius versus canonicus habeant in domino suum uxorinem aliquam, nisi matrem, etc. Benedictus VIII. in Conc. Ticinensi, between 1014 and 1024 (ap. Mansi, xix. p. 344): Nicanii patres non solam convicium, sed etiam cum mulieribus habitacionem clericis omnis interducunt. So also Alfonso a Castro († 1550), l.t. Sacerdotii: Conseguendo, juxta quam matrimonio alligatis promovestur ad sacerdotium, invioluit usque ad tempora Nicanii concilii, in quo, ut fertur, generali decreto statutum est, ne aliquis uxoribem habens consecratur sacros. Quod statutum cum ab aliquibus minime ut decebat observaretur, Siricius Papa de haec re illos accurisse reprehendit.


6 Respecting Eusebius see Ambros. Ep. 63, ad Vercellenses, § 66: Haec enim primus

though at first they found no imitators. But we may see how difficult it was to carry out the law of celibacy, though Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, strongly advocated it, from the frequent repetition of the law, and the mildness with which it was found necessary to punish transgressors. Still Leo the Great extended the requisition even to the sub-deacons (subdiaconi).

In the east, on the other hand, the Eustathians were opposed for their very rejection of marriage in the case of priests, and no law of celibacy was generally adopted. It was the custom, indeed, toward the end of the fourth century, in several prov-


7 Synchron Ep. ad Episc. Afr. (A.D. 386) c. 3. Conc. Carthagi. (390) can. 2. Innocent. I. Ep. ad Vitriiciun (404) cap. 9. Conc. Taurin. (397) can. 8. Carthage. v. (398) can. 3. Toletan. i. c. 400) can. 1, etc. Conc. Turenensis i. (401) can. 2: Licet a patribus nostris missa auctoritate id fuerit constitutum, ut, quicumque sacerdos vel levita filiorum procreationem operam dare fuisse convinxerit, a commune domini actus abstineretur: nos tamen in his distinctionis moderationem adhaerentes, id justum constitutum esse, id decretum, ut sacerdos vel levita conjugal consuplentiae imitetur, vel a filiorum procreationes non destines ad altiorum gradum non ascendat, neque sacrificium Deo offerit vel plebi ministre praesumat.

8 Leo Ep. 14 ad Anastas. Episc. Thessalon. (A.D. 446) c. 4. Still this was by no means general till the times of Gregory the Great. See Caesarius, l. c. p. 380, sq.

incomes, to select the unmarried for bishops; and in some of these this was extended even to the clergy in general, but in most parts, all clergymen had the liberty of living in wedlock.

FIFTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 98.

The church had triumphed over heathenism. It had acquired riches, external influence, and power. The effect of this was seen in the increasing splendor of its ceremonial. At the same time, a great number of those who now pressed into the church brought with them that purely external tendency peculiar to heathen religions, which turned on the sensuous forms of worship, partly with a one-sided aesthetic interest, and partly


11 Examples of married bishops in the fourth century. Calixtus, p. 258, ss. Theiner, i. S. 263, ss. Gregory of Nazianzum was born when his father was a priest, for he makes him say, Carmen de vita sua, v. 512:

Οὗτις τοσοῦτον ἐκμηρμέρηκας βιον,
ὤσς διήλθε θυσίων ἔμαι χρόνος.

with a superstitious veneration. Even those who were capable of higher views yielded to this tendency, either that the pagans might be the more readily won over to Christianity, or from a desire to show honor to a supposed pious intention. But in proportion as the internal life evaporated from the Church, and its external reputation increased, the more usual did it become to impress the character of a law externally binding on ecclesiastical usages which had been gradually developed. Thus the entire ecclesiastical life was overburdened with forms which were merely tolerated at first, but finally converted into laws.

§ 99.

NEW OBJECTS OF WORSHIP.

Jo. Dallacinus adversus Latinorum de cultus religiosi objecto traditionem. Genevae. 1664. 4.

Martyrdom, which presented so strong a contrast to the lukewarmness of the present time, was the more highly venerated in proportion to its remoteness. The heathen converts naturally enough transferred to the martyrs the honors they had

1 This irritation of heathen usages into the church is acknowledged as early as Baptista Mantuanus in Fastis mense Febr. et Novembr. Beatus Rhenanus ad Tortoll. contra Marc. lib. v. and de Corona militis, Polydorus Vergilius de Rerum inventoris, lib. v. c. 1, Baronius ann. 58, § 76, ann. 200, § 5. It has been shown more at length by (Massard) les Conformitez des Ceremonies modernes avec les anciennes. (Londres) 1667. 8 (new edition, Amsterdam. 1744); Conyers Middleton a letter from Rome, showing an exact conformity between Popery and Paganism (London. 1753. 8); Jo. Maragonius Delle cose gentilesche e profane transportato ad uso e ad ornamento delle chiese. Rom. 1744. 4 (comp. the continuation of the same, 1759, S. 511, ss.); Ge. Christ. Hamberger Enarratio rituum, quos Romanam ecclesiam a majoribus suis gentilibus in sua sacra transituli. Gotting. 1751 (reprinted in J. P. Berg Museum Daisburgense, t. i. P. ii. p. 363, ss.). John James Blunt Vestiges of ancient Manners and Customs, discoverable in modern Italy and Sicily. London. 1833.

2 Leo M. Sermo 77, de Jejun. Pentecost. 2: Dubitantum non est, quicquid ab Ecclesia in consuetudinem devotionis est receptum, de traditione apostolica, et de Sancti Spiritus prodire doctrina.


2 To which even the apologists of the day contributed. Eusebius Praep. evang. xiii. c. 11, cites a passage of Plato concerning the worship of demons, and then continues: Καὶ ταῖς δὲ ἀρμοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς θεοφόλου τελέσθη, οὕς στρατιωτᾶς τῆς ἀληθείας εὐφράσιον οὐκ ἐν ἁμάρτως εἰσέλθων, παραλκημένων. Ἡθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θεοίας αὐτῶν Ἰωάννης ἡμῶν παρέμιερ, καὶ τὰς εὐχάς παρὰ τῶν συνεισθα, τιμῶν τε τὰς μακραίς αὐτῶν ψυχῶς, ὡς εὐλόγως καὶ ταῦτον ἦν ἡμῶν γεγομένων. Comp. below, note 33.
been accustomed to pay their heroes. This took place more readily as the scrupulous aversion to excessive veneration of the creature died away in the church after the victory over heathenism; and the despotic form of government became accustomed to a slavish respect for the powerful. Thus the old custom of holding meetings for public worship at the graves of the martyrs now gave occasion to the erection of altars and churches (Martyria, Memoria) over them. In Egypt, the Christians, following an old popular custom, began to preserve the corpses of men reputed to be saints in their houses; and since the

3 Respecting the pagan belief that the relics of distinguished men afforded protection to cities and countries, see Lobeck Aglaophamus, t. i. p. 280, a. Thus Aelius Aristides (a rhetorician who lived about 170 A.D.) Orat. ii. ad Platonem, ed. Dindorf vol. ii. p. 230, calls the Greeks who had fallen in battle against the Persians, ἐπιχολοιοῖς τῶν Ἐλλήνων, ἀλεξιούσιοι καὶ σατῆρας τῶν Ἐλλήνων, ἀλεξιούσιοι καὶ σατῆρας τῶν Ἐλλήνων, ἀλεξιούσιοι καὶ σατῆρας τῶν Ἐλλήνων, with various ancient manuscript readings. Respecting Εὔδηππος, Valerius Maximus, i. 3, externa 3: Οὐδεπόδιος οσθὲ—inter ipsum Areopagum et—Minervae arceo honoré arae decorata, quasi sacrosancta, collis. In Greece worship was paid especially to the founders of cities, which were built for the most part over their graves. Thus Antolycus was worshiped in Sinope, Tenea in Tenedos, Εὔκαστος by the Εὔκαστος (Liv. xlv. 4). See others noticed in Voss. de Idolol. i. 13, comp. Thucydides, v. 11, concerning Brasidas: Οἱ Ἀρματιλίται, περιέχειντες αὐτῶν τὸ μνημεῖον, ὡς ἄρισκ τε ἔντερωντες καὶ τιμᾶς δεδώκασιν ἅγιοι καὶ ἑτοιμοῖς τρυπῖσεν καὶ τὴν ἀποκλοῦσαν ἀνακερδίσθησαν.

4 Compare the honors paid to the emperors: their edicts were termed divina, sacra coelestia: their statuas were honored by adoration and frankincense (Zorn, in Miscell. Groning. vol. i. p. 186, ss.). Consultatunm Zachaei Christ. et Apollonii Philos. (after 408) lib. i. c. 28 (in d’Archery Spicileg. i. p. 12): Apollonius: Cur imagines hominum vel coria picta, vel metallis defecta sub Regnum reverentia etiam publica adoratione venerantini, et ut ipsi praedicatis, Deo tantum honorem debuit etiam hominis datis? Zachaeus: Istud quidem nec debeo probare nec possum, quia evidenter Dei dictis non Angloc, nec quaelibet coeli ac terrae vel aries principatus adorare permitterim. Divini enim speciale loc nomen offici est, et alior omnai terrae veneratione reverenter: sed sicut in hujusmodi malum primum adulato homines impulit, sic nunc ab errore conscendo vix revocavit; in quo tamen incautum obsqueum, non aliquem divinum deprehendit cultum. Sed propter similitudinem amabilitatis vulgum gaudia intenta plus facient, quam hi forte excitant, quibus fecerunt, aut perfungi oporteat deferentes; et licet hanc incautiori obscuraque consuetudinem distriptis horreant Christiani, nec prohibere desinent sacerdotes, non tamen Deus dictis cujus effigies salutatur, nec adulentur thure imagines, aut colendas aris superant, sed memoria pro meritis exponuntur, ut exemplum factorum probabilium postea præestent, aut praesentem pra abscionem castigent. A law of Theodosii II. a.d. 425 (Cod. Theod. xv. iv. 1): Si quando nostrae statuae ubi imagines eriguntur,—ad altéx leges sine adorationis ambitiosos fastigio,—excedens cultura hominum dignitatem superum numini reservatur. Cf. de Rhoer Dissertt. de effectu refig. christ. in jurisprud. Rom. p. 41, ss.

5 So called at first by Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 48. So also Constantine, on no higher authority, indeed, than the liber pontificalis, vita 34, Sylvesteri, written about the year 570, is said to have built the basilicae in Rome over the graves of the apostles Peter and Paul. Comp. Jerome, below, note 8. Afterward they were called, too, Ἀποστολειῶν, Προφητειῶν. A practice strongly disapproved by St. Anthony. Comp. Athanasius in vita Antonii (Opp. i. ii. p. 539): Τῶν δὲ ἐκλελθῶν διαζωμένων μεταί τύπων παρ᾽ αὐτῶν, κάκα πετελω-

---
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idea of communion with the martyrs was always increasingly associated with the vicinity of their mortal remains, the latter were drawn forth from their graves and placed in the churches, especially under the altars. Thus respect for the martyrs received a material object to center itself on, and became in consequence more extravagant and superstitious. To the old idea of the efficacy of the martyrs' intercession, was now added the belief, that it was possible to communicate the desires to them directly; an opinion partly founded on the popular notion that departed souls still hovered about the bodies they had once inhabited; partly on the high views entertained of the glorified

θάνα, οὐκ ήνεχτο,—διὰ τοῦτο δὲ μάλαστα· οι Αυξίτικοι τὰ τῶν τελευτάτων σπουδαίων σώματα, καὶ μάλαστα τῶν ἀγίων μαρτύρων φελοῦν μὲν βάντες καὶ περιελάσσον θυσίαις, μὴ κρύστες δὲ ἐν τῷ γῇ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σκηνοθείων τιθέναι, καὶ φιάλεστεν ἐνδον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς νομίζοντες ἐν τούτῳ τιμήν τοῦς ἀπελθόντας. Ὡδ' ἀφετέρων πολλαίς περὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπισκόποις ἢ λίγον παραγέλλειν τοῖς λαοῖς ὁμώς ἐν καὶ λαϊκοῖς ἐνέτρεπτε, καὶ γυναικίς ἐκπέλτησεν, λέγων, μὴ νόμιμον, μὴ τὰς δορὰς δοσιν εἶναι τούτο. Καὶ γὰρ τῶν Πατριαρχῶν καὶ τῶν Προφητῶν σώματα μέχρι τῶν σάρκων εἰς μνήματα, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ τῶν κυρίων σῶμα εἰς μνήμεως ἐντέθη.—Καὶ τοῦτο λέγων ἐδείκνυ, παραμείνει τὸν μετὰ θάνατον μὴ κρύστες τὰ σώματα τῶν τελευτάτων, καὶ ἡ λίγα τυχίνη τί γὰρ μείζων ἢ ἀγάμερον τοῦ κεραυνοῦ σώματος;—Αὐτὸς δὲ τοῦτο γυναῖκις, καὶ φυσικόν, μή καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν παύσαις αὐτῶν σῶμα, ἢπείναι λατοῖς, συντάξαμον τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἑκὼ δρόμοι μοναχοῖς. In like manner Marcian, Theodoret Hist. relig. c. 3 (ed. Schulz. t. iii. p. 1147, s.), and Akepsimas, ibid. c. 15, p. 1521.

7 Translations of the bodies of the saints into churches. The first instances were those of St. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy (359), at the command of Constantine. Hieron. contra Vigilant. (Comp. the discovering and transferring of the bones of Theseus, by Cimon, Plutarch in Thes. ad fin.)


9 See Div. I. § 70, notes 12–81.

10 This was the opinion of the heathen. Cf. Platonis Phaedon; Tibullus, i. 6, 15; Macrobius de Somn. Scip. i. 9, et 13; Porphyrius de Abstin. ii. 47. Lactantius, ii. 2: Vulgus existimavit, mortuorum animas circa tumulos et corporum suorum reliquias oberrare. Cf. Wettstein Nov. Test. 1. p. 334. Hence Conc. Ililbertanum, c. 34: Cereos per diem placuit in coemeterio non incondi: iniquitandic enim spiritus Sanctorum non sunt. Among the spiritual Originists this idea did not naturally meet with acceptance. Cf. Macarri Politici (about 370) Sermon de Excesso justorum et peccatorum, in Cave Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 259, and in T. Toliis Insignia itineria Italici (Traj. ad. Rhen. 1696, 4) p. 196. But comp. Ambrosii de Viduis, c. 9: Martyres obsecrando, quorum videmur nobis quodam corporis pignore patrocinium vindicare,—istis enim sunt Dei martyres, nostri praesales, specula.
state of the martyrs\textsuperscript{11} who alone abide with the Lord. As Origen first laid the foundation of this new kind of respect for martyrs, so the Origenists were the first who addressed them in their sermons, as if they were present and besought their intercession.\textsuperscript{12}

But though the orators were somewhat extravagant

tores vitae, actuumque nostrorum.—Pseudo-Ambrosii (perhaps Maximi Taurinensis about 430) Sermo vi. de Sanctis: 

Cuncti martyres devotissime percedendi sunt, sed specialiter ii venerandi sunt a nobis, quorum religiosis possidemus. Ilii enim nos orationibus adjuvantis, isti etsi adjuvans passione: cum hic autem nobis familiaritas est. Semper enim nobiscum sunt, nobiscum moratur, hoc est, et in corpop nos viventem custoditat, et de corpore recedentes excipiant: hic ne peccatorum labes absuant, ibi ne inferno horrorn invadat.

\textsuperscript{11} So that people attributed to them a kind of omnipresence, as the heathen did to the demons (Hesiodi Opera et Dies, v. 121, ss.; cf. Hieronymus adv. Vigilantiam: "Tu Deo leges ponis? Tu Apostolis vincula injiciis, ut asque ad diem judicii teneretur custodia, nec sunt cum Domino suo, de quibus scriptum est: Soguntur agnos, quoscumque vadit (Apoc. xiv. 4)? Si agnos ubique, ergo, et hi, qui cum agno sunt, ubique esso crecedenti sunt. Gregori Naz. Orat. xviii. in laudem Cyripanic, p. 286: "Si de .productionibus nostris non pater te habeas, non tamen tuum esse capias." Ad 3, 97, and often. Sulpicius Severus Ep. ii. de Obitu b. Martini (ed. Lips. 1709, p. 371): Non decret nobis ille, sibi crede, non decret: interrierit de se saramochiatus, adstabat orantibus: quodque jam hodie praestare dignatus est, videndum se in gloria sua saepere praebetur, et adiutus, sicut ante paullum facit, benedictionem nos proteget. Ep. iii. p. 381: Martini hic pauper et medicus colorem dicens ingreditur: illice nos ut spero custodiemus, me haec scribere sectem respicite et legemem. At first, Vigilantius (404) resisted this opinion (see below, § 106, note 6), and Jerome defended it against him (see above). On this Augustine also combated it, while he endeavored at the same time to defend the practice of praying to the martyrs, which had been already established. Cf. Augustinus de Cur a gerenda pro mortuis (A.D. 421) c. 13: Si rebus viventium intercessunt animae mortuorum, et ipsae nos quando eas videmus allegarentur in somnis; ut de alis taceamus, me ipsum pia mater nulla nostra desereret, quae terra marique secuta est, ut secum viveret.—Isaías prophetæ dicte (lxix. 16): Tu es enim pater nostra: quia Abraham nescivit nos, et Israel non cognovit nos. Si tantù Patriarchae quid erga populum ex hoc procreatum ageretur ignoraverant, quomodo mortui vivorum rebus atque atque cognossendis adjuvandisque misercordia? With regard to the martyrs, he is not indisposed indeed to allow a miraculous exception (cap. 16), but proceeds: Quamquam ista questio vires intelligentiae meæ vincit, quemadmodum opitulentur Martyres ipsis, quos per eos certum est adjuvare; utrum ipsi per se ipsis adsum uno tempore tam diversi locis,—sive uesti sunt corum Memoriarum, sive praeter suas Memorias ubiqueque adesse sentiantur: an ipsis in loco suis meritis congruo ad omni mortalium conversatione remotis, et tamen generaliter orantibus pro indigenæ suppliantium,—Deus—exauditns Martyrum prece, per angelicæ ministeriar? aquaquaque diffum praebet hominibus ista solutud, quibus in hujus vitae miseria judicat esse praebenda: et suorum merita Martyrum, ubi vult, quando vult, quando quod, maximeque per eorum Memorias, quoniam hoc navit expedire nobis ad aulificandum fidem Christi—mirabili atque ineffabil potestate ac bonitate commendar. Res haec siher est, quam ut a me positum sittingi, et abstrusor, quam ut a me valeat perscrutarsi: et ideo quid horum dorum sit, an vero fortassius utrumque sit, ut ali quando fiant per ipsam praesentiam Martyrum, aliquando per Angoles suscipientes personam Martyrum, dicntire non audic: mallem a scientibus ista perquirere. Cf. de Civit. Del. xxii. c. 9. In his sermons he does not attach the usual opinion, ex. gr. sermon de Diversis 316 (al. 94): Ambo (Paulus et Stephanus) modo sermonem nostrum anistis: ambo pro nobis orate.

\textsuperscript{12} Basilii M. Hom. 19, in xl. Martyres, § 8: O őtői eliso o őr őn kal hιμας χώρας.
in this respect, the poets, who soon after seized upon the same theme, found no colors too strong to describe the power and glory of the martyrs. Even relics soon began to work miracles, and to become valuable articles of commerce on this account, like the old heathen instruments of magic.

In proportion as men felt the need of such heavenly intercessors, they sought to increase their number. Not only those persons who were inscribed in the Diptycha* for services done to the church, but also the pious of the Old Testament, and particularly distinguished monks, were taken into the cata-

* Diptycha. In Reces's Cyclopaedia, Diptycha are explained to be “a double catalogue, in one whereof were written the names of the living, and in the other those of the dead, which were to be rehoarsed during the office.”
logue; and thus a still more comprehensive saint-worship arose out of the veneration paid to martyrs.\textsuperscript{16} Martyrs before unknown announced themselves also in visions; others revealed the places where their bodies were buried. Till the fifth century, prayers had been offered even for the dead saints;\textsuperscript{17} but at that time the practice was discontinued as unsuitable.\textsuperscript{18} It is true that the more enlightened fathers of the church insisted on a practical imitation of the saints in regard to morality as the most important thing in the new saint-worship,\textsuperscript{19} nor were
exhortations to address prayer directly to God also wanting; but yet the people attributed the highest value to the intercession of the saints whose efficacy was so much prized. Many heathen customs were incorporated with this saint-worship. Churches, under whose altars their bodies were rested, were dedicated to their worship. As gods and heroes were formerly chosen

sentimus. At vero illo cultu, qui græce latría dicitur, latine uno verbo dici non potest, cum sit quaedam proprie divinitatis debita servitus, nec colimus, nec colendum docemus, nisi unum Deum.

20 Ambrosianæ ad Rom. I. 22, against those who adored the elements, the stars, etc.: Solent tamen pudorem passi, neglegent Dei misera uti excussione, dicentes per istos posse iri ad Deum, satis per comites pervenitur ad regem. Αγο, numquid tam demens est alquis, aut salutis suae inmenor, ut honorificantiam regis vindicet comiti, cum de hac re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnum pro manestia? Et isti se non potant record, qui honorem nominis Dei defuerant creaturœ, et relitto Domino conservar adorns; quasi sit aliquid plus, quod reservaret Deo. Nam et ideo ad regem per tribunos um comites itur, quia homo utique est rex, et nescit quis debeat republícam credere. Ad Deum autem, quem utique nihil latet (omnia enim merita novit), promerendum suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota. Ubicunque enim talis loquitur fuerit ei, respondebit illi. So Chrysostomus in Matth. Hom. 52 (al. 53), § 3, annexes to the history of the woman of Canaan (Matt. xv. 21), the admonition: Σοι δέ μοι εκάστοι, πότες τῶν ἀποστόλων ἠττηθέντων καὶ οὐκ ἀνυμινων, αὕτη ἡμεῖς. τοσοῦτον ἵστη προσδέρκω εὔχης καὶ γὰρ ἐπέρ τῶν ἡμιτίρων παρ’ ἡμῶν βοήθει μᾶλλον τῶν ἐπευθύνων ἐξουσια- θης ἢ παρ’ ἐξερήμων ἀπέρ ἡμῶν. Cf. de Sacralitania orat. iv. 1: (ὁ θεὸς) χορεῖ μετόν παρακαλεῖντα. Comp. Cramer’s dritte Fests. und Bossnet, S. 350, sq.

21 Ambrosianus de Víduis, c. 9: Legri, nisi ad eos aliorum precibus medicus fuerit invitatus, pro se rogare non possunt. Infirma est caro, mens negra est et peccatorum vinculis impedita, ad medicinì illius sedem debile non potest explicare vestigium. Obscendanti sunt Angeli pro nobis, qui nobis ad praesidium dati sunt, martyres obscendanti, quorum videmur nobis quodam corporis pignore patrocinium vindicare. Possunt pro poecatis rogere nostris, qui proprio sanguine etiam si qua habuerant peccata lavaret. Iste enim sunt Dei martyres, nostri praesules spectaculares vitae actuales nostrorum. Non erubescamus eos intercessores nostrae infirmitatis adhibere, etc. Even Chrysostom recommends (de Sancto martyr. Serm. 68. Opp. v. 872), the worship of martyrs and their relics as a means of procuring the forgiveness of sins, and virtues.

22 The churches were still named in different ways, many after their founders (so in Carthage the basilicae Fausii, Florentii, Leontii, in Alexandria the ecc. Arcadii [the old Serapeum], in Rome the basilicae Constantini and Justinianii), others from other circumstances, thus in Carthage basilica restituta, in Alexandria the Caesareum, in Rome the ecc. triumphalis (the old Church of Peter), ecc. Laterane (because on the site of the palace of Lateranæ, a contemporary of Nero), see Bingham, vol. iii. p. 329. Thus although originally the calling of churches after martyrs did not denote that they were dedicated to them, yet the meaning attached to the names came gradually to be so understood, and even the distinctions made by Augustine admit of this acceptation, comp. de Civitate Dei, xxii. 10: An dicent, etiam se habere deos ex hominibus mortuis, sicut Herculæum, sicut Romulum, sicut alios multos, quos in deorum numerum receptos opinantur? Sed nobis Martyres, non sunt dili.—Nos Martyribus nostris non templum sicut dili, sed memorias sicut hominibus mortuis, quorum apud Deum vivunt spiritus, fabricamus; neque ibi igitur altaria, in quibus sacrificium Martyribus, sed un Deo et Martyrum et nostro sacrificia immolamus: ad quod sacrificium, sicut homines Dei, qui mundum in ejus confessione vicerant, suo loco et ordine nominantur, non tamen a sacerdote qui sacrificat invocatur. Deo quippe, non ipsis, sacrificat, quasvis in memoria sacrificiæ eorum. Cf. vü. 37.
for patrons, so patron-saints were now selected. And since the heathen had been so bitterlyaccused at an earlier period by the Christians of worshiping dead men, they could not now be blamed in their turn for ridiculing the new saint-worship.

In the fourth century no peculiar reverence above other saints was as yet shown to the Virgin Mary. In consequence of monastic ideas (see § 95, note 23), the Christians merely attributed a high value to her perpetual virginity; and for this reason began to declare the opinion that she had afterward borne children to Joseph to be heretical; as, for instance, Epiphanius

---

23 Theodoretii Graec. affect. curat. disp. 8 (ed. Schulzcz, t. iv. p. 902): Αἱ μὲν γενναία τῶν νικηφόρων φύσιν πεποιθοῦσα τῶν οὐρανῶν——τὰς σώματα, οὐχ εἰς ένός κατακρίπτει τάφος εκάστου, ἀλλὰ σώλες καὶ κόμοι ταῦτα διανειμένα, σωφρίας καὶ ψυχῶν καὶ σώματων, καὶ λατρείας διαμόρφωσεν καὶ ὡς πολυτιμώδες τιμῶν καὶ φάλλας· καὶ χρόνων προσβέντας πρὸς τῶν τῶν ὅλων δεσπότηρην, διὰ τοῦτο τῆς θείας κομίζομεν ωρείς. Page 921: Οἱ δὲ γέγονα τῶν καλλικράτων μαρτυρῶν σηκόν, λυπηρόντας καὶ πείραττος, καὶ μεγάλης διαπερπείς, καὶ παντοδαπῆς πεποιθοῦσιν, καὶ κάλλους δόξαν καὶ κύριον. Εἰς τούτοις ὁ μὲν έκ μηκέτης εἰς τὸ τούτος δεσπότης τοῦ δικείους προσφέρομεν· καὶ οἱ μὲν θυγατέρες αὐτοῖς τῆς θείας τῆς πολυτιμώσας· ἀλλὰ πολλὰς καὶ στεφάνους παλαιοὺς· τοῖς τῶν παθητῶν ἐπολλαγήν· αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ κατά αὐτούς παῖδες, καὶ στεφάνους παρακαλουσι. Εἴπα οὖν· καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰς τινα ἀπόδικη τηλεμάχοι, λυπηροὶ τούτοις ξυνοδοτοῦσας γεγονόντα, καὶ τῆς ὀδού ήγεμόνοις· οἱ δὲ τῆς ἐπανόδων τετυγχάτως· τῆς τῶν χρόνων ἡμέρας προσφέρομεν· οὔτως δὲ θείας αὐτοῖς προσφέρετε· ἀλλάς δὲ θείας ἀνθρώπους προσβεθεῖτε· καὶ γεγονός προσβεθεῖτε υπὲρ σοφῶν παρακαλοῦντες· ὅτι τοῖς τούτοις άνθρωποις αὐτοῖς τοὺς θείης τούς, τοῖς ταῦτα, τῶν τούτοις εὐθυγέμονας παλαιοὺς. Page 923: Τὸς γὰρ οἰκείους νεκροῖς ὁ Δεσπότης ἀντεισῆξε τοὺς υἱοίς τὸις θείοις· καὶ τοὺς μὲν φροντίδος ἀπέφηνε, τοῦτοις δὲ τὰ εἰκόνων ἀπένεμε γέρα· ἀντὶ γὰρ δὴ τῶν Παν- δίων, καὶ Μισσίων, καὶ Διονυσίων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὄνομα βορτῶν, Πέτρων καὶ Πάουλου καὶ Θεοτόκος καὶ Τιμίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μαρτυρῶν· επιτέλουτος δομοφονια, κ. τ. λ. Comp. Neander's Chrysostomus, Bd. 2, S. 128 ff. 24

24 Arnobius adv. Gentiles, vi. 6: Multa ex his templis—comprobatur, contegere cineres atque ossa, et funerum esse corporum se, etc.


26 Basilius M. Hom. in sanctam Christi generationem, c. 5 (Opp. t. ii. p. 598), remarks, however, on Matth. i. 25: Ὅσο ἐγινόμασιν αὐτῶν, ἐκεῖ οὖ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱόν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον the following τούτο δὲ ἥξι ὑπόνοιαν παρέχει, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ καθάρος ὑπερτερήσασθαι τῇ γενήσει τῶν κυρίων τῷ ἐπετελεσθείᾳ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, τὸ νεκρομενικόν τοῦ γάμου ἤμα μὴ ἀπροφασμένος τῷ Μαρίας· οἷς εἶ δέ, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλαμβάνειται λόγον (μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὑπερτερίας ἀναγκαία ἡ παρενια, τὸ δ' ἐξῆς ἀποκεφαλήσατον τὸ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου) ὡς δὲ τὸ μὴ καταδεχθεῖται τῶν φυλοχωρίων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπασαντι αὐτῆς ἡ ἡθονία, ἐκείναις ἡγομεν ἡ τοῦ κυρίως αὐτῆς.
(Haer. 78) against the 'Antidikomarianitai, in Arabia (367); Jerome against Helvidius, in Rome (383); 27 and the Macedonian bishops against Bonosus, bishop of Sardica (392); 28 while it was also shown in what way she did not cease to be a virgin, notwithstanding the birth of Christ. 29 Besides, the teachers of the Church in the fourth century did not refrain from speaking of the faults of Mary; 30 and Epiphanius includes certain enthusiastic women in his catalogue of heretics for their extravagant adoration of the Virgin (Kolluvridiarioi). 31 The Nestorian controversy first led men to set her at the head of the host of saints, as the mother of God, theotokoς. 32

Though it was the general belief that angels guarded men, and presented their prayers to God, it was still thought unali-

31 Concerning them Epiphanius. Haer. 78, § 23. Haer. 32. Anacrephal. c. 79. Comp. Walch's Ketzehistorie, iii. 633. F. Münter de Collyridianis in the Miscellanea Hafniensia, t. i. fasc. 2. Hafn. 1818, p. 153, as. Their heresy was: 'Αυτι θεω ταύτην παρεσώζειν προσωθεῖσαν—ὡς εἰς νόμο τῆς ἀπεσχέσθην κοιλυρία τοῖς ἐπιτελεῖσθαι καὶ συνάγεσθαι ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτά, καὶ εἰς νόμο αὐτῆς λειτουργεῖν διὰ γενεαλ. This usage is perhaps explained by Jerem. xlviii. 19, where the women offer cakes to the Queen of Heaven: perhaps by Conc. Quinisexti, can. 79: "The birth of the Virgin was ἀλογένος: hence no cake (σεμάδιας) shall be presented at the birthday of Christ proφάσει τιμής λοχείων τῆς ἀγαθοῦ παρθενομυθόρος."
lovable to address them, because of the passages, Coloss. ii. 18, Revelation of John xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9. Ambrose is the first who recommends seeking the intercession of the guardian angel; but as yet the Christians had not adopted a more general worship of angels.

The cross, always a highly honored symbol among Christians, had been more superstition venerated ever since the time when Constantine believed that he owed to it his victory over Maxentius. But after the tradition had spread, from the end of the fourth century, that Helena (326) had discovered the true cross of Christ, relies and even imitations of it began to


23 Ambros. de Siduia, c. 9: Obsecrando sunt angeli, qui nobis ad praeedium dati sunt. See note 21.

24 Augustini Collatio cum Maximino, c. 14 (Opp. vii. 467): Nonne si templum alicui sancto Angelo excellentissimo de lignis et lapidibus faceremus, anathematizarem a vertice Christi et ab Ecclesia Dei, quoniam creaturas exhiberemus eam servitutem, quae uni tantum debetur Deo? In the time of Sozomen there was, it is true, a church in Constantinople, named Michael, but solely for this reason (Sozom. ii. 3): Καθότι πεπίστευται ἐνόθε ἐπιφάνειαι Μιχαὴλ τοῦ θείου Ἀρχάγγελου.

25 But Minucius Felix, c. 29: Cruces nec colimus, nec optamus.

26 Euseb. de vit. Constant. 1. 40; ii. 6-9, 16; iv. 21. Sozom. i. 8, in fine.

27 This story is false. Eusebius de vita Const. iii. 25, relates at great length how the holy sepulcher was cleared out at the instance of Constantine, not of Helena, and the church of the resurrection built over it, but says nothing of the discovery of the cross. Then not till c. 41, ss. does he speak of the journey of Helena to Palestine, and how she built churches at the spot where Christ was born in Bethlehem, and on the locality of the ascension on the Mount of Olives. The Gaul also, who was in Jerusalem A.D. 333, and mentions all the holy places in the city in his Itinerarium (Vetera Rom. Itineraria, ed. P. Wosseling, p. 529), know nothing of the holy cross and its finding. The oldest testimony alleged for it, but which notwithstanding does not speak of Helena, in Cyrilli Hieros. Epist. ad Constantinum, professedly written about A.D. 354, is a later interpolation. It can not have been known before the fifth century, for Jerome, in Catal. s. v. Cyrilus, does not mention it, and Ambrose Orat. de obitu Theodosii, Jo. Chrysostomus Hom. 85 (al. 84), Faustus Nolani Epiat. 31 (al. 11), Rufinus Hist. eccl. x. 7, 8, Socrates, i. 17, Sulpici. Sever. Hist. sacr. ii. 34 are ignorant of it; since otherwise they would not have related the circumstances of the finding, and especially the recognition of the true cross so differently. The
work miracles, became objects of the highest adoration, and were finally put on altars.

Helena set the first example of a pilgrimage to Palestine, which was soon extensively imitated. By this means ideas of the holiness of that country had increased so much, even to the grossest superstition, that many teachers of the Church openly discouraged these pilgrimages.

Aversion to pictures ceased among Christians in the fourth century. They allowed not merely likenesses of emperors, but also sacred objects, images, and stains, etc.

叙述的Sozomen ii. 1) first speaks of this letter of Cyril. The conclusion of it, in which the emperor is designated as διος εν την ἡμετέρων τριάδισ is decidedly adverse to its authenticity. For Cyril, in the time of Constantius, was not an adherent of the Nicene faith, and that this emperor was not so might have been unknown a considerable time after, in different places. Comp. Dullaeus adv. Latinorum de cultus religiosi objecto traditionem. Genevae, 1664. 4. p. 704. Witsiis Miscellan. sacra, ii. 364.

51 Paulinus Nolanius Ep. 31 (al. 11): The bishop of Jerusalem alone could bestow splinters of the cross, ad magnam fidei et benedictionis gratiam. Quoque quidem crucem in materla inunctata vivum vivam tenens, ita ex illo tempore innumeros pascere quotidianum hominum votis lignum saum commodatum, ut detrimenta non sentiatur, et quasi intacta permaneat.


53 Partly in order to be baptized in Jordan (Euseb. de locis Ebr. s. v. Ἐβραϊκά), which was also the purpose of Constantine (Euseb. de vit. Const. iv. 69); but also attracted by the marvelous and the love of relics. Paulinus Nol. Ep. 11: The holy cross was shown only at Easter, nisi interdum religiosissimi postulent, quia hunc tantum causa illo peregrinati adverrent, ut sibi ejus revelatio quasi in pretium longinquae peregrinationis defecerat. Epist. 36: Religiosa cupitudo est loca visenda, in quibus Christus ingressus est, et passus est, et unde descendit: et aut de ipsis locis egressum pulvere, aut de ipsis Crucis ligno aliquid saltem festuca similire sumere et habere, beneficio est. As τω ωμο υ του εις τοιουτον δοκοι καταρρυσθεί να ποταμονα σεντεδειο, και εντεμεναι αποτελον, και εντεμεναι, και οντος αυτος, και χαορια, και ουχαρια, και ειδολολατρεια, και φαρμακεια, και φθονοι, και φωναι.
but also of other distinguished men.44 On the other hand, it was still reckoned a heathen custom to represent objects of worship by pictures.45 At first, allegorical representations of sacred doctrines, and historical pictures taken from the Scriptures or from the history of martyrs, were allowed in the churches. Of these the earliest instances in the east are mentioned by Gregory of Nyssa;46 in the west, by Paulinus, bishop of Nola (409–

44 Thus the Christians of Antioch had likenesses of their bishop Meletius († 381) even during his lifetime, on the seals, rings, vessels, and walls. See Chrysostom Orat. encomiastica in S. Meletium, Opp. ii. 519.

45 See Div. I. § 70, note 5. Euseb. Caesariensis Ep. ad Constantium. (Conc. Nicaeni, ii. actio 6. Published more complete by J. Boivin in the notes to Nisaepohi Gregorius Byzant. Histor. ed. Boun. t. ii. p. 1301) 'Επει δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν εἰκόνων ὡς ὧν τῆς Χριστιανῆς γεγραμμένα, εἰκῶνα βασιλεύουσα σωτῆρα ἡμῶν περὶ φήματά την τίνα λέγει καὶ ποιών ταῖτην, ἧν φόρος τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκώνα γραφόμενος ἡ τάσις εἰρικίας καὶ ἀμήλλατος, καὶ φόρος τούτου αὐτοῦ ηθικής ἢ πρὸς τὴν θάνατον ἢ δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνελθεῖν, τῆς τοῦ δοῦλου μορφῆς περιβλέποντος τὸ σχῆμα · ἄλλα τοῦ πρὸ τῆς μεταβολῆς σαρκίματος αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ θανάτου τῆς εἰκόνας φησὶ παρὰ ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ· ἀρα γιὰ τοῦτο σοὶ μόνον ἅλλον ἄλλο

46 In the Euch. not. cit. p. 93, he describes a picture of the sacrifice of Isaac. (Augustin. contra Faustum, xxil. 73: Factum ita nobilis,—ut tot linguis cantatum, tot locis pictum, et aures et oculas
431, A.D.). Such pictures were not intended to be worshiped, but were merely for instruction and stimulus. The likenesses of individuals only were capable of leading the minds of the illiterate astray, so as to worship them. The first pictures of this kind which we find in a Gallic Church at the end of the fifth century do not, it is true, imply that they were worshiped; but soon after, superstition connected itself with the likenesses of miracle-working persons, which were placed in houses. Under Leo the Great, we find the first picture of Christ in a Romish Church.


47 Paulin. Natal. ix. Feliciaus:

Propterea visum nobis opus utile, totius
Felicius dominus pictura illudere sancta:
Sic forte attonitas haec per spectacula mentes
Agrestum caperet fucata coloribus umbra, etc.


48 Nilus (see § 85, note 1) advised the Eparch Olympiodorus who intended to build a Martyrium and to adorn it with a number of pictures (lib. iv. Ep. 61): 'Εν τῷ ἱερατεύω μὲν κατὰ ἀναγορά τοῦ θεοτόκου τεμένως ἕνα καὶ μόνον τιμῶσαι στάφυλον; δι' ἐνός γὰρ σωματικῶς σταφυλὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων διασαζέται γένος, καὶ τοῖς ἁπλοπομένοις ἐλπὶς παντοχωρ εκχύομεσται; ἵθελον δὲ παλαιὰς καὶ νέας διαθήκης πληροῖαι ἐνθεῖ καὶ ἐνθεῖ χειρὶ καλλάσταν ζωγράφων τοῦ νῦν τοῦ ἀγίου, ὥσπερ ἂν τίνα ἐδώτος γράμματα, μηδὲ ἀνάμευσα τοὺς τειχοὺς ἀναγγέλλεις γοργός τῇ θεωρήσει τῆς ζωγραφίας μνήμην τε λαμβάνων τῆς τοῦ γεροῦ τῷ ἄλλην ἡμῶν ἄδοξον καὶ ἄγαθον Καθίσας, καὶ πρὸς ἀμάλλων διεγείρων τῶν εὐθείων καὶ λαμβάνων ἀριστερὰς, δι' ἐν τῆς γῆς τῶν οἰκίων ἀπαλλάξαστον.

Severus caused pictures of Martin of Tours and Paulinus of Nola to be brought into the baptistery of the church in Bourges, while the former was probably alive, the latter, certainly so. Paulin. Sel. Ep. 32. Cf. Bingham, vol. iii. p. 305.

49 Thus Augustine mentions pictures of Peter and Paul (de Consensu evangel. i. 10), but says of them: Sic omnino errare meruerunt, qui Christianum et Apostolos eum non in sanctis codicibus, sed in pictis parietibus quaesierunt. Comp. de Moribus ecc. cath. i. 34: Novi, multos esse sepulchorum et picturam adorantes. Nunc vos illud admoine, ut aliquando Ecclesiae catholice malolicere desinatis, vituperando mores hibernae, quos et ipsa condemnant, et quos quotidian tuquam malos filios corrigeare studet. According to Theodoret Hist. relig. c. 26 (ed. Schultze, iii. 1372), Simeon Styliates was held in such honor at Rome even during his lifetime, δε εν ἀπαί τοις τοῦ ἐγγαστρίων προσπαθειοι εἰκώνοις αὐτῷ βραχεῖας ἀναστήσας, φιλακτὴν τινα φιλον αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐσφάλειν ἐνέθεσθαν ποιότητας.

According to Severianus (about 490) an opponent of Chrysostom, subsequently bishop of Gabala (Tract. in s. crucem in S. Jo. Chrysost. de Eundemis libris, lib. etc. ed. Franc. Combeles. Paris. 1656. 8. p. 129), the cross is η τοῦ ιδιωτῶν бασιλέως εἰκών. In the churches of Paulinus of Nola, Christ appears only in the symbolic form of the lamb at the foot of the cross. In the mosaic picture belonging to the S. Maria Maggiore, the oldest extant, which was made under Sixtus III., 432-440, a throne with a book roll, and behind it a cross, forms the central point. In the background, Christ appears only as a child, in historical representations from the accounts of his childhood. In the Basilica of St. Paul, which was built under Leo I., in the picture of the triumphal arch he is first made to occupy the exact center as a Savious (see die bildl. Darstellungen im Sanctuarium d.
§ 100.

PLACES AND TIMES OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Since basilicae\(^1\) had frequently been converted into churches after the time of Constantine, and churches had been built in the form of basilicae,\(^2\) the name basilica was also the more readily transferred to the churches themselves,\(^3\) because it was susceptible in this instance of a signification so appropriate. The churches, now large and splendid, were divided into three parts: the νάφον\(^\text{1}\) (πρόναος, ferula) porch, from which the beautiful gates, πύλαι ὁπαια (according to Acts iii. 2–10), led into the body of the church, ναός, navis (where was the ἄμβων, pulpitum), which again was divided from the βηθά, sacrarium, sacristy, by cancelli, κυκλίδες, a lattice-work. There were usually other buildings attached to the churches, and especially a baptistery, βαπτιστήριον, with the font, piscina, fonts, κολυμβήθρα. All the buildings were situated in an inclosed court (αἴθρων, αὐλή, atrium), in which was also a reservoir or large vessel of water (κρήνη, cantharos) for washing the hands before entering the church, after the ancient, originally Jewish fashion.

\(^1\) The Roman basilica, an imitation of the στοις βασιλεία in Athens, consisted partly of an oblong four-cornered space, which served principally for a place of merchandise, and partly of a second space situated over against the entrance which formed a semi-circle, and in which a court was held, the so-called tribunal. See Vitruv. v.i. Hirt's Baukunst; iii. 180. Dr. F. Kugler's Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte. Stuttgart. 1842.


\(^3\) Hieronymus Ep. 35; epitaph. Nepotian: basilicas ecclesiae.

Fasts, hitherto voluntary, were now prescribed by the Church. Festival days were more regularly arranged, and, at the same time, multiplied. In the east, the Epiphany was celebrated as the festival both of the birth and baptism of our Lord; in the west, the 25th December had been adopted as the birthday ever since the middle of the fourth century; the cus-

4 The older and more liberal view (see Div. I. § 73, note 1) is still maintained by Victor Antiochenus (about 400), Comm. in Ev. Marci, c. 2 (Bibl. PP. max. t. iv.): Enimvero inter eos, qui in Moyiais, et eos rursum, qui in gratiae lege jejunium dant operam, hoc praeter castera intereunt, quod illi quidem jejunia a Deo praefinita habebant, quae proute modis omnibus explices obligabantur, eijamsi alia nonissent; hi vero virtutis amore, liberaque voluntatis electione jejunant verius, quam ulla legis conectione. Quosdi vero quadragesimale vel aliud quodcumque jejunium definitum habebamus, propter ignaves et negligentes, quo nimium quoque ii officium faciant, praefinitum habebamus. Chryssostomus Hom. iii. in eos qui primo Pascha jejunant. Cassianus Collat. xxi. c. 30: Scendum sane hanc observantiam quadragesimae, quandam ecclesiae illius primitiva perfecto inoviieta permanetit, penitus non fuisse. Non enim praecepti hujus necessitatem nec quasi legale sanctione constricti, arctissimis jejuniorum terminis claudebantur, qui totum annu spatium aequali jejunio concludebant. Socrates, v. 22. On the contrary Epiphanius Haer. lxxv. 6. Expos. fidei, c. 22, derives the Wednesday and Friday fasts from an apostolic arrangement.

Hieronymus Ep. 27 (al. 54), ad Marcellam: Nos unam quadragesimam secundum traditionem Apostolorum, toto nobis orbe congruo, jejunandum. Leo P. Scumm. 43, de Quadrages. 6: Apostolica institutio xl. dieum jejunio implicatur. While in the Oriental church all fasting was prohibited on the Saturday, the custom of fasting on this day arose in the west, especially in Rome, perhaps even in the third century (Neander, i. i. 510: Territiam de Jejun. c. 14, does not, however, prove this. See my remarks in the Theol. Stud. und Kritik. 1833, iv. 1149). In the fourth century, Saturday as a fast day entirely took the place of Wednesday at Rome (Innocent I. Ep. 25, ad Dicentium. c. 4. Augustini Ep. 36, ad Casulanum). Cf. Quon. Dial. de Jejunio Sabbati in Excl. Rom., obsservato, in his edition of the Opp. Leonis, ii. 544.

5 Cassian. Collat. x. c. 2: Intra Aegypti regionem mors iste antiqua traditione sorvatur, ut peracto Epiphaniusor die, quae provinciae illius aequandictes vel dominici baptismi, vel secundum carnem nativitatis esse definiunt, et idcirco utoriusque sacramenti solenimitatem non bifacie, ut in occiduis provinciis, sed sub una diei hujus festivitate concelebrant, epistolare pontificis Alexandrinorum per universas dirigentur Aegypti ecclesias, quius et initium quadragesimae et dies paschae non solus per civitates omnes, sed etiam per universa monastera designatur.

6 According to Epist. Johannis Episc. Nicæini, in the auctor. Bibl. Patr. ed. Cambelius, t. ii. p. 297, and an Anonymous ap. Coterelius ad Constit. Apost. v. 13, which, however, are too modern to be regarded as proper witnesses, although they certainly come near the truth, this day was established by Julius, bishop of Rome (337-339). An expression of his successors, Liberius (352-366) in Salvatoris Natalis is added by Ambrosius de Virginibus, iii. c. 1. Even an ancient Syrian in Assemani Bibl. orient. ii. 164, states that the natalis solis invicti falling on this day (Winter-solstice, according to the erroneous reckoning of the Julian calendar on the 25th December, see Ideler's Chronologie, ii. 349), was the reason why the natalis Christi was assigned to the same day. So also Jo. Harduin (Acta SS. Junei iv. 702, D.) and especially Jablonowski de Origine festi nativit. Christi, diss. ii. § 2 (Opusc. ed. te Water, iii. 349). Even so late as the times of Leo the Great, there were many in Rome quibus hanc die solenimitatis nostrae non tam de nativitatis Christi, quam de novi, ut dicunt, solis ortu honorabilis videatur (Leonis M. Sermo xxi. c. 6). According to Credner de Natalitiorum Christi et rituum in hoc festo celebrandae solemnium origine, in Iilgen's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol. iii. ii. 228, this festival began in Egypt in the fourth century.
tom proceeding from Rome and spreading into the different parts of the empire. This festival began now to obtain in the east; and at last, also (shortly before 431) in Egypt. The Epiphany was observed in addition as the day of baptism, and came to be kept as such even in the west. The celebration of the passover, as customary in Asia Minor, had been rejected at the council of Nice; and since that time, those who still retained it were regarded as heretics, Ῥησουσαμασκαλκτίας, Quartodeci

With respect to the appointment of the Easter festival, they followed for the most part the patriarch of Alexandria; yet not always, especially in the west; and thus Easter was sometimes observed on different Sundays in different provinces. The Paschal festival, which was announced at the

7 For example, in Antioch about 380. Chrysost. Hom. 31, de Natali Christi (ed. Montfau.

8 The first trace of it is in 360, when Julian, according to Ammian. Marcell. xxii. c. 2, celebrated the Epiphany in the church at Vienne. In the west, the commemoration of the arrival of the Magi (l. c. three kings, according to Psalm lxix. 10) and the first miracle in Cana were united with this feast. Bingham, vol. ix. p. 89. Neander, ii. ii. 657, ss.


10 The name first occurs in Conc. Laclid. (about 364) can. 7. Conc. Constant. oec. ii. ann. 381, c. 2. Epiphani. Haer. 50. On the other hand, Philastrius Haer. 87, knows nothing of it.

11 Leoni Ep. 121 (ed. Quesn. 94): Paschalis festum—quamvis in primo semper mense celebrandum sit, ita tamen est nonus cursus conditiones mutable, ut plectumque sacratissimae diei ambiguus occurrat electio, et ex hoc flat plerumque quod non licet, ut non simul omnis Ecclesiae quod nonnisi unum esse oportet observet. Studiernunt itaque sancti Patres occasionem hujus erroris inuerre, omem hanc curam Alexandrinum Episcopo delegantes (qui, nam apud Aegyptios hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita esse videbatur peritam, per quem quotannis diea praeceptacis solemnitate Sedis apostolicae indicaretur, eujus scriptis ad longinquiores Ecclesiae indicium generale percurreret.

12 Ambrosii Ep. 23 (al. 80). On the different paschal cycles see Bingham, vol. ix. p. 99. Idee's Chronologie, Bd. 2. S. 200, ss. In Alexandria a cycle of nineteen years invented by Anatolius was used (ἐννεακαλοκαταρχής). In Rome, to the time of Leo the Great,
Epiphany, was preceded by the Quadragesima (πεντηκοστή) and divided into the πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, hebdomas magna, the great week, in which the feria quinta (ἡ ἀγία πέμπτη), the παρασκευή, and the Sabbatum magnum were distinguished from one another; and into the πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, the week of the resurrection, which ended with the Dominica in albis (κατηκυριακή). This festival was followed by the Quinquagesima (πεντηκοστή), which included the ascension (ἀνάληψις), and ended with pentecost (πεντηκοστή).

The nightly service (vigiliae, παννυχίδες) which preceded the Easter festival was observed with great splendor; but now similar vigils were also annexed to other festivals, especially to those in honor of martyrs.

§ 101.

RITES AND CEREMONIES OF WORSHIP.

Christian worship was now invested with a splendor hitherto unknown. The clergy began to wear a peculiar costume while engaged in holy things. In some of the services lights were and in the west, the cycle of eighty-four years. With the Alexandrians, Easter festival must fall between 23rd March and 23rd April; with the Latins, between the 18th March and the 1st April. Hence there was a difference in the keeping of Easter, and hence arose the discussions respecting it. Ideler, ii. 254, ff. For this reason, Leo M. Ep. 121 (see note 12), applied to the emperor Marcian: Obsecro clementiam vestram, ut studium vestrum praestare dignemini, quatenus Aegyptii, vel si qui sunt ali, qui certam hujus supplicationis videntur habero notitiam, scrupulum hujus sollicitudinis absolvant, ut in eum diem generalis observantia dirigatur, qui nec paternarum constitutionum normam relinquat, nec ultra praefixo terminos evagetur. Quicquid autem pietas vestra de hac consultatione cognoverti, ad meam jubebat mox notitiam pervenire, ut in divinis mysteriis nulla dissanantiae culpa nascatur.

14 Among the Orientalis seven weeks, among the Westerns who fasted also on the Sabbath (see above, note 6) six; in both cases, therefore, thirty-six days. Cassiani Collat. xxi. 24, 25 (qui substantiarum nostrarum omniumque fructum decimas offerre praezipinar, multo magis necessae est, ut ipsius quoque conversationis nostrae, et huius usus, operumque nostrarum decimas offeramus, quae profecto in supplicatione quadragesi-mae implantur), 27, 28. Comp. Socrates, v. 22.


1 All the clergy wore the σταυρόν (vestis alba tunica); bishops, presbyters, and deacons wore over that the ωφάριον (according to Jo. Morinus de sacris Ecclesiae ordinantium, p. 174, ωφάριον, according to Suicer. Thes. codd. ii. 498, ὄψαριαν lat. orarium, afterward Stola), bishops and presbyters over that the ψελάνγιον or ψελάνγιες (planeta, casula; comp. Morinus, p. 176. Suicer. ii. 1492). The ἄσφαριον (pallium) distinguished the bishops in
also used in the day-time; and in the fifth century frankincense began to be employed. More attention was paid to the music. The custom of singing in responses, first introduced into the Church at Antioch, soon spread in the east, and was transferred to the Western Church by Ambrose. The disciplina arcani (distinction between the initiated and uninitiated) reached its highest development in the fourth century, but afterward gradually disappeared as heathenism ceased. Public worship (λειτουργία, missa) was divided on account of it into several

the east; in the west it was not yet in use (cf. Portach de Origine, usa et auctoritate pullii archiepiscopalis. Helstn. 1754. 4. p. 91, sq.). That no tonsure was ever practiced either by monks or clergymen may be inferred from Hieronymus ad Ezecch. xlv. 20 : Quod sequitor; caput suum non radet nec commum nutrient, sed tendentes attende cantum capitum, perspicuus demonstratur, nec rasis capitibis, sicut sacerdotes cultoresque Isidis ac Serapis nos esse debere, nec rursum eum demittere, quod proprie luxuriosorum est, barbarorumque et militantium, sed ut honestus habitus sacerdotum facie demonstratur, etc. Comp. Bingham, vol. ii. p. 413, iii. 50.

2 Before the relics of martyrs, and in the east also during the reading of the Gospel. See Hieronymus adv. Vigilantium. Lactantius (Institut. vi. 2) still mocks the heathens on account of it.

3 The first certain trace of it is found in Pseudo-Dionys. Areop. de Eccl. hier. c. 3. It had been used before as a mark of honor to the emperors. See § 99, note 4.

4 According to Theodoretas H. E. ii. 19. Flavianus and Diodorus, two monks in Antioch, in the time of Constantius, were its originators: Οὕτω πρῶτον, ἔχα δελεόντες τόσης τῶν φαλάλων χρόνος, ἐς διαδοχής βόει τὴν Δαυμικήν ἐθείαν αἰείδον, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Ἀρχιερείᾳ πρῶτον ἔφαμεν πάντως διάδομεν, καὶ κατέλαβε τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ τέρματα. According to Theodore of Moravia in Nicetae Acomin. Thesaurus orthodoxiae, v. 39, they first only translated Antiphonies from the Syriac into Greek; and Socrates, vi. 8, attributes the first introduction of this kind of music to Ignatius (Augusti Diss. de hymnis Hyrornum. Vrat. 1814. 8). Hahn über den Gesang in der syrischen Kirche, in the Kirchenhist. Archive für 1883, iii. 59. The custom of singing in responses was especially diffused by the monks (τὰ ἄντροι, ἀντίφωνα ἔχειν). Comp. generally M. Gerbertus de Cantu et musica sacra (tomi ii. typis San Blasianis, 1774. 4), i. 40. Schöne’s Geschichtsforschungen über die kirch. Gebrauche, ii. 191.


7 Comp. Suiceri Thes. eccl. ii. 220. Bingham, v. 16, particularly the solemnity of the Lord’s Supper, but in other respects every religious service too.

8 Missa, i. e. missio: as remissio, offesa, for remissio, offensio. Avitus (archbishop of Vienne about 490) in Epist. 1.: In Ecclesiis, Palatinae, sive Praeclaria missa fieri pronominatur, cum populus ab observatione dimittitur. In the first part of the service, which consisted of psalms, readings, and sermon, even the unbelieving portion of the people were permitted to join. After their retiring, the proper missa catechumenorum followed, which was a series of prayers, whereby the catechumenus, penitents, and possessed, were dismissed in classes (by the call or ἀκοινόση, περιστάση. μυ τῶν κατεκυμενων, etc. (Cf. Conc. Carthag. iv. ann. 398, can. 84: Ut Episcopius nullum prohibeat ingredi
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parts (missa catechumenorum, and missa fidelium), and received more definite formularies.

Baptism, now preceded by uction, was frequently delayed as long as possible. Against this abuse several teachers of the Church zealously remonstrated. The baptism of infants did

Ecclesiast, et andire verbum Dei, sive gentilem, sive haereticum, sive Judaeum, usque ad missam catechumenorum. Augustini Sermo 40, § 8: Ecce post sermonem ita missa catechumenis: manebant fideles, veniatur ad locum orationis. According to this analogy, the last part of public worship was called missa fidelium, i.e., the service with which the fideles were dismissed, and which ended with the call *apōlύσθητε, i.e., missa est* (this dismissal was among the Greeks, η ἀπόλυσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας). Since the last part was the most important, it was also called in particular missa (cf. Ambrosii Epist. 29, al. 14, ad Marcellinum sororom: post lectiones atque tractatum dimissis catechumenis—missam facere coepit. Finally the name was transferred to every public service. Thus it is applied to the meetings of the monks for prayer, Cassian. Instr. ii. c. 13, missa nocturna, iiii. c. 5, missa canonica.

9 See note 8. The Greeks distinguished the parts of public worship in a different manner. See Conc. Laodic. can. 19: Περὶ τοῦ δὲν ἡδι πρῶτον μετὰ τὰς ὑμιλίας τῶν Ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῶν καταρχομένων ἐκχήν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ μετά τὰ ἐξελθόν τῶν καταχω- μένων τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ τὴν ἐκχήν γίνεσθαι, καὶ τῶν προσελθόντων ἀπὸ χειρὰ καὶ ὑποχωρηθέντων οὗτοι τῶν πιστῶν τὰς ἐκχήν γίνεσθαι τρεῖς—καὶ μετὰ τὸ Προσεχήσω τοὺς οὖν τῇ Ἐπισκόπῳ τὴν ἐκχήν, τότε τοὺς Δαιμόνις τὴν ἐκχήν διδάσκεται, καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἀγαθὰ προσφοράν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.

The arrangement of public worship and single formularies had been already established for a long time; but now there were added to them formularies of prayer too; complete litanies were made, and those of the apostolic services were soon derived from their founders. Proclus Episc. Constantinoep. (about 440) de traditione divinae Missae (in Gallandii Bibl. PP. ix. 680: Πολλοί μὲν τεχνῆς καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀποστόλων διαδεξαμένων θεοῦ τεμένες καὶ διδάσκαλοι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὴν τῆς μυστικὴς λειτουργίας ἔκθενεν ἐγγράφως καταληπτούτες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας παραδεδιδάκται. Εἰ ὡς δὲ πρῶτον οὕτω καὶ διαστήματο τευχέως ὑπάρχοντι ὁ Χριστὸς τὸν κυρίας τῶν Ἀποστόλων μαθήτης καὶ διδάσκον, αὐτῷ τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀποστόλων ὑπογραφήναι. (This is the liturgy found in the Constantin. apost. vii. 16, the oldest extant.) καὶ οἱ θεοὶ Ἰακώβος, οἱ τῆς ἱερο- σολυμίων Ἐκκλησίας τῶν κληρῶν λοχεῖς.—Οὐ δὲ μέγας Βασίλειος μετὰ ταύτα τὸ βάθυνμν καὶ κατωφθέν τῶν ἀνθρώπων θεωρεῖ, καὶ διὰ τούτω τὸ τῆς λειτουργίας μήκους δικοῦντον, —ἐπιτομώτερον παρέδωκε λέγεσθαι. Μετ' οὗ πολλὶ δὲ παλάν ὁ ἡμερῶν πατὴρ τὴν γλώσσαν χαριστήρια—ἐν τῆς τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως ὁμοιώματος ἐφορῶν—τοῖς ἐντίμους, καὶ συντομώτερον τελείατο διετάξατο. In the fifth century the liturgy of Basil had been spread almost over all the east. But in addition to it, that of Cyrillemont also, proceeding from Constantineople, gradually obtained acceptance. The Alexandrians derived their liturgy from Mark, the Romans from Peter, the Milanese from Barnabas and Ambrose. No liturgy of this period, with the exception of that in the Constantin. apost., has been preserved free from alteration. Comp. Leoni Alattii de Libris ecclesiasticis Graecorum, diss. ii. Paris. 1645. 4. (with Fabricius' remarks in the old edition of his Bibliothe. graeca, appended to vol. v.) Jacc. Goar eikologyôn n. rituale Graecorum. Paris. 1647, and Venet. 1730. fol. Eus. Radiodtii Liturgiarum orientalium collectio, t. ii. Paris. 1716. 4. J. A. Assemann Codex liturgicus Eccl. universae, p. vi. Romae. 1749, ss. 4.

not become universal until after the time of Augustine. The
baptism of heretics was still, in the fourth century, rejected
for the most part in the east; and afterward the baptism of
single parties only was excepted. On the contrary August-
ine established the milder practice of the west on firm prin-
ciples.

As to the Lord's Supper, the Christians of that period recog-
nized in it the flesh and blood of Christ, and even spoke of a
transformation; but only in a figurative sense. As this rite

Augustinus de Baptismo contra Donatistas, vi. 47: cae.
us, baptismum Christi, i.e. verbiis evangeliciis consecratum, ubique eundem esse, nec hominum quorumlibet et quilibet
perversitate violari. C. 61: Manifestum est, iniuros, quaedam iniuriam, baptismum quidem posse habere; sed saltem, cujus sacramentum baptismata est, habere non posse.
C. 78: Dicimus, accipientibus non prodesse (baptismum), cum in haereticis accipiant conscientiam hereticam: et ideo veniant ad catholicam paccem atque unitatem, non ut baptismum accipiant, sed ut eis prodesse incipiat quod accipereant.

We find the expressions: metaβαλον, metaβαλλεσθαι, metaβολογοσθαι, metaβαλλεναι (similar expressions with regard to the consecrated oil, Münchener, iv. 387, and the baptismal water; same author, p. 352. Wandelmann, ii. 417), and again, τῆς, ἀντι-

ρυμος, figura, signum. Hence all churches appeal to the fathers in their favor. Comp. especially the dispute between A. Arnauld, P. Nicole (chief work, la Perpétuité de la foi de l'église catholique touchant l'eucharistie, 3 t. 1669-1672; t. 4 et 5, par Ens. Remondot, 1711-1713. 4), and J. Claude (Réponse aux deux traités intitulés: la Perpétuité, etc. Charent. 1666. Réponse au livre de M. Arnauld intitulé: la Perpétuité, etc. Charent. 1671. 2 voll. 8). Clear passages on this subject are: Augustinus Epist. 98 (al. 23), ad

Bonifacium, § 9: Nemo sepe aetatem in aliquo urbe, ut Pascha propinquata dicitur crassinam vel perenniam Domini passionem, cum ille ante saepe annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. None semel immolatus est Christus in se ipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschae solemnitates, sed omni die populi immola-
tur, nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatum est respondere immolato? Si enim sacramenta quaedam simuladdinem earum recum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non habereant, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nominum accipiant. Sicut ergo secundum quaedam modum sacramentorum corpus Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum sibi simile est. Contra Adimantium Manich. c. 12: Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis ssi. Ad Ps. iii.: Figuram carnis et sanguinis sui, in Ioan. tract. xxi. 18: Qui non maneat in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nee manuclat carmen ejus, nec bilius ejus sanguinem, etiam si taceat rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi maadnecet et bibat (so all MSS. The editions have interpolations). Cf. contra Fanum, xx. c. 18 and 21. De Doctrina christiana, iii. 16. A fragment in Fulgentius in Bibl. max. PP. t. ix. p. 177, &. While the Catholic theologians endeavor to explain away these passages by a forced interpretation, P. de Marca, in his Traité du sacrament de l'Eucharistie (published after his death by his relative, the abbot Paul Ségét, Paris, 1668, and though suppressed soon, reprinted in the Netherlands), can-
was looked upon in the light of a sacrifice, the idea was naturally suggested, that God could be propitiated by it, and in this way it was even already abused, and that frequently, by superstition. The Agape had been, for a considerable time past, in most countries separated from the Supper, and converted didly acknowledged that the fathers, to Chrysostom, and particularly Augustine, did not teach the doctrine of transubstantiation. Very clear passages on this subject are furnished by the polemical demonstrations against Eutyches and the Monophysites, so far as they had been always accustomed to compare the union of the earthly with the heavenly in the Supper, with the incarnation of Christ, and now borrowed a proof from the rite in favor of the fact, that the human nature in Christ did not cease to exist after the union. So Theodoretus Erminiast, Dial. ii. (ed. Schultze, t. iv. p. 199): ἀλλ᾽ μετὰ τὸν ἄγνουμο τὰ μαντικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας εἰςτάται φέος· μένε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχῆματος, καὶ τοῦ ἐλούν—νοείται δὲ ἀπὸ εἴγενετο, καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προκεκοίμηται, ὡς ἔκεινα ἑντα ἀπὸ πιστεύεται. First to this controversy is to be assigned Chrysostom’s Epis. ad Caesarianum, although even Leontius Hierosolym. (or Byzantium, about 600) in Maji Script. vett. coll. vii. i. 130, 135, Johannes Damasc., and others, cite this letter as belonging to Chrysostom. The same is preserved in Latin, in a codex Florentinus, and was first discovered and employed by Peter Martyr. The first edition by Bigot (appended to Palladini vita Chrysostom, see above, § 85, note 6), was torn out of the copies by royal command (see Chaufepié and Bayle, in their Dictionnaires, art. Bigot). The second edition appeared, according to a copy of Scipio Macel, with Greek fragments, in Canali Lecct. ant ed. Bassigne, i. 235. Comp. especially Salig de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen, p. 367. In this letter it is said: Ante quam sanctificentur panis, panem nominamus, divina autem illam sanctificantur gratia, modiane sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellations panis, dignus autem habitus est dominici corporis appellaciones, etiam natura panis in ipso permanit. Comp. R. Hospit.; Historia sacraentaria (t. ii. Tigravi. 1609. Genova. 1691. fol.), J. A. Ernesti Antiraxtorius, 1755 (Opusc. theol. p. 1). Münchh. iv. 377. Wundemann. ii. 419. How value was still attributed to the fact, that the laity also received the cup, may be seen from Leo I. Sermon iv. de Quadrages. (§ 86, note 6). Chrysostom in Epist. ii. ad Cor. Hom. 18: Εἴτε δὲ ὅπως οὐδὲ διέσχεν ὁ λαός τοῦ ἐρείπου, οἷον ὅταν ὕπολευσεν δέ των ὑπόλευσαι μυστήριον· οἷον γὰρ πάντες άξιούμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν· οὗ καθαίρεσι ἐπὶ τὰς σαλαίας τὰ μὲν ὁ ἐρείπου ἔσθη, τὰ δὲ τὸ ἀρχόμενος, καὶ δῆμος ὅπως ἄν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν, ὅν μετέχειν ὁ λαὸς· ἀλλὰ οὗ νῦν· ἀλλὰ πάσιν ἐν σωμά προσκύνειται, καὶ ποιήσων ἐν.

16 How far, see Münchh. iv. 400. Wundemann. ii. 411. Neander’s K. G. ii. ii. 707.
17 Especially as the bread was often taken home (in Egypt universally, see Basilii Ep. 93, ad Caesariam). Thus Saturnus, brother of Ambrose, during a shipwreck, took the holy bread, ligari fecit in orario, et orarium involvit collo, utque ita se dejecto in mare—:his se tectum atque munimentum satis credens, alia auxilia non desideravit (Ambrosius de Oblitu fratris sui Satyri, c. 13): A certain Acutius (August. Opus imp. contra Julian. iii. c. 163), related to Augustine that he had been born blind, and a surgeon was about to perform an operation for him, neque hoc permisisse religiosum matrem suam, sed id efficacissimis imposito ex Eucharistia cataplasmate. Comp. Gregor. Naz. Orat. xi. in laudem Gorgiosae, p. 180, s. Epist. 249. Comp. Münnchh. iv. 403. Wundemann. ii. 446. Neander, ii. ii. 705. In like manner the heathen, cf. Etn. Magn.: ὁ γάλλος καλύτερον ἄλκην τοῖς σπερματσι ὁ δὲ ἄλογον δὲται καὶ τῶν δετε ἐκ εἰρην ῥέματι, οὗ ταῦτα τῶν ἄλογα ἑνακοη. Simplicius (about 530) Comm. ad Epictet. c. 38, ed. Schweigh. p. 351: Τὰ προσώποκοι καὶ ἀναπτυγματε—μετασχηματε καὶ αὐτὰ τὸς θεοὺς ἀγάθοντος, ὡς καὶ θεοὶ ἐνεργεῖα ἐπικεφαλήσαι. καὶ γὰρ ἐπιλήψις τῆς ὑμολόγησιν ἀπερημένη καὶ τῆς τῶν τοιούτων ὑμελαίως, καὶ χαλάζας καὶ θαλάσσης κλόνων ἐπανεῖ. Cf. Lobeck Aclaophamus, i. p. 766, ss.
18 As it was now an ecclesiastical law that the Lord’s Supper should be taken fasting,
into entertainments which families prepared on the death of relatives, churches on the anniversaries of martyrs, and at which clergy and poor were regular guests. But because the heathen notions of the people found in them the reappearance of their Parentalia and sacrificial festivals, drunkenness soon pervaded them. Hence they began to be discountenanced and opposed,

so it was also believed that even in the time of the Apostles the agapae were observed after the Supper. Chrysost. Hom. xxvii. in 1 Cor. (on xi. 57); Pelagius in 1 Cor. xi. 20; Theodoret. in 1 Cor. xi. 16.—Remains of the old custom were still found in several parts of Egypt, in which the Lord’s Supper was observed on the Sabbath, after the evening meal, Socrates, v. 22; Sozomen. vii. 19; and in the African mode to celebrate the Supper after the evening meal on the Thursday before Easter. Conc. Carthag. iii. ann. 397, c. 29: Ut sacramenta altaris nonmissi a jejunis hominibus celebrantur, excepto uno die anniversario, quo coena dominii celebratur. Cf. Augustin. Ep. 54, ad Januarium, c. 9.


Can. 11: Εἴ τις καταφρονεῖ τῶν ἐκ πίστεως ἀγάπας ποιοῦν τινὰ καὶ διὰ τούτου τοῦ κυρίου συγκαλύπτων τῶν ἀυλόφοις, καὶ μὴ ἔθελεν κοινωνεῖν τοὺς κλησίας, διὰ τὸ ἐξεντελεῖν τὸ γενόμενον ἀνδρεύμενον εἶτο.

Even teachers of the church compared them with those heathen festivities. See Theodoret, note 19. Chrysostom (Hom. xlvii. in 8. Julianum) advises his hearers to partake of the meal to be appointed in honor of the martyr beside his church (τοῦ μαρτυρίου πληρών ἀπὸ συκῆς ἢ ἢμπελοῦ), instead of joining in the heathen feasts in Daphne, a suburb of Antioch. Hence some even supposed that they had been appointed by their ancestors as a substitute for those heathen banquets. See Gregory of Nyssa, in vita Gregor. Thaumat. Div. I. § 70, note 3. So also Augustine explains the origin of them to his church (Ep. xxix, ad Alypium, c. 9): Post persecutiones—cum facto pace terrae gentilium in christianum nomen venire cupientes hoc impedirentur, quod dies festos cum idoli suis solerent in abundantia epulorum et ebrietate consumere, nec facile ab his—voluptatibus se positam abstineu, visum fuisse majoribus nostris, ut huic infirmitatis parti interim pararetur, dicasque festi post eos quos reliquiam alii in honorem SS. Martyrum vel non similis sanctiglória, quamvis similis luxa celebrarentur. On the drunkenness at these meals, Ambrosius de Elia et Jejunio, c. 17: Calices ad sepulchra Martyrum deferunt, atque illic ad vesperam bibunt, et alter se exaudiri posse non credunt. Augustin. Ep. 29, ad Aureliam, c. 3: Concessiones et ebrietates ita concessae et licita putatur, ut in honorem etiam
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and even banished from the Church where it could be done without offense, while the clergy were forbidden to take part in them. Thus these festivals ceased in most countries, though in some they still continued beyond the present period.

In the east, the Laodicean council enacted (probably 363) can. 28: "Οτι οδα με εν τοις κυριακοις ή εν τας ηλικιωσις τως λεγομενους ηγιατες παιτει, και εν τω ολο του θεου οπισθεν και ακοινοτα στρατιωτειν. Accordingly they were, even in Antioch, celebrated beside the places dedicated to the martyrs. See Chrysostom, note 29. About 392 they were no longer observed in the greatest part of the west out of Africa. See Augustin. Ep. xxii. ad Aurelius, c. 4: Per Italiam maximam partem, et in alis omnibus aut prope omnibus transmarinis Ecclesiis partim nonquam facta sunt, partim vel orae vel inveterata—Episcoporum diligentia et animadversione extincta atque deleta sunt. In Milan, Ambrose had forbidden them (Augustin. Confess. vi. 8, ne nulla occasio se ingurgitant daretur ebriosit, et quia illa quasi parentalia superstitionis gentilium essent simulata). In Rome, Athanasius, at the funeral of his wife, entertained all the poor in the basilica S. Petri (Paulinus. Ep. 33); Pamphilus on the contrary gave rich sums on similar occasion (Hieron. Ep. 26, ad Pammech. c. 9). In Nola they kept vigils on the festival of the birth of St. Felix, while all the night through they ate and drank in the church of the saint. Paulinus, since he could not abrogate this practice, endeavored by means of pictures which he brought into the church to give a more serious direction to the joy (Paulini nat. Felicis ix. Compare above § 69, note 47). In Africa, where those festivals were universal (August. de Moribus ecc. cath. i. 34): Novi—mullos esse qui luxuriassimeo super mortuos bibant, et opulas cadaveribus exhibentes, super sepultos se ipsos sepellant, et voracitates ebrietatique suas deputent religiosa. Augustinio his influence against them. He first of all motioned for their abolition from Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, in the Epist. xxi. ad Aurelius, c. 6: Mihi videtur faciler ille dissansere possis etam foeditatem,—si—oblationis pro spiritibus dormientium, quas vere nihilqu adequare credendum est, super ipsas memorias non sint sanctiores, atque omnibus potentibus sine typho et omn alacritate praebentur: neque vendantur (that is, when that which was intended to serve as oblation is not offered for sale there), sed si quas pro religione aliquid pecuniae offere volunt, in praestate pauperius erogent. Afterward he effected, their abrogation in Hippo; in what way is related by him Ep. xxxix. ad Alypium, in the year 395. Finally it was enacted by the Conc. Carthag. iii. ann. 397, c. 30: Ut nulli Episcopii vel Clerici in Ecclesia conviventer, nisi forte transuntes hospitatorium necessitate illic reficiantur: populi etiam at hujusmodi convivias quantum fieri potest prohibentur.

In Syria they are mentioned at a time so late as that of Theodoret, without blame, see note 19, and Theodoret's Hist. eccles. iii. 11, where he relates how the martyrs, Juvenius and Maximinus in Antioch, were honored, μεχρι δε τιμερν άτριφο δομοθάνων γεραιαρτον.—The council Quinisextum, a.d. 692, repeats can. 74 of the can. Laodic. 28 (see note 21).—L. A. Muratori de Agapis sublatis, in his Anc. graec. Patav. 1709. 4. p. 241. Bingham, vol. vi. p. 516, ix. 147, x. 69. Drearch de Agapis comm. Giessae, 1824. p. 32.
SIXTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF MORALS.

§ 102.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS.¹


The disposition already manifested in the preceding period to lay too much stress on certain forms of external discipline, had now been much increased by the influence of monachism. Fasting and almsgiving,² as well as prayer, were regarded as expiatory of sins. The theater, dancing, and other amusements,³ were branded as absolutely sinful; oaths,⁴ the taking of interest for money lent,⁵ every kind of self-defense,⁶ capital punishments,⁷ and second marriages,⁸ were rejected. In the fourth century,


⁵ Basilium M. in Ps. xiv. et contra cœnecrates. Gregor. Nyss. ep. can. ad Letaion can. 6. Ambrosius de Tobias, c. 2, ss.

⁶ Ambrosius, Augustinus, Basilium, see Staudlin's Gesch. der Sittenlehre Jesu, iii. 65, 145, 219.


⁸ Forbidden by Ambrose and Jerome, advised by Chrysostom, only made second to a state of widowhood by Augustine, cf. Cotelerius ad Hermæ Pastor. lib. ii. Mand. 4. c.
Indeed, those who had been legally divorced were still universally allowed to marry again, though this was discouraged as well as second marriages generally; but in the fifth century, the Latin church began to forbid the divorced person to marry as long as the other party lived. So prevalent was now the spirit of monachism, that the married state began to be considered as something impure, and only a tolerated evil. Even certain kinds of food were forbidden.

By means of such excesses, whose foundations could not be shown in the moral consciousness of mankind, Christian

4, and in Constit. apost. iii. 2. Stæuldin. iii. 60, 92, 141, 146. Hence penances were imposed on those who married twice. Conc. Nicaeas. can. 1, 3; Laodic. can. 1; Basilii Epist. 188 (Ep. can. 1), can. 4. Comp. Ep. can. ii. c. 50, respecting those who married three times, and Ep. can. iii. c. 80, respecting those who married more than three times.


10 The transition to this view may be traced in Augustinus de Fide et Opere, c. 19: In ipsis divinis sententibus tunc obscuram est, utrum et iste cui quidem sine dubio adulteram licet dimittere, adulter tamen habentur, si alteram duxerit, ut, quantum existimo, venialiter ibi quiescunt fallatur. Still the Conc. Milevitanum, ii. ann. 416, at which also Augustine was present resolved, quite unanimously, can. 17: Placuit ut secundum evangeliwm et apostolicam disciplinam, neque dimissus ab uxore neque dimissa a marito, alteri conjugetur; sed ita maneat, ut sibimet reconcilietur. Quod si contempserit, ad poenitentiam reducatur. In qua causa legem imperiali petendam promulgar. Such too was the opinion of Innocentius I. Epist. 6, ad Exsuperianum, c. 6: De his etiam requisivit dilecto tua, qui interventione repudio aliis se matrimonio copularunt. Quos in utraque parte adulteros esse manifestum est, etc.


12 Hieronymus adv. Jovinian. i. 4, with reference to 1 Cor. vii. 1: Si bonum est malierum non tangere, mulum est ingle tangere, nihil enim bono contrarium est nisi malum. Si autem malum est, et ignoscitur; idee conceditur, ne malo quid deterius sit.—Oro, to quale illud bonum est, quod orare prohibet? quod corpus Christi accepit non permissit? Quantum imploa marii officium, non imploa Christiani. Yet he was obliged in the Epist. 30 (50) ad Pammachium, pro libris adv. Jovinianum apologia to make some concession. Among other things he writes: Cum toties et tam crebro lectorem admonerim,—me tis recipere nuptias, continentia vidius virginesque praeserem: debent prudens et benignus lector etiam, ca, quae, videntur dure, nescire de caeteris, etc. Augustine is more moderate in the work called forth by this very controversy between Jovinian and Jerome, de Bono conjugali. Among other things, he writes. c. 8: Duo bona sunt continum et continentin, quorum alterum est melius. Cap. 10: Certa dubitat si non est, nuptias non esse pecement. Non itaque nuptias secundum veniam concedit Apostulus (1 Cor. vii. 6).

13 Against the use of flesh and wine Hieronymus adv. Jovinian. lib. ii.
morals now assumed the aspect of a series of arbitrary, divine, despotick commands. And since those rigorous principles were not at all observed by most people, they promoted the spirit of indifference toward the divine precepts generally, and prepared the way for the unfortunate distinction between a higher virtue, which was solely for the monks, and a lower, which was sufficient for common Christians.

It seems at first sight contradictory to this external strictness, yet it is in fact intimately connected with it, that most of the church fathers of this period maintained, in addition to that apparent moral severity, lax principles concerning veracity, which threatened the very foundations of the most virtuous virtue.

§ 103.

MORALS OF THE CLERGY.

As ecclesiastical offices were no longer attended with dangers and persecutions, but with honor and power, there was a general

14 Comp. de Wette, l. 340. 15 Münchener's Dogmengesch. iv. 311; de Wette, l. 346.

16 See Div. I. § 63, note 7.

17 Ex. gr. Hieronymus Epist. 30 (al. 50), ad Pammachium: Aliud esse γνήσιοτάτος scribere, aliud δογματικός. In priori vagam esse disputacionem, et adversario respondentem nunc haec nunc illa proponere, argumentari ut libet, aliud illoqu, aliud agere, panem, ut dicatur, ostendere, lapidem tenere. In sequenti autem aperta frons, et ut ita dicam, ingenia necessaria est, etc. In particular they stretched the limits of allowed accommodation quite too far (sicophis), and believed that they could attribute it in the same extent even to Jesus and the apostles. Comp. Saüer, s. v. συγκατάθεσις, l. 1057. Münchener's Dogmengesch. iv. 154, s. Jahn's Nachträge zu s. theol. Werken. Tübingen. 1821. S. 15, ss. 28, ss. In this way Jerome Comm. ad Gal. ii. 11, ss., thought that he could explain the transaction between Peter and Paul by a mere accommodation, but was opposed by Augustine who held stricter principles. (Comp. his writings de Mendacio and contra Mendacium.) Comp. the correspondence between them on this subject in Epist. Hieron. Ep. 65, 67-73, 76; see Jahn, l. c. p. 31, ff. Even Chrysostom lays down very questionable principles respecting the allowableness of deception and lying, in certain cases. In this he is followed by his disciple John Cassian, Coll. xvii. 8, ss. ex. gr. cap. 17: Itaque taliter de mendacio sentiendum, atque ita co utendum est, quasi natura ei insit hellobori. Quodsi imminente exitiali morbo sumuntum fuerit, fit salubre: cæterum absque summi discriminis necessitate perceptum praesens exitii est.—Non enim Deus verborum tantum actuamque nostrorum discursus et judex, sed etiam propositi ac destinationis inspector est. Qui si aliquid causa salutis acternas ac divinae contemplationis intimam ab unoquoque vel factum viderit vel promissum, tametsi hominibus durum atque iniquum esse videatur; ille tamen intimatum cordis inspiciens pietatem, non verborum somnum, sed votum duplcet voluntatis quia finis operis et affectus considerandus est perpetrantis: quo poterunt quidam, ut supra dictum est, etiam per mendacium justificari (for example, Bahab. Josh. ii.), et alii per veritatis assertionem peccatum perpetuum mortis incurretor (Delliah, Judg. xvi.).
pressing toward them: all the arts of unworthy flattery and low intrigue were put in requisition to obtain them, and to rise from a lower to a higher station. In this way not merely the unprepared, but even many absolutely immoral pushed themselves into the clerical office; an objectionable, worldly spirit pervaded the whole order, which frequently perverted what was holy to its own purposes; and since that monkish morality re-

---


3 Hieron. in Ep. ad Titum i. 8 (Opp. iv. p. 417): Vero nunc est cornerea—in plerisque urbibus, Episcopos, sive Presbyteros, si laicos viderint hospitales, amatores bonorum, invidere, fremere, excommunicare, de Ecclesia expellere, quasi non lineat facere quod Episcopus non faciat; et tales esse laicos damnatio Sacerdotum sit. The Can. Apost. 36, 64, 71, are directed against roughnesses and common offenses in the clergy, which, in fact, must have occurred at this time, See Drexch Apost. Constitut. S. 339, 344.

4 Comp. Hieronymus Ep. 34 (al. 9), ad Nepotianum, concerning the law of Valentine against underhand dealing with inheritances, given above, § 91, note 15. He then continues: Ignomina omnium Sacerdotum est, propriis studere divitiis. Natus in paupero domo, et in tugurio rusticano, qui vix milia et cibario pane regissent satarae ventrem poteram, nunc similam et nella fastidio. Novi et genera et nominis piscium, in quos littera concha lecta sit caulce: saporibus avium discerno provincias; et ciborum preciosorum me multas, ac novissime damna ipsa deletant. Audito praeterea in sensus et anus abaque liberis querendum tarpe servitum. Ipsi apponunt matulam, obsident lectum, purulentam stomache et phlegmatum pulmonum manu propriis suscipiunt. Pavent ad introitum medici, trementibusque labis, an commodius habentur secabitur: et si patulum senex vegetat fuerit, periclitantur: simulataque lascivia, mens intrinsice avara torquetur. He describes the life of rich widows, Ep. 18 (al. 92), ad Eustochium: Plura adulatores et sua summi. Clerici ipsi, quos in magisterio esse oportaret doctrinae pariter et timoris, oculantur capita matronarum, et extensa manu, ut benedicens deos putet vello, si necassis, ostentantur simulcati. In an oration of that time, which is found among the sermons of Ambrose (Sermon in dominicam xxii. post Pentecosten, and of Augustine (tom. v. app. Sermon 82), it is said on Luke iii. 14: Si clericae non contentum stipendis fuerit, quos de altario, Domino jubente, consequitur; sed exercer mercediones, intercessiones vendit, vidinarum numeri libenter amplificetur: hic negotiator magis potest videri, quam clericus. Gregorii Naz. Carnae de se ipso et adv. Episcopos, v. 331, ss. (in J. Tolfi Insignia itinerarii Italic. Traj. ad Rhein. 1696. 4. p. 34, ss.):

331. 'Αγνοεῖ χάρι κακῶν μέν, ἀλλ’ ἁπλοῦ κακίων. Τὶ δὲ ἀν τις εἴποι κακῶν μεμνημένος; Εἰλαίν γὰρ, εἰλαίν ἀδιάστεροι τίνες, Δίστατιν, ἀπεκτὰ τὸν βίου κυβέρνατα, Τὴν πίστιν ἀμφίθεν, καιρῶν νόμος, Οὐ τὸν θεὸν σέβετε, εὐφοι πάνω λόγῳ Ηλιακὸσοντες, ἡ κλάδων μετακλήσεις, ὅπως γνωσκοῦν, τρεπὴν διήγημα, Μαρτυρίος λέγουτε, τοῖς κρατοῦσι δ’ αὐ κόνες, Πάσης τραπέζης εὐφρεῖς ἤξειόμενοι.
quired of the clergy many external things to keep up the appearance of spirituality, low hypocrisy pervaded the clerical

341. ὅμοιος κρατοῦντοι ἐκτρίβοντες, οὐ σοφῶν. . . .
361. Ἀπερχόν μὲν εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἔχει, φράσεως ὡς ὁμοίως.
   Ταχθεῖσις εἶναι τοῦ καλοῦ διασκάλαι,
   Κακῶν ἁπάντων λέον ἐργασθήροιο.
   Συγγραφεύτης, καίν δικάδων μὴ λέγειν:
   Πρόσθεσις η κακία, συνεῖρις μὴλ εἰς:
   Κακῶν γίνεσθαι, τοῦτο συντιμωτάτων,

387. Καὶ λόγων. . . .
378. Ἰμαῖς δὲ πάντας ῥάβδιοι καθίζομεν,
   'Ελαίαν μόνον θέλασιν, λαοῦ προστάτας,
   Οὐδένα σκοπούντες τῶν νέων, ἢ τῶν πάλαι.
382. Οὐ πρᾷσιν, οὐ λόγοι τε' οὐ συνοικίαν. . . .
389. Εἰ γὰρ τὰ χειρεῖ παρὰ τὸν εἰς εὐσεβέστερον
   Χειρὶ νίθεσιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ξύνων.
384. Τίς ἂν προβάληται οὐ φρονῶν, οὖν ἀγνοεῖ; . . .
383. Ο δὲ πρόερχος ῥάβδοις εὐσεβεσται,
   Μηδὲν ποινηθείς, πρόσφατος τὴν ἀξίαν.
395. Ὡ τῆς τῆς τραχείας τῶν τρόπων μεταστροφῆς!
400. Χθες ἦσαν μίμων καὶ θεάτρων ἐν μέσῳ.
   (Τὰ δ' εκ θεάτρων ἄλλος ἑξαπατῶσθ' Ἰησοῦς)
   Νῦν αὐτός ἦσει εἰ ἐξήνθε θεώρει.
403. Πρώην Φελεσσῆς, καὶ βεβεῖ πέμπτων κόμων,
408. Ὡς ἄλλος εὐχαρίταν, ἢ νομισματ' εὐσεβής. . . .
411. Νῦν εὐστάλης τε, καὶ βλέπων αὖθις μόνην,
417. Πλὴν εἰ λάθων ποιρό ήραϊον οἰκομένως. . . .
412. Χθες χρηστέον τὰς δικαίας ἅγιαπόλεις,
417. Στρέφον ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω ταῦτα νόμων. . . .
419. Νῦν μοι δικαιοτέρας καὶ Δανείη τῆς ἀθρόος.
   Χθες μοι δικαιότως σὺν ζηλεύει γνωσιμονήν
   Τὸ βῆμα ἐποίησεν ἐνῷ ἐκχίλεσεν λοιπόν,
   Κλέπταις, τυραννοῖς, καὶ πρὸ πῶντων τοὺς νόμους.
   'Ος μὲν χρηστάς μοι σήμερον! αὖθις ἐσθήτα τις
   Οὕτως ἀμεθῆσαι ῥάβδοις, ως σὺ τρόπων'
   Χθες ἐν χειρείς ταύτης ἑπάτρων θηλασμάτων,
   Τίμων δὲ κήρεως ἦσαν Ανδαίας ἐν μέσῃς,
   Όμοίως λυρίζων, καὶ ποτούς γαραφομένως.
   Νῦν σωφομορίας παρθένων καὶ σεβαγόων.
   'Ως σὺ τοῦ καλοῦ ὑποτούν ἐν τὸν πρῶτον
   Σύμων μάγος χθες, σήμερον Πέτρος Σίμων!
431. Φεύ τοῦ τάξεις! φεύ, ἄντι ἀλώπεκος λέων!

The remark is worthy of attention, v. 382, s. comp. v. 634, ss.: ὡς σὺ τοῦ καλοῦ ὑποτούν ἐν τῷ πρῶτον . . .

Oὕτως μὲν οὕτως: καὶ τάξιν ἢ καὶ βελτίως
Αὐτῶν γεωμετροῖ κάλλονται τοὺς ἄρμας.
Τὸ γὰρ κρατεῖν τὸν ἄφαντα ποιεῖ χειράρων.

order. This corruption of the clergy was not a little increased by the interference of the emperors with ecclesiastical disputes. While, on the one side, the clergy were always carrying their spiritual pride higher, on the other, they frequently changed their opinions at the beck of the court. Synods were the theater on which this new pharisaism of the Christian clergy, along with a rough passionateness, was chiefly exhibited. ⁷

⁵ Especially as monachism led them to place so great value on external forms. Gregor. Naz. Carmen de se ipso, et adv. Episc. v. 647, ss., thus describes the spiritual hypocrite:

647. Ἐπετα χαλκὸς χρυσὸν ἴμπρεσιένοι, 'Ἡ καὶ χαμαιλέωντος ἐκτασεις χρόνος, Πόλιοι, κατηφός ἡθος, αὐχένος κλάσεις, Φωνή βραχεία, πιατός ἐκενασμένος,

651. Νοθρινός βιασμος, πάντα, πλὴν φρενος, σοφός.

696. Λόγχρων μὲν οὐν αὐσιμινοὶ τὴν τρόπον πλάσιαι.

Thus it became the custom, especially in consequence of the example of the monks (see Bingham, vol. ii. p. 389, ss.), seemingly to decline receiving ecclesiastical honors when presented. Cf. lex Licinis, A.D. 649 (Cod. Justin. i. 3, 31): Nemo gradum sacerdotii præsil venalitate mercetur.—Cesare altarius immuno profani arbor avaritiae, et a sacris adytis repellantur piaclure flagitium.—Neœ pretio, sed proculibus ordinetr antistes. Tantum ab ambitu debet esse apositus, ut quaeratur cœunus, rogatus recedat, invitatus effugiat: sola illi suffragetur necessitas excussand. Profecto enim indignus est sacerdotio, nix fuerit ordinatus invitus. This priestly decorum led of course, very frequently, merely to a mock reluctance and hesitation. Cf. Gregorius Naz. Orat. xvii. de se ipso, p. 466: Οὐ γὰρ ἐνα ἐν ζητηθήνειν ἀποκρυπτόμεθα· οἴδ' ἐνα πλειονος ἁζου δεξιωμεν τιμᾶς.

⁶ See above, § 91, note 24.

⁷ Comp. the ironical discourse of Gregory of Nazianzum, at the second eccumenical council (Carmen de vita sua, Opp. ii. 37):

.... ὃς θέλει δεύτ᾽ εὐστῶ, Καὶ δίστροφος τις ἡ πολύστροφος τέχνη. Παγόγηρος ἑστηκεν, ἀπέτευ τρεῖς· ἀπραγματευτὸς. ἢ μεταστραφή κύδος (Καρπὸς γὰρ ἀεύθεν τῶν εὐστροφῶντων), ἢτοι τὸ τεχνὸν, εἰδώλιον πάλα. Οὐκ εἰμάθης πιάστε πόσοκεισαί με, ἴππου δέ πολλὰς εἰδέναι δειεδὼνες.

Comp. Carmen de se ipso, et adv. Episc. v. 152 (ap. Tollini, p. 13), on the same council:

.... καὶ γὰρ ἐν αἰσχὸς μέγα, Τοιῶν των 'ειναι τῶν κατέλημα πίστεως.

In like manner he calls the bishops (Carmen de vita sua, p. 29) Χριστιάνοιροι. When he was invited to the synod at Constantinople, A.D. 382, he replied, Epist. 55, ad Procopium: Ἐγὼ μὲν οὕτους εἴ θεί τάλαθες γράφεις, ὡστε πάντα σύλλογον φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι μηδεμία τυχόν τιλός εἰδον χρυσῶν, μηδέ λύσιν κακὰς μάλλοι σχημασίας, ἢ προσβήκας. Αἰ γὰρ φιλονεικία καὶ φιλαρχία (ἄλλ' ὅπως μήτε φορτίκιον ὑπολάβης ὡς γραφότα) καὶ λόγου κρίτηκος: καὶ δάκτυλον ἄτι γεγυγμένη κακεὶ κέρατι διάκος, ἢ τῶν ἐκείνων λάσσει. Διὰ τούτο εἰς ἑμαυτῶν συνεστάλη, κ. τ. ἐ.—Carmen x. v. 92, ss. (Opp. ii. 81):

Οὐδὲ τι που συνόδεια ὁμαθρῶν ἔσορρα ἐγγίση. Χρώμα τ' ἡγεράνων ἀκρατα μαραθμένων· Ἑκὼ μὲν, ἐνδιὰ μόνο τι, καὶ αἰσχρα κρυπτα πάροιλην. Εἰς ἕνα νυμφαίαν χάρον ἁγειρέμενα.

In the mean time, however, zeal for morality among the clergy was not rare. This zeal for morality fearlessly found fault with sin where it existed, opposed with spirit tyrannical barbarity,\textsuperscript{9} took under its powerful protection all that needed help,\textsuperscript{9} and left behind even permanent monuments of benevolence and concern for the public good.\textsuperscript{10}

\section*{§ 104.}

MORAL INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE PEOPLE.

The clergy thus sinking into degeneracy were now called to solve the most difficult problem that could ever, perhaps, be presented to an order of Christian teachers. A highly cultivated people, but one sunk in unbelief and superstition of every kind, now crowded into the church,\textsuperscript{1} impelled, for the most part, by interested motives; a people either for the most part fully devoted to paganism in their heart,\textsuperscript{2} or apprehending Christianity from a heathen point of view,\textsuperscript{3} and transferring into it even

---

\textsuperscript{9} See § 91, note 8.  
\textsuperscript{10} Σενάντων ου ξενοδοχεία, πτωχοτροφεία, γηροκομεία, νοσοκομεία, ἱδρυαντροφεία. The institution which Basil founded in Caesarea for strangers and the sick was very large. After him it was called Basileiás (Basil. Ep. 94. Gregor. Naz. Orat. 30 and 27). Basil also caused to be established smaller ones of the same kind, in the country (Basil. Ep. 142, 143). Theodoret got colonades and bridges built, and a canal made (Theod. Ep. 81). See Neander, ii. i. 292.  
\textsuperscript{1} See above, § 75, notes 7 and 35.  
\textsuperscript{2} Chrysost. in Ep. ad Ephes. c. 3, Hom. vii. (Opp. xi. 44): Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὅρθοὶ μοναχοὶ—τὰς κορώνας τῶν ὁρῶν κατειλήφατοι, καὶ ἐκ μέσου γεγόνατοι (the monks)—φθόροι ἐκ καὶ μυρίων γέμοισεν κακῶν εἰσεπέθησαν εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας.—Εἰ ταῖς κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ Πάσχα πίνακας τοὺς προσώπους—ἐξήθανε σὺν ἀγρίβεις,—πολλὰ ἐν εὐφρενὶ βαρότερα τῶν ἱερακίας κακῶν. καὶ γὰρ ὀλυμπιώμονος, καὶ φαιμακίας καὶ κληρονομίας καὶ ἐποδίς κυριμένος, καὶ πεπορφυεύτας, καὶ μοιχεύσαντας, καὶ μεθύσαντας, καὶ λοιπόν, εὑρέθη ἐν.  
heathen customs or Jewish practices. In addition to this, the new converts were demoralized by all the vices which follow in the train of over-refinement, and confirmed in them by the example of the court which had been growing more corrupt ever since its removal to the east, and by the example of the nobility. Christian knowledge and Christian faith, in place of unbelief and superstition, and piety for vice, had to be infused into this spiritually dead mass. To be successful, the Gospel needed to be proclaimed in its spiritual aspect with apostolic zeal; but the greater portion of the clergy depended for the most part on external means; and thereby gave Christianity the character of a compulsory institute, promoting the superstitious and external view of it.

The Christians soon forgot the principles of religious toleration which they had so prominently exhibited and insisted on in their former persecutions; and fanatical voices were raised among them calling for a violent suppression of paganism. It


5 Comp. the description of the court at Julian's accession, Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 4: Numequit etiam stipendium est plerumque eorum (Pelatinarum) partem vitiorum omnium seminaria effusi aliusae, uta rempublicam inficerent cupiditatis privatis, plusque exemplis quam peccandi licentia laederent multos. Pasti enim ex his quidam templorum spolia, et lucta ex omni odorantes occasione, ab egestate infima ad saltum sublati divitiarum ingentiun, nec largiendi, nec rapiendi, nec absumendi tenuere aliquem modum, aliena invadere semper adnuefacti. Unde flexioris vitae initia pullularunt, et pejuria, et nullas exsitiones respectus, demensque superstia fidem suam probosis quasi satis populabant. Inter quae ingluvies et gurgites crevere praecurto conviviorum, etc. An orator of the day (Augustini, tom. v. app. Sermo 82, also in Ambrosii Opp. s. Sermo in dom. xxii. post Pentecosten) complains: Usque adeo autem hoc inoluit malum, ut jam quasi ex consuetudine vendantur leges, corrumpan tur juris, sententia ipsa venalis sit, et nulla jura causa possit esse sine causa. Salvianni de Gubern. Dei is particularly full of complaints of the corruption of his time, e.g. gr. iv. 5, 7; vi. 11; vii. 13, 15.

6 For example, Justin. Apol. i. 2, 4, 12. So still under Constantine, Lactantius Institutt. v. 19: Religio cogi non potest; verba potius quam verberibus res agenda est, ut sit voluntas—Nihil est tam voluntarium, quam religio. C. 30: Nos non expetimus, ut Deum nostrum, qui est omnium, veliunt, nolint, colat aliquis invitus: nec, si non coloriit, irascimur. Epitome c. 54: Religio sola est, in qua libertas domicilium collocavit. Res est enim praeter caeteras voluntaria, nec imponi cuiquam necessitas potest, ut colat quod non vult. Potest aliquis forsitan simulare, non potest velles.

was not without the co-operation of the Christian clergy that the prohibitions of *heathenism* were always assuming a stricter tone, and that the laws against *Judaism* were more and more circumscribing. The treatment of heretics, too, became more severe. At first the Catholic Christians were contented to render them innocuous by interdicting their meetings or by banishment. The execution of *Priscillian* (§ 86) was still universally regarded with abhorrence. At the same time, however, Augustine allowed himself to be persuaded that corporal punishments against heretics were allowable and fit; and Leo

Paulus cum in theatro spectaculum ipse essebat, Christo ecclesiam conregabat?—Ant non manifesta se tum Dei virtus contra obia humana porruxit: cuin tanto magis Christus praeclaretur, quanto maius praeclari inhaberetur? At nunc, proh dolor! divinam idem sufragia terrae commendant: inopiae virtutis sua Christus, dum ambitio nonnulla suum conciliatur, arquitur. Terreter exiit et carceribus Ecclesia, qne sibi cogit, quae exiit et carceribus est credita: pendet a dignatione communicantium, quae sequentur est consecrata terrenae fugat sacerdotes, quae fugat est sacerdotibus propagata: diligent esse gloriam a mundi, quae Christi esse non potuit, nisi eam mundus odisset. Hac de comparatione traditae nobis olim Ecclesiae, nunc quam deperditae, res ipse, quae in oculos omnium est atque ore, clamavit.


10 It is true that Julianus (ap. Cyril. c. Jul. lib. vi. ed. Spanh. p. 296) accuses the Christians, even in his time: Ἀπεσφάζατε οὖς ἡμῶν μονον τοὺς παρότης ἐμένοντας, ἄλλα καὶ τῶν ἔξω παλάπασιν ἀριστεῖς τοὺς μή τὸν αὐτόν τρόπον ἡμῖν τὸν νεκρὸν θηρώνουτα. Eppis. 52, that under Constantinus τοὺς πόλλους αὐτῶν καὶ φυγαδευθηκαί, καὶ διωχθηκαί, καὶ δισεκανθηκαί: πολλὰ ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ σφαγάμα πλέθη τῶν λεγόμενων ἀριστεῖς, καὶ ἐν Σαμοσάτοις, καὶ Κεκίλιοι, καὶ Παλαιογενεῖς, καὶ Βαθυντικα, καὶ Ταλατία, καὶ πολλοὶ ἄλλοι ἔθνεων ἄρρη καταρρηθηκαί πορφυρίησας κόμας. Perhaps, however, this should be understood of extra-judicial murders.

11 Not only by Latinsus Pacatus, in his Panegyricus Theodoci dictus, c. 29, but also by bishops: Sulpic. Severus Hist. saec. ii. 59: Namque tunc Martius (bishop of Turumum) apud Treveros constitutus, non desinebat increpare Ithacum, ut ab accusatione desistaret: Maximum orare, ut sanguine infelicium abstineret: satis superque sufficio, ut Episcopali sententia haeretici judicati Ecclesias pelenctur: novum esse et inauditum nehas, ut causam Ecclesiæ judex sacculi judicaret. How he behaved when he came again to Treves, after the murder of Priscillian may be seen in Sulpic. Sever. Dial. iii. c. 11-13. Maximus wished that the persecution of the Priscillians should be continued in Spain; but πιὰ erat solicitato Martino, qui non solam Christianae, qui sub illa crant occasione vexandus, sed ipsos etiam haereticos liberaret. Besides cavat cum illa Ithacianae partis communionis miseric. Ambrose, too, who was with Maximus as ambassador from Valentinian II., A.D. 387, endeavored there (Ambros. Ep. 24, ad Valentinum) abstiner ab episcopo,—qui aliques devos licet a hide ad necem petebant. Cf. Ep. 36. Indeed, at that time every kind of capital punishment was pretty generally regarded as forbidden.

12 Augustini Ep. 60, ad Vincentium § 17: Mea primitus sententia non erat, nisi nimirum ad unitatem Christi esse cogendum, verbo esse agendum, disputatione pugnandum, ratione vincendu, ut fictos haereticos noveramus. Sed hac opinio mea non contradicentiam verbi, sed demonstrantium superabat exemplis. Nam primo mihi opponebat civitas mea, quae cum tota esse in pacto Donati, ad unitatem christianam timore legum imperialium conversa est, quam nunc videmus ita.
the Great went so far as to approve the putting of them to death.\textsuperscript{13} Besides, the bishops endeavored by means of ecclesiastical laws, not only to prevent all contact of the faithful with the opponents of the church,\textsuperscript{14} but ventured even to absolve individuals from the obligation of duties which they manifestly owed to heretics.\textsuperscript{16}

At the same time, the church did not the less deviate from the

\textsuperscript{13} Retractt. ii. 5. How the Donatists attack these new principles, and how Augustine defends them, may be seen in ejusd. contra litt. Petiliani lib. ii. Contra Gaudentium lib. i. Epist. 185, ad Bonifacium, among other things, § 21, it is written: Melius est quidem—ad Deum colendum dominiæ homines duci, quam poenam timore vel dolore compelli. Sed non quia isti meliores sunt, ideo ipsis qui tales non sunt, negligendi sunt. Multis enim profuit (quod experimentis probavimus et probamus) prius timore vel dolore cogi, ut possa possent doceri. Then he refers, § 24 the cogito intrare (Luc. xiv. 23) to this point: ipse Dominus ad magnam coenaam suam prius adduxit jubet convivas, postea cogi.—In illis ergo, qui lenitior primo adducti sunt, completa est prior obedientia, in istis autem, qui cognatur, inobedientia coercetur. Still Epist. 100, ad Donatum, Procons. Africani: Unam solum est, quod in tua justitia, pertinacissimus, ne forte—pro inanitate facchorum, ne co potius pro lenitatis christianae consideratione censeas coeterum, quod te per Jesum Christum ne facias obsercamus.—Ex occasione terribilium judicium ac legum non in actorni judicii poenas incident, corrigi eos capimus, non noci; nec disciplinam circa eos negligi volumus, nec supplicium, quibus digni sunt, exerceris. So, too, Epist. 139, ad Marcellum: Poena sana illorum, quamvis de tantis sceleribus confessorum, rogo te, ut præter supplicium mortis sit, et propter conscientiam nostram, et propter catholica manus studiæaem commendandum. Cf. Ph. a Limborch Historia inquisitionis. (Ann. 1692. 50.) lib. i. c. 6. J. Barbeyrac Traité de la morale des pères, c. 16, § 19. Jerome, however, says, Epist. 37 (al. 53) ad Riparium, adv. Viguantium: Non est crudelitas pro Deo pietas. Unde et in lego dicit: si frater tuus et amicus et uxor, quae est in sua tuo, depravare te voluerit a veritate, sit manus tua super eos, et effunde sanguinem eorum, et auferes malum de medio Israel (Deut. xii. 6, ss.). Chrysostom, indeed, recommends Christian love toward heretics and heathen (Hom. 29 in Matth.), but would yet have them restrained, and their assemblies forbidden, and declares himself only against putting them to death (Hom. 46 in Matth.). Thus also, he caused their churches to be taken from the Novatians, Quattordecimanis, and other heretics in Asia, and many considered his misfortunes a righteous retribution for this. Socrates, vii. 19.—Staëlin's Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu. iii. 238. De Wette Gesch. d. christl. Sittenlehre, i. 244.

\textsuperscript{13} The first law of a Christian emperor, authorizing capital punishment against certain heretics, is that of Theodosius I. A.D. 388, against the Manichæans. Sozomen, however, vii. 12, says of all the laws of this emperor against heretics: Χαλεπάς τοῖς νόμοις ἐπέγραφε τιμωρίας, ἄλλα δὲ ἐπέτρεψεν ὧδε τιμωρεῖται, ἄλλα ἐκ δύο καθιστῶν τοῖς πρώτοις ὑποδέχθηκαν. (Cf. Socrates, v. 20): and Socrates, vii. 3, still maintains: Οὐκ εἴδω τί διώκειν τῆς ἐκθέσεως εκκλησίας. On the other hand, Leo M. Epist. 15, ad Turribium:—Etiam mundi principes ita hanc sacrilegam amentiam (Priscillianistarum) detestati sunt, ut autorem ejus cum plerisque discipulis legum publicarum esse posternuerunt.—Profuit diu ista districtio ecclesiasticarum lenitati, quae etsi sacerdotali contenta judicio, cruentas refugit ultiones, seorsis tamen christianorum principum constitutionibus adiuvatur, dum ad spiritale nunquam recurrit remedium, quia timent corporale supplicium.

\textsuperscript{14} For example, Concil. Carthag. iii. ann. 397, can. 13: Ut Episcopi vel clerici, in eos qui catholici Christiani non sunt, etiam si consanguinei fuerint, nec per donationes, nec per testamentum rerum suarum aliquid conferunt.

\textsuperscript{15} Bingham, vol. vii. p. 296, ss. 294, ss.
right path, in her measures instituted for the purpose of gaining over the masses of external professors to the side of Christianity internally. She endeavored to give her service the external attractions of the heathen worship, and thus only strengthened the tendency to externalities; thus she herself invited men to substitute for a genuine interest in religion and the service of God a feeling quite foreign to piety. On the one hand, many were confirmed in the heathenish, superstitious notion of looking for works acceptable to God in the external rites of his worship; on the other hand, there were not a few, especially in the cities, who went to the churches as if to the theater, with a mere aesthetic interest; and followed the spiritual orators as they would rhetoricians, while, on the contrary, they did not remain to be present at the Lord’s Supper, a circumstance which necessarily led to the command to partake of it. Meetings for public worship began to be even abused, as occasions for sensual excesses. Finally, the theological disputes of this period were also an important obstacle in pre-


17 Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in epist. ad Ephes. (Opp. xi. 33): Εἰκώ τοῦτον καθημερινὴν ἐκατ ἀπερευγμένον τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, σῶδες ὧν μετέχων. Id. de incomprehensibili hom. iii. 6 (Opp. i. 462).


19 Hieronymus adv. Vigilantiam (ed. Martin. t. iv. P. ii. p. 285), says de vigilitis et pernocitationibus in basilicis Martyrum celebrandis in defense of them: Error autem et culpa juvenum villissinamurique multum, qui per noctem saepe deprehenditur, non est religiosis hominibus imputandus: quis et in vigilitis Paschae tale quid fieri plerumque convincitur, et tamen pannorum culpa non praecedat religioni, etc.
venting Christianity from exercising its full power on the men of the age. While they were contending about definitions, as if the essence of Christianity consisted in them; the interest of the understanding being in a one-sided way excited in favor of it; it was no wonder that among many Greeks the interest in favor of Christianity was of the same nature with an interest in sophistical problems; the holiest relations being torn asunder at the same time by hatred and discord. And then, again, as the prevailing systems changed, sometimes one and sometimes another being enforced by wordly power, it was almost an unavoidable consequence that the people should either be made suspicious of Christianity and indifferent to it, or else tempted to employ falsehood and hypocrisy in the most sacred things.

It is true that monachism appeared likely to subordinate every thing to a striving after the highest, by means of its example in giving a wholesome stimulus to the enervated race; but it was itself too impure in most of its manifestations to be able to give pure impressions, while it brought confusion into moral ideas by its arbitrary mode of worship. In former times, this external strictness of morals had found a corresponding internal basis in the minds of men; but now it was to be made prominent, in a degree much increased by monachism, among a people devoid of faith. Of course the people endeavored to make the pressure of the new law as light as possible, to which

20 Hilarius ad Constantium, ii. 5: Dam in verbis pagna est, dam de novitibus quaestio est,—dam de studia certamen est, dam in consensus difficultas est, dam alter alteri anathema esse coeptit; proper jam nemo Christi est.


24 Neander's Chrysost. Bd. 1, S. 78, 90.

monachism itself contributed most readily by making a distinction between a higher and a lower virtue.\textsuperscript{26} To introduce a Christian morality into the life of society, the church began to extend its penance to smaller offenses likewise,\textsuperscript{27} and at the numerous councils an extensive code of laws was formed, which fixed certain ecclesiastical punishments for different ecclesiastical and moral transgressions, according to their external form. In the eastern church, this penance was left to the free-will of the transgressors, in the case of private offenses; particularly after Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, had abolished (about 391) the προσβήτερος ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας (see Div. I. § 71, note 11).\textsuperscript{28} But in the western church, this began to consider it necessary condition of forgiveness for all sins,\textsuperscript{29} and in order

\textsuperscript{26} Comp. an unknown preacher of the day (Augustini, tom. v. app. Sermo 82, also in Ambrosii Opp. as Sermo in dom. xxii. post Pentecost.) on Lucc. iii. 12, ss.: Nonnulli fratres, qui aut militiae cingulo detinentur, aut in acta sunt publico constituti, cum peccant graviter, hae solent a peccatis suis prima se voce excusare, quod militant. — Illud autem quale est, quod cum ob errorem alicui senioribus argumentat, et imputatur, alicui de illis, cur ebris fuerit, cur res alienas pervaserit, cadem cur turbulentur amiserit; statim respondet: Quid habebam facere, homo secularius et miles? Non numquam monachum sum professus aut clericum? Quasi omnis, qui clericus non est aut monachus, posit in lice, quod non iicit. Chrysostom frequently inveighs against the abuses of this distinction; for example, de Lazerro Orat. iii. (Opp. i. 737) in Ep. ad Hebr. Hom. vii. c. 4 (Opp. xii. 79). Neander's Chrysost. i. 85. Augustin. in Psalm xviii. Sermo ii. § 4: Cum cooperitis Deo quisque vivere, mundum contemnere, injuriar suas nonne ulciaci, nonne hoc civitas, non hoc quasercere felicissimam terram, contumax omnis. Dominum solum cogitate, viam Christi non deserere; non solum a paganis dicitur insanus, sed quod magis dolendum est, quia et intus multi dormiant, et evigilare nonunt, a suis, a Christianis audiant quid petere? in Psalm x°. Sermo i. § 4: Quoniam inter Paganos qui fuerit Christianus, a Pagannis audita verba aspera,—sic inter Christianos qui voluerint esse diligentiores et meliores, ab ipsis Christianis audituri sunt insulaciones,—dicunt: magnus tu justus, tu es Elias, tu es Petrus, de caelo venisti. Insultant; quocumque se vererit, audite hinc atque inde verbum asperum.

\textsuperscript{27} Cramer's Fort. v. Bossuet's Weltgesch. Th. 5, Bd. i, S. 379, ss.

\textsuperscript{28} Socrates, v. 19. Sozomenus, vii. 16. According to Socrates, the decree was: Πέμελην μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας προσβήτερον· συγχωρήσας δὲ, ἐκατόν τὸ ἱδώ συνειδήτη τῶν μοναχικὸν μετέχειν. So Chrysoest. in Ep. ad Hebr. Hom. 31, c. 3 (Opp. xii. 289): Μή ἁμαρτολοὺς καλόμενοι ἑαυτοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀναλογίζομεθα, κατ’ ἑδον ἐκατόν ἀνάλογοντες. οὐ λέγω οὐ “ ἐκπόνησαν σαντοῦν,” οὐδέ γαρ τοῖς ἅλλοις καθήκορον, ἀλλ’ πάλιν ιδύνομεν συμβούλιον ὑπερήφανον “ ἀποκλήσαν πρὸς κύριον τῷ ὅλῳ σοι” (Psalm xxxvi. 3). ἐπὶ τῶν θεών ταῦτα ὀρθόγραφον, ἐπὶ τῶν ὅκαστον ὀρθόγραφον ἀνάμεσα ἁμαρτήματα, ἐλέγξησον, εἰ ἀλλ’ τῇ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ’ τῇ μορίᾳ. In like manner ad Illuminandos catech. ii. c. 4 (Opp. ii. 240), de Poenitentia Hom. vi. c. 5 (ibid. p. 326): Non esse ad gratiam concionandum, c. 3 (ibid. p. 665), in Ep. i. ad Corinth. Hom. 28, c. 1, ad 1 Cor. xii. 28 (Opp. x. 250), et passim.

\textsuperscript{29} Augustinus Serm. 351 (de Poenitentia, § 2, ss., distinguishes tres actions poenitentiales. Una est, quae novum hominem partitur, donee per baptismum salutare omnium
to set aside all difficulties, to change public confession into a private one in the case of private sins.  

It can not be denied, that this system of penance promoted a certain external propriety of conduct; and as little can it be disallowed that the church awakened and animated a feeling, which had almost entirely disappeared from paganism, by its care

praeteritorum fact ablatio pecatorum.—Alteras.—Nulli actio per totam istam vitam, qua in carne mortalis dignitias, perpetua supplicationis humilitate subeunda est.—Tertia, quae pro illis peccatis subeunda est, respectas the contrary: § 9: Implicatus egit tibi mortifero crimine vinculis pecatorum detectat, aut differt, aut dubitat confugere ad ipsas claves Ecclesiae, quibus salvator in terra, ut sit solutus in caelo: et audet sibi post hanc vitam, quia tua tanti Christianus dicitur, salutem aliquam polliceri?

—Judiet ergo siste ipsam hominem et mortem vestrum in me. Et cum ipso in se profecerit non esse antiquum medicinae, sed tam in medicinae sententiam, venitat ad antisodium, quia illa in Ecclesia claves ministerient: et tamquam bonus jam inceptus esse fuit, materno- orum membrorum ordine custodiatur, quae praeecessit sacramentorum aliquis satisfactionis suo modum.

Ut si peccatum ejus non solum in gravi ejus mulie, sed etiam in tanto scandalo aliorum est, atque hoc expedire utilitati Ecclesiae videtur antiitissi, in notitia multorum, vel etiam totius plebis agere poenitentiam non recusat, non resistat, non set et morti- feras plagas per pudorem addit tumorem.  

However, de Symbolo ad Cathedramus, c. 7: illi, quos videtis agere poenitentiam, sceletae commiserunt, aut adulteria, aut aliquas facta immanis: in se agent poenitentiam. Nam si levia peccata (above) venialia, sine quibus vita ista non est, and: levia, sine quibus esse non possimur) ipsorum essent, ad haec quotidiana oratio de loculo sufficit.  

Leo M. Epist. 108, ed. Ball. (83, ed. Quass.) ad Theodorum, c. 2: Multiplex misericordia Dei ita lapsibus subvenit humanis, ut non solum per baptismam gratiam, sed etiam per poenitentiae medicam eips vita, repararet aeternae, ut qui regenerationis dona violasset, proprio se judico condensantes, ad remissionem criminum pervenirent: sic divinae bontatis praeeditis ordinatis, ut indulgentiæ Dei nisi superstitionibus Sacerdotum neque obstineri. Mediator enim Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus haec prae oppositae Ecclesiae tradidit potestatem, ut et confitentibus actionem poenitentiae darent: et eodem salubri satisfactione purgatos ad communem sacramentorum per jamun reconciliationes admittat. Cui utique operi inaccessibiliter ipsa Salvator intervenit, nec umquam ab his abstet, quas ministri suis exequanda commissit, dicens: Ecce ego vos bibam, et doctiores (Matth. xxviii. 20), ut si quid per servitutem nostri bono ordine et gratulando impleatur effectu, non amissus pro Spiritu Sanctum suisse donatam. Cf. Hieronymus Comm. in Matth. xvi. 19: Iste locum: Et dabo tibi claves regni caelorum, Episcopum et Presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisaeor- rum assumptum supercilium, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se novitis absolvunt, cum spad Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed eorum vita quaeraret.

Leo M. Epist. 108, ed. Ball. (ed. Quass. 136), c. 2: Iliam etiam contra apostolicam regulam praeconuem, quam nuper agnoverit a quibusdam illicita usurpatioe committe, modis omnibus constitutum subveni. De poenitentia scilicet, quae a fidibus postulator, non de singulorum pecatorum genera libelli scripta professio publice recitatur: cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta.—Quia non omnium buxomodi sunt peccata, ut ea, qui poenitentiam posseunt, non timeant publicare; removetor tam improbabilis consuetudo: ne multi a poenitentiae remedium accedant, dum aut erubescent, aut motent inimici qui ea facta reserab, quibus possint legenum constitutione percelli. Sufficient enim illa confessione, qua primum Deo offertur, tum etiam, Sacerdoti qui proficet poenitentiam precator accedit. Tunc enim demum plures ad poenitentiam poterunt provocari, si populi auribus non publicaret conscientia consistentis.

for the oppressed and suffering part of humanity, for the poor, the captives, the sick, widows and orphans. But yet by this new system of legislation, Christian freedom, and genuine morality which has its root in it, were robbed of their true life. A comparison of the present with earlier times, in this particular, would present none but melancholy results.

§ 105.

INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON LEGISLATION.


Though the great changes which had taken place in Roman legislation since Constantine had not been effected by Christianity alone, yet Christian principles and Christian customs, even respect to the Mosaic law, had an important influence on it; while several laws were directly owing to representations made by the bishops. A stay was put to sensual excesses, rape was punished with death, immoral plays were abolished or checked. Contestes of gladiators, which had been already pro-

---

1 De Rhee, p. 39, ss. 2 De Rhee, p. 65, 77, 8.
5 Cod. Theod. lib. ix. tit. 24, de raptu virginum vel viduarunm. Riffel, i. 110.
6 Comp. the laws Cod. Theodos. lib. xv. t. 5, de spectaculis; tit. 6, de Majuna; tit. 7, de scenicis. Stäublin's Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu, Bd. 3, S. 388. Yet it is evident from the law, Cod. Justin. iii. 15, 11. A.D. 469, that at that time, in addition to the scene theatrals and the circense theatrum, the ferarum lacrymosa spectacula also still continued:
hibited by Constantine, still continued, it is true, at Rome; but they were entirely abolished by Honorius. Classes of society which had been heretofore almost unrecognized by the laws, were now embraced within their operation. The condition of slaves and of prisoners was improved; the unlimited power of fathers over their children abridged; women, who had been kept till now in a very inferior position, were invested with greater rights; and the widow and orphan protected. On the other hand, legislation did not comply everywhere, or in every respect, with the peculiar requirements of the Christian morals of this age. The laws became more bloody and strict than before. The oath assumed Christian forms, but was more frequently administered. And though restrictions upon certain marriages were established, agreeably to Christian principles, the laws against celibacy abolished, and second marriages rendered difficult, yet the old liberty of divorce was but partially limited; and from fear of still greater crimes, the emperors were obliged to admit many causes of valid separation, besides unfaithfulness to the marriage contract.

probably only in the west, for in the east, they appear to have ceased even before Theodosius I. See Müller Comm. de genio, moribus et luxs nevi Theodosiani. Hav. 1797 P. ii. p. 87.


2 De Rhee. p. 117, ss. Meysemb. p. 34.

3 Cod. Theod. lib. ix. tit. 3, de castodia ruorum. De Rhee, p. 72.

4 De Rhee, p. 137, ss. Meysemb. p. 45.

5 De Rhee, p. 134.

6 De Rhee, p. 111.


8 Cod. Theod. lib. iii. tit. 12, de incestis nuptiis, on forbidden degrees of affinity. De Rhee p. 248. Besides, marriage between Christians and Jews was forbidden (l. c. iii. 7, 2). A proposal of marriage made to a nun was punished with death (ix. 25, 2).


10 On the poena secundarum matricum, see de Rhee, p. 240; Meysemb. p. 61; v Lühr in the Archiv d. civilistische Praxis, Bd. 16 (1833), S. 32.

SEVENTH CHAPTER.

ATTEMPTS AT REFORMATION.

§ 106.

The new tendencies of Christian life could not slide in unnoticed, especially as it is certain that the Catholic church was frequently reproached with them by the older Christian parties.\(^1\)

Nor were the morally dangerous aspects of these tendencies entirely overlooked by the more acute; though they were too often exculpated on the ground of pious intentions.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Faustus (ap. Augustin. contra Faust. xx. 4): Vos, qui deciscentes a gentibus monachiae opinionem primo vobiscum dvolisistis, id est, ut omnia creeditis ex Deo; sacrificia vero eorum vertistis in agapae, idola in Martyres, quos votis similium colitis; defunctorum umbras vino placatis et dapiibus; solemnnes gentium dies cum ipsa celebratis, ut calendas, et solstitialia; de vita certe mutastis nihil; estis sane schisma, a matrice sua diversum nihil habens nisi conventum. The Novatians also rejected the worship of martyrs and relics. See Eulogius Patr. Alex. (about 589) contra Novatianos lib. Vto. (ap. Photius Cod. 289; cf. Cod. 189); perhaps also Eustathius (Conc. Gangr. c. 29, comp. however, Dallaeus adv. Latinorum de cultuis religiosi objecto tradit. p. 151). Eunomius was an opponent of martyr-worship (auctor hujus haeresis. Hieron. adv. Vigilant.) and of monachism (Gregor. Nyssen. contra Eunom. lib. ii.).

\(^2\) As Hieronym. adv. Vigilant. (Opp. iv. ii. p. 284): Cereos autem non clara luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniari, sed ut noctia tenebras hoc solutio temperemus.—Quod si aliqui per imperitiam et simplicitatem saecularium hominum, vel certe religiosarum feminarum, de quibus vere possimus dicere: confiteor, eum Dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam (Rom. x. 1) hoc pro honore Martyrum faciant, quid inde perdìs? Causabantur quondam et Apostoli, quod perierit unguentum; sed Domini voce correpit sunt (Matt. xxvi. 6, 8, ss.). Neque enim Christus indigebat unguento, nec Martyres lumine cereorum: et tamen illa mulier in honore Christi hoc fecit, devotioque mentis ejus recipitur; et quicumque accedunt cereos, secundum fidem suam habent mercedem, dicente Apostolo: unusquisque in suo sense abundet (Rom. xiv. 5). Augustin. ad Januarium lib. ii. (Epist. 55) § 35: Quod autem institutur praeter consuetudinem, ut quasi observatio sacramenti sit, approbase non possum, etiamsi multa hujusmodi propter nonnullarum vel sanctarum vel turbulentarum personarum scandalis devianta, liberius improbare non audeo. Sed hoc nimis doleo, quod multa, quae in divinis libris subseriisse praecipita sunt, minus curarent; et tam multa praesumendum sie plena sunt omnia, ut gravius corripitur, qui per octavas suas terram nudo pede tetigitur (namely neophyts, cf. Tert. de Cor. mil. c. 3. See Div. I. § 53, note 25), quam qui mentem virilem regerent. Omnia itaque talia, quae neque sanctarum scripturarum auctoritatis continentur, nec in concilii episcoporum statuta inveniuntur, nec consuetudine universae ecclesiæ roborata sunt, sed pro diversorum locorum diversis moribus innumerabiliti variatur, ita ut vis aut omnino nunquam inveniri possint causa, quas in eis instituendis hominæ securi sunt, ubi facultas tribuitur, sine ulla dubitatione resecanda existimari. Quamvis enim neque hoc inveniri possit, quomodo contra fidem sint: ipsum tamen religionem, quam
looked into the ecclesiastical and religious errors of the time more profoundly, and attacked them publicly, were declared heretics by the offended hierarchy; and their voice soon died away without being able to give another direction to the incipient development of ecclesiastical life. To these latter belonged Aerius, presbyter in Sebaste, and friend of bishop Eustathius (about 360); 2 Jovinian, monk at Rome (about 388), first condemned there by Siricius, afterward by Ambrose at Milan; 3 some of

paeonissimus et manifestissimus celebrationum sacramentis misericordia Dei esse liberam voluit, servilibus oneribus prunam, ut tolerabilirat miti conditio Judaeorum, qui, etiamsi tempus libertatis non agnovissent, legibus tamen servarent, non humanis praesumptibus subjiciuntur. Sed ecclesia Dei inter multam palam multaque zizania constituta, multa tolerat, et tamen quae sunt contra fidelem vel bonum vitam non approbat, nec tacet nec factit. Id contra Fustum, xx. 21: Allud est quod docemus, allud quod sustinamus, allud quod praecipere jubemur, allud quod emendare praecipimus, et donece emendemus, tolerare compellimur. Alia est disciplina Christianorum, alia luxuria vilenientorum, vel error infirmorum.


3 Sirici Epist. ad diversos episcopos adv. Jovinianum (about 389) ap. Constant. Epist. 7 Ambrosii Rescriptum ad Siricium (Epist. 12, ap. Constant. Ep. Sirico, 8). Hieronymi libb. ii. adv. Jovinianum a.D. 392. Augustini de Haer. c. 82, and in other writings. Doubtless Jovinian was greatly strengthened by the prevailing prejudice at Rome against monachism, and by the death of Blaesilla (384). See § 96, note 3. He was thus excited to reflection, and was brought to deny the advantages which the monastic state claimed in its favor. Hence also he met with so much acceptance in Rome. See his doctrines in Jerome, i. 2: Dicit, virginis, viduas et maritatas, quae semel in Christo locata sunt, si non discrepant caeteris operibus, ejusdem esse meriti (August. l.c. virginitatem etiam sanctimonialium, et continentiam sexus virilis in sanctis eligentibus cellibem vitam coniugiorum castorum atque fidelim meritis adaequabat: ita ut quaedam virginis sacrae protrahentiam jam acetatis in urbe Roma, ubi haec docebat, co audito nupissae dicantur). Nihil approbare, eoa, qui plena fide in baptismo renati sunt, a diablo non posses subvertire (farther below:—non posses teutari: quinqueque autem tentati fuerint, ostendit, eosque aqua tantum et non spiritut baptizatos, quod in Simonie magno legimus: more accurately Jerome adv. Pelaq. ii. Posse huiusmodi baptismatum, si velherit, necquaquam ultra perecebat: i.e., divine grace is communicated fully to man in baptism, and is not increased by the monastic state). Tertium propositum, inter abscinentiam ciborum et cum gratiarum actione perceptionem corum nullam esse distantiam. Quantum, quod et extremum, esse omnium, qui sumum baptismam servaverint, unam in regno caelorum remunerationem. Augustine adds, l.c.: Omnia peccata, sicut stoici philosophi, paria esse dicerant. (Jovinian said: Hieron. adv. Jov. ii. 20: Qui fratri dixerit satus et data, renis erit Geennas: et qui homicida fuerit et adulter, mittetur similiter in Geennam), and virginisatem Martiae destruabat, dicens eam pariendo Frisse corruptam.—Comp. Augustin. Retract. ii. 22:
whose opinions were soon after adopted by two monks of Milan, *Sarmatio* and *Barbatianus* (about 396); but especially *Vigilantius* (shortly before 404) of Calagurris in Gaul (now Caseres in the district Comminges in Gascony), presbyter in Barcelona.\(^6\)


\(^5\) Ambrosii Epist. 63 (al. 62, al. 25) ad Vercellensesm ecclesiam: Audi venisse ad vos Sarmationem et Barbatianum, vanillogos homines, qui dicunt nullam esse abstinentiam meritum, nullum frugalitatem, nullam virginitatem gratiam, pari omnes aestimari preto, dolirae eos, qui jejunis custigent carnem suam, et menti substitam faciant etc.


EIGHTH CHAPTER.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 107.

IN THE EAST.

In Persia, where there were numerous churches under the metropolitan bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, Christianity had become an object of suspicion ever since it had prevailed in the Roman empire. The recommendation of Constantine, therefore, in favor of the Persian Christians, had no permanent or good influence with the king (Sapor II. 309–381). When a war broke out soon after between the Romans and Persians, Sapor began a tedious and horrible persecution of the Christians with the execution of Simon, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon (343), under the pretense of his being a spy of the Romans. After Sapor’s death, indeed, this persecution ceased, Jezdegerd I. (400–421) being at first even a friend to the Christians; but the fanatic Abdas, bishop of Susa, by the destruction of a fire-temple (414) brought on another persecution as severe, which was finally extinguished by Theodosius II., making war on the Persians (422). The Persian church was always in close connection with the Syrian, and exhibited the same theological tendency. When, therefore, Nestorianism in its native land was forced to give way to violence, it found a secure asylum among Persian Christians; from which time the Persian church separated itself from that of the Roman empire.

Christianity had also been introduced into Armenia as early as the second century. In the time of Diocletian, it was spread

4 § 85, at the end.
5 Dionysius Corinthius according to Eusebius, vi. 46, πρωτε τοις κατὰ Ἀρμενίαν περὶ μετανοίας, ὄν ἐπισκόπευε Μεροντέμις.
more widely by *Gregory the Illuminator*, who gained over king *Tiridates* himself to its side, and was consecrated first metropolitan of Armenia in 302 by Leontius, bishop of Caesarea. The long contests that followed, with the adherents of the old religion, had an important political character, so far as the one party was supported by the Persian, the other by the Roman emperors. But when, after the greatest part of Armenia had come under the Persian dominion (428), the Persian kings wished to procure by violence a victory for the Zend-doctrine over Christianity, they found such determined opposition, that they were at last obliged to allow the Christians the free exercise of their religion, after a lengthened war (442–485). In the fifth century, *Mesrop* gave the Armenians their alphabet and a version of the Bible.—Christianity was carried into *Iberia* under Constantine the Great.

At the same time it was introduced into *Ethiopia* by *Frumenius*; first at court, and, very soon after, throughout the country. In southern *Arabia* among the *Homerites*, Constantius endeavored to establish Christianity by means of *Theophylactus* (about 350). He seems, however, not to have produced any considerable effect.

---

9 A history of these persecutions, from 439–451, and of the general of the Armenians, Vartan, written by a contemporary, Eliaš, bishop of the Amadunians, is: The History of Vartan, by Eliasae, bishop of the Amadunians, translated from the Armenian by C. F. Neumann. Lond. 1830. 4. Comp. St. Martin, i. 391. The proclamation in commendation of the Zend-religion, issued before the beginning of the persecution by the Persian general Mirr-Nereh, is especially deserving of notice, ap. Saint-Martin, i. 472, more correctly in the history of Vartan, p. 11.
11 Rufini Hist. eccl. x. 10. Socrates, i. 20. Sozomenus, ii. 7. Theodoretus, i. 23 Moses Chorenesis, ii. c. 83.
13 Philostorgius, ii. 6; iii. 4. Since it was an Arian Christianity, orthodox historians are silent on the subject.

§ 108.

IN THE WEST.

In the preceding period Christianity had been known among the Goths (Div. I. § 57), and there was even a Gothic bishop at the council of Nice.¹ After Arianism had been fathered upon them by their ecclesiastical connection with Constantinople,² Ulphilas, who was consecrated bishop in 348 at Constantinople, became their apostle.³ When the Christian Goths were oppressed by a persecution, he led a great multitude of them into the habitation about Nicopolis in Moesia, which Constantius had assigned them (355), where, after inventing the Gothic alphabet, he translated the Bible into Gothic.⁴ Afterward, Frithigern broke off from Athanarich, the leader of the Visigoths, who persecuted the Christians, with a part of the people, was supported by Valens, and spread Christianity among his subjects. And when the Huns pressed upon the Goths, this portion of the Visigoths received a place of residence from Valens, in Thrace, on condition of their becoming Christians (375); and Ulphilas was especially active in their conversion. Soon after, Arianism was overthrown by Theodosius. Ulphilas died in Constantinople (388), where he endeavored in vain to revive it. Efforts were now made at Constantinople to procure acceptance for the Nicene confession among the Goths, but without much success.

¹ Among the signatures preserved in Latin: Theophilus Gothorum Metropolis (sc. Episc.). Socrates also mentions the signature of Θεόφιλος τῶν Τύκτων ἐπίσκοπος.
² According to Theodoret. H. E. iv. 33, Ulilla led away the Goths to Arianism, while he told them ἐκ φιλοστίμως γεγενήσατί τὴν ἔρων, δομινών δὲ μηθείαν εἶναι διαφοράν. It is true, indeed, that the Goths had such a view of the controversy.
³ Respecting him, Socrates, iv. 33; Sozomenus, vi. 37; Theodoretus, iv. 33; Philostorgius, ii. 5; Jordanis (about 550 in the Eastern Roman Empire, incorrectly called Jornandes, and reckoned a bishop of Ravenna) de Rebus Goticis (in Muratori Rerum Italicarum scriptores, l. p. 157), c. 25. More exact information respecting him was first furnished by the letter of Auxentius, bishop of Dorostorus, his disciple, which, transferred to a work of the Arian bishop Maximin, has been again found along with it in a cod. Paris, and printed and explained in: G. Walz über das Leben u. die Lehre des Ulilla. Hanno- over. 1840. 4.
Arian Christianity was diffused by the Visigoths with surprising rapidity among the other wandering German tribes, while it was suppressed in the Roman empire. The fact of the Arian doctrine being more easily apprehended, and hatred to the Romans, procured the confidence of the Germans in Arianism; and it soon obtained the reputation of being as generally the Christianity of the Germans as Homousianism was of the Romans.

The Ostrogoths and Vandals first received Arian Christianity from their countrymen. The Burgundians had passed indeed into the Catholic Church after their wandering into Gaul (413); but they afterward (about 450) adopted Arianism, along with their kings, belonging to the Visigothic race. In like manner, Catholic Christianity had been at first received by the Suevi in Spain; but Arianism was subsequently disseminated among them by the Visigoths (469). The older Catholic inhabitants of the countries in which these German tribes had settled suffered oppression only from the Visigoths and Vandals. They were especially persecuted by the latter in a most horrible manner after Africa (431–439) had been conquered by them under their first two kings, Genseric († 477) and Huneric († 484). The Christianity of the Germans was still mixed, to a considerable degree, with heathenism: what rude notions they entertained of the former may be seen in the practice of buying off crimes with money, which they soon transferred to Christian repentance.

---


6 Jordanis, c. 25 : Sic quoque Veseogothae a Valente Imp. Ariani potius quam Christiani effecti. De caetero tam Ostrogothis quam Gepidis parentibus suis per affectionis gratiam evangelizantes huys perfidiae culturam edocentes, omnem ubique linguae huys nationem ad culturam huys sectae invitatere.


9 Cf. Homilia de haereticis peccata vendantibus, in Mabillon Museum Italicum, t. i. P. 27 (according to Mabillon's conjecture, p. 6, belonging to Maximus Taurinensis, about 440) : Nec mirari dehemes, quod huysmodi haeretici in nostra aberrare coeperint regione. Nam ut eorum interim blasphemiae seponamus, restexamus, quae sint ipsorum praecipua vivendi. Praepositi eorum, quos Presbyteros vocant, dicuntur tale habere mandatum, ut si quis laicorum fasus fuerit crimen admission, non dicat illi: age poenitentiam, deplorea
Christianity in Britain (Div. I. § 57) was in the mean time very much retarded by the Anglo-Saxons, who had established themselves there from A.D. 449. The Britons still held out in Wales, in the mountains of Northumberland and Cornwall, where alone Christianity was preserved. Shortly before this, Christianity had been established in Ireland by St. Patrick (about 430) and spread with rapidity over the island. The seat of the bishop soon arose at Armagh.

Facta tans, defle peccata; sed dicat: pro hoc crimine da tantum mibi, et indulgetur tibi.—Suscipit ergo dona Presbyter, et pactione quadam indulgentiam de salvatore promittit. Insipiens placitum, in quo dicitur, minus deliquisse Domino, qui plus contulerit Sacerdoti. Apare hujusmodi preceptores semper divites innocentas, semper pauperes criminosi.

10 According to Ussher, belonging to Kilpatrick in Dumbarton in Scotland; according to John Lanigan Ecclesiastical History of Ireland (2 ed. Dublin. 1829. 4 vols.), i. 93, belonging to Bonaventura Tavereus, i. e., Boulogne in Picardy.

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON TO THE BEGINNING OF THE MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSIES, AND THE TIME OF MUHAMMED.
A.D. 451–622.

SOURCES.

I. *Ecclesiastical historians*: The works of the two Monophysites are lost, viz., the presbyter John Aegeates, Hist. eccles. lib. x., of which the first five books comprised the period between 428 and 479 (see Photius Cod. 41, cf. 55); and of Zacharias Rhetor, bishop of Meletina in Lesser Armenia, an excerpt from Socrates and Theodoret, and a continuation to 547 (Greek fragments in Evagrius: 19 Syrian fragments, of which Assemanus Bibl. orient. ii. 53, gave an account, communicated in A. Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. x. 361); as also of the Nestorian Basil of Cilicia (presbyter in Antioch, Photius Cod. 107), Eccles. hist. libb. iii. from 450 to 518 (Photius Cod. 42).

Still extant are: Theodorus Lector, in fragments, Evagrius Scholasticus, Nicephorus Callistus (comp. the preface of division 1).

Gennadius, presbyter in Marseilles, † after 495, and Isidore, bishop of Hispalis, † 636, de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, both in Fabricii Bibliotheca eccles. Hamb. 1718. fol.


Chronicon paschale (comp. the preface of division 1).


III. *Latin chroniclers* (comp. preface to division 1): Marcellinus Comes, till 534, continued by another till 566 (in Sirmondi
SECOND PERIOD.—DIV. II.—A.D. 451-692.


IV. Imperial decrees: Codex Justinianus, see preface to division 1.—Novellae (νεαραὶ διατάξεις μετὰ τὸν κόσμικα).

FIRST CHAPTER.

ENTIRE SUPPRESSION OF PAGANISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

§ 109.

In the east, the remains of paganism disappeared under Justinian I. (527-565), who abolished the New Platonic school at Athens (529), and compelled the heathen to submit to baptism. Only the free Maenotts in the Peloponnesus clung obstinately to it. Even in the west it was not yet completely extirpated. Theodoric was obliged to prohibit sacrifices to the gods on pain of death; and at the end of the fifth century many heathen practices were still continued at Rome, and could not be abolished without resistance. Still longer did various

2 Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. xi. (de paginis et sacrificiis et templis) l. 10. Theophanes, i. 276, activity of Johannes Episc. Asiae (probably a missionary bishop for the conversion of the heathen in Asia Minor) see Assemani Bibl. Orient. ii. 85. As late as the year 561 heathens were discovered in Constantinople (Joh. Malala, p. 491).
4 See Lindemrogi Cod. legum antt. p. 255.
5 Cf. Salvianus Massil. above § 79, note 23. Gelasius P. (492-496) adv. Andromachum Senatorum caeterosque Romanos, qui Lupercailla secundum morem pristinum colenda constituunt (ap. Manst., viii. p. 95, ss.). He shows of what a sacrilege he is guilty, qui cum se Christianum videri velit, et profiteatur, et dicat, palam tamen publiceque prae-
superstitions adhere to those heathen temples which were not destroyed. 6 In many distant places paganism was maintained for a long time undisturbed. Sacrifices were offered in a temple of Apollo on Mount Cassinum, until Benedict (529) transformed it into a chapel of St. Martin. 7 In Sicily, 8 but especially in Sardinia 9 and Corsica, 10 there were still many heathen about A.D. 600. Even Gregory the Great did not hesitate now to advise violent measures, with the view of effecting their conversion. 11

dicare non horret, non refugiat, non pavescat, idem morbos cognos, quia daemonia non colantur, et deo Februario non litetur.—Quando Augustinus Imperator Roman venit (about 479), Lupercalia utique gerebantur—dam hace mala licuitque perdurant, idem hace ipsa imperia dolocerunt, idem etiam Romanorum, non romitis etiam Lupercalibus, usque ad extremum quaque pervenuit. Et idem nunc in renovenda suadeo.—Postremo si de mœrum persona praescrivendum aestimas praecesseremus; unaqueque nostrorum administrationis suae redditorum est rationem.—Ego negligientiam accusare non audeo praecesseremus, cum magis credam fortasse tentasse eos, ut habe provocatas tolleretur, et quandam extitisse causas et contrariis voluntates, quae eorum intentionibus praedipitent: sicut ne nunc quidem vos istos absistere insanis consibus velle perpenditis. Beugnot Hist. de la destruction du Paganisme en Occident, i. 273.


7 Gregorii M. Dialog. lib. ii. Beugnot, ii. 285. At a still later period heathen rites of worship in holy groves were practiced in the diocese of Terracina. Gregorii M. viii. Ep. 18, ad Agnellum Episc. Terracina.

8 Gregor. M. lib. iii. Epist. 62.


11 He prescribes, lib. iv. Ep. 66, in case a peasant should obstinately persist in heathenism: Tanto pensionis meae gravandas est, ut ipsa exactionis suae poena compellatur ad rectitudinem fastinare. And lib. ix. Epist. 65: Contra idolorum quoque culturos vel aruspices atque sortilegos Fraternitatem vestram vehementius pastori hortamus in vigillare custodi, atque publice in populo contra hujs rei viros sermonem facere, esque a tanti labo sacrilegi et divini intentatione judicii et praesentia vitae periculu, adhoratione suscipia revocare. Quos tamen si emendare se a talibus atque corrigeere none repereris, ferventi comprehendere zelo te volumus: et siquidem servi sunt, verberibus cruciatibusque quibus ad emendationem pervenire valeant, castigare. Si vero sunt liberi, inclusione digna districteque sunt in poenitentiam dirigendi; ut qui salubri et a mortuis periculo revocanda audire vera contemnant, cruciatus saltem eos corporis ad desideratum mentis valeat reducere sanitatem.

vol. 1.—30
SECOND CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 110.

MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSIES.


The decisions of the council of Chalcedon were regarded by the Egyptian party as completely Nestorian.¹ There was therefore an insurrection of monks in Palestine, led on by one of their number, Theodosius, against Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, and favored by the widowed empress Eudoxia, which was finally crushed after much bloodshed (451–453).² But in Alexandria, a considerable party, headed by the presbyter, Timothy of allous, and the deacon Peter of myogos (i. e., blaesus, Liberat. c. 16), separated from the newly-appointed bishop Proterius. The

¹ So also the Monophysites related that Leo the Great and Theodoret had been completely reconciled to Nestorius; that the latter had been invited to the Synod of Chalcedon by the Emperor Marcian, but had died on the way. See Zachariae Hist. eccl. in Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. x. 361, and Xenayas, bishop of Mabug, about 500, in Assemanii Bibl. or. ii. 49. On the other hand, it is remarked by Evagrius, ii. 2, that Nestorius had died previously.

greatest part of this faction continued to maintain the doctrine of one nature, rejected the council of Chalcedon, and considered Dioscorus as unjustly deposed; 3 while, on the contrary, they

3 The most important representative of this tendency which we have is Severus, Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, from A.D. 513. (See below, note 19.) Compl. leg. Comm. qua Monophysitarsen veterum variae de Christi persona opiniones imprimit ex ipsoarchi effatis recens. editis illustrantur (Partic. ii. Gotting. 1635, 38. 4), i. 9, ss. Severi locus (prim. ed. Mansi. vii. 831. Gallandius, xii. 733, is, according to Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. i. 136, from Severi lib. contra Grammaticum, Ioannem Ep. Caesareae): Αι τις φύσεις τον Χριστον νοομεν, την μεν κατηγορη, την δε άκτιστον: άλλες άνωθεν έγραψατο τον Χαλκοδόνο σώματος την άλλων ταυτην γραφων, τη δηστε δυο φύσεις άνωθαν σερη της τον οπαδωνηλη. ένωτες διαλαμβανομενοι, άνωθεν ταυτην έστησε την κατηγορη, άλλες έκτην μαλα δικαιων, τη δηστε μη άκολουθησαν το άγιο Κυριλλον εκ δυο φύσεων έσταν εντο Χριστον. Οι ταυτεμεθα λέγοντες, ως δειπνα τις την Χαλκοδον σώματος τον τομον Λεοντος την καθ ιπόστασιν ένωσαν ομολογοσαντος, ουτων ουκ εστων φυσικων, ή εις άρμονον ένα Χριστον, ή μαν φύσις του θεου λογον παρακυμαμενης και τοτε γνωσσαμεν, ως κατα τον σωφρονα Κυριλλον θεωρια μην ανακρινοντες την ουσιοθε ταφε αποφασα τον συνεκπελτην οπικρασιως εις εν Ισαα: και ως έτερο η του λογου φυσες, και έτερο η της ταρασιν, και ως ου τα άλλας συνεπερας καθισμας την νυς, διαταται δε ονταμεν. Ex ejusd. ad Jo. Grammat. liii. e. 1, ap. Majum. l. c. p. 138: Και των, εις ου ενος, μενοντων ομοιων και αναλογιων, εν συνθε τι εθε ουτωσι και οι εν μιαν αυτον θεωσαντος. Ex ejusd. epist. iii. ad Ioannem decor. ap. Majum. l. c. p. 71: Εναν δεν εις εις εις της Χριστου, μαν ως εν εις αυτον εν το το φυσες και την ιποστασιν και την ενεργειαν συνθετον εις δωρε υψηλοι, το δε λεγεμονον, ανασκηπτης κρατημενος, ανασκηπτοντας και παντας τοις επι αυτον μετα την εις δευτερον εις θεος και ενεργειαν ουκαριζοντας.—Collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis habita Constantinop. anno 331, ap. Mansi. viii. 832: Quod ex duabus quidem naturis dicere unam significat Dei verbi naturam incarnatam, secundum b. Cyrilium et SS. Patres: in duabus autem naturis duas personas et duas substantias significat. At the same time they allowed that Christ is κατα σαρκα ομοουσιον ημιν (Leontius de Sectis, act. 5. Evagrius, iii. 5).—Severus ap. Anastasius Sinai (about 560) in the Οδηγος adv. Acephalos (prim. ed. J. Gretscher. Ingolst. 1606. 4), c. 18: Αφετερ επι των μιας τον ανθρωπου φωσιας μερος μεν ταυτης εστιν η ψυχη, μερος δε το σωμα, ουτω και επι των Χριστου, και των μιας αυτοι φωσιας, μερος ταυτης ετεχη ε θεος, και μερος του σωμα. This comparison was frequently used by the Monophysites generally after Cyril's example (see Ep. ad Successum, above § 88, note 21), and in like manner by Philoxenus or Xenayas, bishop of Mabug (489-516) in Assemanni Bibl. orient. ii. 35. Gelasius I. (bishop of Rome, 493-496) de duabus naturis in Christo adv. Eutychen et Nestorium (in Bibl. PP. and in Jo. Harel. Haereseologia. Basil. 1556, p. 688): Adhuc autem etiam illud adjectum, ut sicut ex duabus rebus constat homo, id est ex anima et corpore, quoniam ursurque rei sit diversa natura, sicut absolutum non habetur, plerumque tamen usus logendi singulari pronuntiet, simul utrumque complementum, ut humanam dicat naturam, non humanas naturas: sic potentiam in Christo mysterio, et unitatem divinitatis atque humanitatis unam diceri vel debere vel posse naturam: non considerantes, quia cum una natura dicatur humana, quae tamen ex duabus constet, id est ex anima et corpore principaliter, illa causa est, quia nec initialiter anima alibi possit existere, quam in corpore, nec corpus valeset constare sine anima: et merito, quae alterutro sibi sit causa existendi, pariter unam abusive diceri posse naturam, quae sibi invicem causam praebeat, ut ex alterutro natura subsistat humana, salva proprietate duxtaxat duarum. According to the decrees of the synod of Chalcedon, φυσες et oσια are synonymous, while το άτομον and η ιποστασις are different from them. But the Monophysites took φυσες, ιποστασες, et άτομον synonymously, and separated η ιποστασις from them. See Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. vii. i, 11, ss.; my Comm. l. i. 11. That this was also the phraseology employed by Cyril is acknowledged by Eubulus, bishop of Lystra, ap. Majus. l. c. p. 31, who endeavours to exculpate him on that account. And that this controversy was more about correctness
approved of the condemnation of Eutyches, for his supposed Docetism. But as the doctrine of one nature had before led, in some cases, to the idea of considering the body of Jesus as something superhuman, so also now, many attributed peculiar excellencies to it. To the most influential advocates of the doctrine of one nature, Athanasius and Cyril, was now added Pseudo-Dionysius, the Areopagite, whose writings were doubtless composed in Egypt toward the end of the fifth century, and there-of expression than of idea, even the monk Eustathius, with all his bitterness against Severus, is obliged to allow. See Majus, i. c. p. 291, and my Comm. i. 23.

4 Collatio Cathol. cum Severianis apud Mansi, t. viii. p. 281. Qualem opinionem de Eutychi habebitis? Orientales dixerunt: Ταυτάτα δεινά: καλά τοι ἤπιον ἤνα ἑκάστου, καὶ τὸν μαθήματα δικούστε καὶ, ἅτιπα ἐρμαίνως τοὺς περιπτήκες αἰθήνης ἰδουθοῦ (Δαυδ),—δρομοί ταρ' αὐθός ἠφεισότων, καὶ ἡ ἀθεληθεῖς πρὸς Τιμοθύνων, ἤφεισόν ἡμῖν εἶναι κατὰ τὰ σῶμα τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, καὶ τὸ πατρὶ ὁμοούσιον κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ὡς τούτων ἄνθρωπων. Prevailing notion respecting the doctrine of Eutyches: Hormosidas P. Epist. 30, ad Caesarius: Eutyches carnis negans veritatem,—ut Manichean phantasiam ecclesiae Christi— insereret, etc. Justinianus in Codice, i. i. 5: (anathematizamus) et Euthychetem mente captam, phantasiam inducendam. Vigiliani Top-sensis (about 484) adv. Eutychen, libb. v. (Opp. ed. P. F. Chiffletius. Divonne. 1664. 4), in the beginning of lib. iii. : Eutychiana haeresis in id impietas prolapsa est errore, ut non solam verbi et carnis unam credat esse naturam, verum etiam hunc eadem carmen non de saec Mariae virginis corporis adsumtum, sed de coelo dicat, justa infandum Valentinii et Marcionis errorem, fuisse deductam. Ina pertinaciter verbum carmen adserere factum, ut per virgillum, ac si aqua per fistulam, transisse videatur, non tamen ut de virgine ali- quid, quod nostris sit generis, adsumisse credatur. Libertinus, c. 11, Samuel, prelector in Eicessa, wout so far as to attempt to prove to the Eutychians veram humani generis car- nem a Deo assumtam, et non de coelo exhibanum, nec crass aoris substantiam in carne incessisse formatam (Gennadius de vir. illustr. c. 87).


6 So said Dioscorus (in Maji Nova coll. vii. i. 289) : 'Ερευνώνος ὑποθέτων, τοις ὑποθέτων κεκολώνοντες πάθεσιν οὐ κατὰ φύσιν, ἄλλα κατὰ χάριν. And μὴ γένοι τὸν τοῖς φύσων λέγειν ἡμας ὁμοούσιον το θεοῦ ἀριστοί. Timotheus Aelurus (l. c. p. 277): Φύσις δὲ ἁγιατοῦ μία μική θεότης (consequently not as according to Severus: φύσις συνθετησις, and: Εἴ γάρ ἐτ' ἄνθρωποι κατὰ φύσιν καὶ νόμου ὁ ὕπερελθαν ἄνθρωπος ἐν μέτρῳ τῆς παρθένου, οἷς ἐν ἑτέρης ἐνας ἐν μού πρώτον τῆς παρθένιας ἀνθρεβύς

De hierarchia coelesti, de hierarchia ecclesiastica, de nominibus divinis, de theologia mystica, epistolae (ed. Paris. 1644, 2 voll. fol.) falsely ascribed to the Dionysius mentioned in Acts xvii. 34, who, according to Dionys. Corinth. ap. Euseb. iii. 4. iv. 25, was the first bishop of Athens. The first seven of these writings which has been preserved to us, belongs to the beginning of the sixth century, when Joannes Ecypolitanaeus wrote scholia on them (Le Quien dissert. Damasc. prefixed to his edition of Joannes Damasc. i. c. xxxviii. verso). The Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Severus, cites them (see note 8), and the no less respectable orthodox writer Ephraemius, who, from 526, was patriarch of Antioch, refers to them (ap. Photius Cod. 229, ed. Hesych. p. 429). When, however, in the collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis, in the year 531, the Monophysites appealed to them (Mansi, viii. 817), Hypatius, archbishop of Ephesus, judged, ostentari non posse, ista vera esse, quae nullus antiquus memoraverit. Subsequently many were found in the Greek church, who always asserted the spuriousness of these writings (Maximi Profl. in schol. Dionys. p. 45, Photius Cod. 1). In the Latin church, in which they had been widely diffused from
fore coincided with the mode of expounding the doctrine of Christ’s person adopted by Cyril. Among the many heretical names which the party received from its opponents, the appellation Μονοφασιται was the most common. On the other hand they called the opposite party Αναθεμα μονοφασιται, or Διαφανεια. The death of Marcian († 457) inspired the Monophysites with new hopes. At Alexandria, Proterius was killed in an insurrection; and Timotheus Aelurus, chosen bishop. The emperor, Leo I. (457–474) actually requested a new decision of the bishops respecting adherence to the decrees of the council of Chalcedon. But as the majority declared themselves in favor of the synod, Timotheus Aelurus was banished, and Timotheus the ninth century, Laurentius Valla († 1457) was the first that detected the impostor. He was followed in his opinion by the ablest scholars of the day; and Jo. Dallaenas de Scriptis, quae sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Aut. nominibus circumspectus. Genevae. 1666. 4, finally exhibited in a copious form the evidence of their spuriousness. Cf. le Quén I. c. Salis de Eutychianismo ante Entychen. Wolfenbuttelae. 1793. 4, p. 159, ss. J. G. V. Engelhardt Diss. de Dionysio Flotaizante. Erlang. 1829. 8. Id. de Origine scriptorum Areopagiticum. Erf. 1823. 8. The same writer’s Die angeb. Schriften des Areopagiten Dionysius, übcr. u. m. Abhandlungen begleitet. Salzbach. 1832, 2 Theile. 8. Baumgarten-Crusius de Dionysio Areop. comm. 1823 (Opusc. theol. p. 261), departing from the opinions of others, attributes these writings to the third century, and thinks they were written with the object of transferring the Greek mysteries to Christianity. See against this hypothesis Ritter Gesch. d. christl. Philos. ii. 559. 8 He combats the excrescences of it, the doctrines of a confusion and transmutation, de Eccl. hierarchia, c. 3 (Opp. i. 297, 299), de Divinis nominibus, c. 2 (l. c. p. 501). The principal passage is in Epist. iv. ad Caius (Opp. ii. 70): Οδηθ αναθεματος ην, αυτος ος με αναθεματι, αλλα εις αναθεματι, αναθεματι διεκκαι, και επε αναθεματι ανθηκε. Και το διοικην, ου κατα θεον το θεον δικαιος, ου το αναθεματι κατα αναθεματι, αλλα αναθεματι Θεον, καινην τινα την θεοφυλκα καινην μενοις κατα πεπολυτεμνησιν. The last words of this passage are addressed by Severus, Epist. ad Joanneum ducem, in Maji Collect. vii. 1, 71, ss a φωνη του παναθεον ιεραστη, and enlarged by the addition of τον αναθεματον θεον τον ταυτον ενεργειαν και ποιησαντος πεπολυτεμνειν, μεναι υμολογουμεναι φειδοι και υποτασσαν θεοφυλην δευτερα και την μανι φειδοι του θεον λογον εσπαρκωμενην. The Monophysites obtained from Dionysius a new formula in addition to the old Athanasian one.

9 At different times and places, for example, Asephali, Severiani, Aegyptii, Jacobitae, Timotheanii, etc.—Pacundas Episc. Hermianensis (about 540) pro defensione III. capitulorum (lib. v. prim. ed. Jac Simond. Paris. 1699. 8. ap. Gallandius, t. xi. p. 655), lib. i. c. 5, et iv. c. 3: Asephali vocatur a Greecis, quos significantur nos Semitechnianos possumus appellare. This name, however, never became usual.

10 So Timotheus Aelurus, in Maji Collect. vii. i. 277.

11 The letters are collected in the Codex encyclicus. Mansi, t. vii. p. 777, ss., gives their form, and the writings themselves also in the same volume, p. 321, ss. Most remarkable is the Epist. Episcoporum Pamphyliæa. Ibid. p. 373, ss.: Doctæa—quæ a S. Nicasio concilio gratia spirituali prolata est—omnium complet et omnibus valde sufficere—Nos et Nicaeum synodum debitō honorō venerarum, et Chalcedonem quantum suscipimus, veluti sectam eam contra haereticos opponentes, et non anathema (leg. matheum, υδρημα) fideli existentem. Non enim ad populum a papa Leone et a S. Chalcedonensi concilio scripta est, ut ex huc debeat scandalum sustinere, sed tantummodo sacer-
σαληφαναλος nominated in his place (460), who succeeded in maintaining the tranquillity of Alexandria by his prudent, conciliating conduct toward the opposite party. It is true, that new commotions arose soon after even in Antioch. Peter the Fuller (ὁ γναφευς), a monk of Constantinople, and an enemy of the council of Chalcedon, endeavored to carry through here the favorite formula of the Monophysites θεος ἵστασιμος, and even to introduce it into the Trisagion; succeeded in gaining over the monks to his party; and put himself in the place of the deposed patriarch; but not long after he was banished by an imperial decree (about 470), and there was hope of seeing the schism gradually disappear and be every where forgotten. But it proved incurable when Basiliscus, having driven the emperor Zeno Isauricus from the throne (476, 477), declared in favor of the Monophysites, reinstated Timotheus Aeorus and Peter the Fuller in their dignities, and by the Encyclion, required all bishops (476) to condemn the synod of Chalcedon.13

dotibus, ut habeant quo possint repugnare contraris. Durarum namque naturarum sive substantiarum unitatem in uno Christo declaratum ivneminus a pluribus apud nos consistentibus sanctis et religiosissimis patribus, et nequaquam veluti mathema aut symbolum his qui baptizantur hoc tradimus, sed ad bella hostium reservamus. Si vero propter mediam eorum, qui per simplicitatem scandalizati noscuntur, placuerit vestrae potentiae, Christo amabilis imperator, S. Leoni Rom. civ. episcopo, hoc non aliorum pariter sanctitati, propter istorum (sicet dixi) condensacionem et satisfactionem, quatenus idem sanctissimus vir litteris suis declarat, quia non est symbolum neque mathema epistola, quae tunc ab eo ad sanctae memoriae nostrae archiepiscopum Flaviannum directa est, et quod a sancto concilio dictum est, sed haereticae pravitatis potius inrepartiali simul et illud, quod ab eis est dictum, “in duabus naturis, quod forte eis dubium esse discerni, dum a patre protulam sit propter eos, qui veram Dei verbi incarnationem negant, his sermonebus apertius indicatam, lita tamen, ut in nullo sanctae synoda flat injuria Nihil enim differt, sive durarum naturarum unitas inconclusa dicitur, sive ex duobus eodem modo referatur. Sed neque si una dicitur verbi natura, inferatur autem incarnata, alio quid significat, sed idem honestiori sermone declarat. Nunc et invenimus saepius hoc dixisse SS. patres. Apud vestrae potentiae imperium, quod significat vestra potentiae denter ago, quia ipsa synodos permanebit, sicut ecclesiae membra disserpta copulabuntur hoc sermone curata, et ea, quae contra succedentes nefanda committuntur, cessabunt, et ora haereticorum contra nos aperta damnabuntur, et omnia reducantur ad pacem, et fiat, sicut scriptum est, unus greg et unus pastor. Quoniam et dominus Christus multa condensacione circa nos usus, et humanum salvavit genus: et quia cum dives esset, utique divinitate, pauper factus est pro nobis, secundum quod homo fieri voluit, ut nos illa panpertata dite remur, sicut b. Paulus edictit, etc.


13 In the ‘Ἐγκύλιον (ap. Evagrius, iii. 4), it is said: ἔφησευσεν τὴν ἐρμήν καὶ βεβαιώσεις τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος εἰσι, τούτατί τὸ σύμβολον τῶν τῆς ἀγίων πατέρων τῶν
It was not long, indeed, before the persevering Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded in exciting a popular tumult, which was the means of restoring Zeno Isauricus to the throne (477–491); but in the mean time, the principles of the Monophysites had been so firmly established in Egypt by these occurrences, that Zeno, by the advice of Acacius, issued the Henoticon (482), in which both parties were to be brought into a state of peace and union by reducing the points at issue to more general principles. Peter Mongus was patriarch of Alexandria, and subscribed the Henoticon. Many Monophysites, however, displeased at this, separated from him, and were called ʻAkēˈfalo, without a head. Peter the Fuller was once more

en Νικαία πάλαι μετά τού ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκλησιασθέντον—μόνον πολιτεύεσθαι και κρατεῖν έν πάσαις ταῖς ἁγιώταιτας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας τοῦ οὐράνιον λαόν, ὡς μόνον τῆς ἀπλάνοιας πάσης τοῦ θεοῦ αἰρέσεως, ἐνεώσω δὲ ἄκρα τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας. έχοντας δηλαδή τὴν οἰκείαν ἱσχύν, καὶ τῶν εἰς βεβαιάσαι αὐτῶν τοῦ θεοῦ συμβολῶν πεπραγμένων ἐν τῇ δυσβασίου πόλει ταῦτη—παρὰ τοῦ ἐκ αὐτῶν πατέρων, ἐτό χάρι τῶν παντῶν τοῖς πεπραγμένοις ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίου μητροπόλει κατὰ τὸν θυσάτον Νηστορίον, καὶ τῶν μετα ταῦτα τὰ ἑκείνον προσφαίροντον. τά δὲ διελύτων τὴν ἐνοίκον καὶ εὐταξίαν τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας καὶ εἰρήκειν τὸν κόσμον πατόρα, δηλαδή τὸν λεγομένου τούτως Λέωντος, καὶ πάντα τά ἐν Χαλκηδών ἐν ὅρω πάσης τοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ συμβολῶν—εἰρήκειν καὶ πεπραγμένα εἰς καινοτομίας καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος μοναχόν τῶν τῆς ἁγίων πατέρων, ἐσπερχομένον ἐνταῦθα τε καὶ παντοκράτωρ καὶ ἐκάστην ἐκκλησίαν οὐ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πνεύματος ἐπισκόπησαι, καὶ ταῦτα παραδόθησαι· τὰ δὲ τούτα εἰρήκειν καὶ τούτους τῶν θεοῦ πατέρων, ὡς εἰσήχθησαν, καὶ τοὺς πατέρους.}

14 Αρ. Εννεάδων Καίσαρ Ζήνων—τοῖς καὶ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων καὶ Αλγούπολις, καὶ Διδών καὶ Πεντάπολις, κ. τ. λ.—νικηφόρου ως ὑποκύπτομεν, ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἡμείς καὶ αὐτοῦ παντοχοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἔπεμψαν συμβολῶν, ἡ μάθησις, ἡ ὁρόν πάσης, τό πλήρη τοῦ εὐφραίνειν ἁγίου συμβολῆς τῶν θεοῦ πατέρων, ὡς εἰρήκειν καὶ τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς εἰρήκειν καὶ τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος καὶ καθήκοντος τοῦ Ἀσία Ἐσδορίου, καὶ τοὺς τὰς ἑκείνον τοῖς τοῖς ἑκείνον διαφόρων τούτως θεοῦ πατέρων. τοῖς τούτως καὶ ἡμείς Νηστόριον ἡμῶν καὶ Δημήτριος, τοῖς τούτως εἰρήκειν καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν. καὶ τίς καὶ τίς μᾶς τοῖς τοῖς πατέροις καὶ τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος. τοῖς τοῖς καὶ τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς πατέροις τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος.
appointed patriarch of Antioch (485); though many Syrian bishops were deposed because they would not subscribe the Henotic. The most decided opposition to church fellowship with the Monophysites was presented by the Roman patriarchs, who had become entirely independent of the emperor since the downfall of the western empire (476). All remonstrances proving vain, Felix II. issued an anathema (484) against Acacius, and communion between the Eastern and Western churches was broken off.

But even in the east, the Henotic proved but a weak bond of union, since the questions left indeterminate in it, were continually employing the minds of men. At Constantinople, the council of Chalcedon stood high in estimation; and the Acoemetae even continued in communion with the Church of Rome. In Alexandria, the decrees of this council were rejected. In the east, opinions on the subject were divided. Among all these churches, it is true, external fellowship was for the most part maintained by the Henotic; but it could not be otherwise than that there should be coldness between the parties, which often led to open quarrels. Such was the situation of affairs at the accession of the emperor Anastasius (491–518). He adopted the principle of avoiding all interference in religious matters, except to protect the peace of the citizens against fanaticism.17

---

Mon. Epist. ad Timoth. Scholasticum, in Maji Coll. vii. 1, 277: Τούτῳ τῇ μεῖρῃ τῆς σήμερον οὐ κοινωνοῦσιν οἱ Σινάκης, άκέφαλος αὐτοῦ προσαγωγέομενεν. However, Timotheus himself seems to have died before the division, since Severus esteems him highly. See his words, l. c.: Διοκέτους δὲ καὶ Τιμοθίου τῶν τῆς ἁλαζίας ἀγωνιστῶν—τῶν ἀγῶνας τιμῶ καὶ ἀσπάζομαι. It might be expected that the strictest Monophysites should have belonged to the Acaphite, who considered even the body of Jesus as something higher, and these found passages in Timotheus Acalus, which agreed with them (see note 6), though he had maintained that the body of Christ is of like essence with our own.


17 Evagrius, iii. 30: Ὁδεὶς ὁ Ἀνασβήτως ἐλθηκαίος τῆς ἄν, οὐ δέν καινοφρεῖα χαρτείας παντελῶς ἠξούθηκε, διαφεύρως περί τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν.—Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν Χαλκηδόνῃ σύνοδος ἄνα τούτως τοῦς χρόνους οὐτε ἀναφερόμεν ἐν ταῖς ἁγιωτάταις ἐκκλησίαις ἐκπρόστηκε, οὔτε μή ἐκ πάντων ἀπεκρίθηντε. ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν προσδεχόμενων, ἀς εἰκόνα νομίζον, διεκρίνοντο. Καὶ ἐννεὶ μὲν τῶν ἐκτεθησάμων αὐτῇ καλὰ γεννήματι ἀντίκειτο, καὶ πρὸς οὐδέμιαν ἐνεδίδοσαν συνάδειθη τῶν ὁρισθέντων παρ' αὐτῆς οὐ
But he could not prevent all outbreaks of the latter. In Constantinople itself, he was threatened by the seditious Vitalianus, who put himself forth as a defender of the Chalcedonian synod (514), and was obliged to promise to him that he would effect a restoration of communion with Rome. But all negotiations to bring this about were frustrated by the extravagant demands of the Roman see; and Anastasius carried with him to the grave the hatred, of all the friends of the council of Chalcedon, as may be seen by many narratives written after his death. 18

Under Justin I. (518–527), a popular tumult finally compelled the general and solemn adoption of the Chalcedonian council at Constantinople, and the renewal of Church-communion with Rome (519). The same measures were soon after taken in the east; the Monophysite bishops were deposed, particularly Severus, patriarch of Antioch, 19 Xenayas or Philoxe-

---


19 To the fragments of his works which were known before (a list is given in Cave, i. 500), many new ones have been added, which are scattered through A. Maji Scriptt. vett. nova coll. viili. i. Fragments of his Comm. in Lucam, and in Acta Apost. are given in Maji Classicorum auctorum, x. 408. Fragments and a Confession of Faith, addressed to the Emperor Anastasius, out of the Arabic in the Spicilegium romanum, t. iii. (Romae,
nus, bishop of Mabug, Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus; and the greater number of them fled to Alexandria; for in Egypt, Monophysitism was so generally prevalent, that Justin durst not undertake any thing against it there.

This very congregating of so many bishops in Alexandria now led to internal divisions among the Monophysites themselves. From the controversy between Severus and Julian respecting the question whether the body of Christ was subject to that corruption, τῇ φθορᾷ, and was therefore φθαρτόν τι, or not, which has come upon human bodies by the fall, arose the first and most obstinate dispute, that of the Severians (Theodosiani, 22 Φθαρτολάτραι) and the Julianists 23 (Gajanitae, Λφθαρτοδοκήται, Phantasiastae.) Soon after there sprang from the former the Αγνοηταί, or Themistiani. 24 On the other hand, the Julianists were divided into the Ακτιστηταί and Κυστολάτραι. About 530, the celebrated John Philoponus 25 pro-mulgated his errors respecting the Trinity 26 and the resurrection.


22 A fragment of Theodosius, Patriarch of Alexandria, which extends over this disputed question, is given out of the Arabic in the Spicileg. rom. iii. 711. Among other things it is written: Nisi Christus—in sua carne eam qualitates habuisset, quae sine peccato consistere possunt, scil. nisi ejus caro par nostrae esset, tum quod ad essentiam attinet, tum etiam quod ad patiendum;—nuncam stimulus mortis destructus fuisse, i.e. pessetam. Comp. especially Severi liber ad Julianum, quo demonstrat, quid acerbi libri doctoresque Ecclesiae docuerint circa incorruptibilitatem corporis J. Chr. out of the Syriac in the Spicileg. rom. x. 169.


24 Fragments of Themistius in Maji Coll. vii. 1, 73. In order to perceive his view, the following sentences are of importance: Μία τοῦ Δόγμου θεολογικῆ ἐννέα γε τα καὶ γνώσεις. But τὰ μὲν θεωρεῖ, τὰ δὲ ἀνθρωπινὸν δαίδαλον ἐννέα γε (consequently also ἐγώαισεν).

25 That a great part of his life does not belong to the seventh century, as has been usually assumed, is shown by Ritter Gesch. des christl. Philos. ii. 501, and confirmed by a letter which he wrote, when an old man, to the Emperor Justinian. See Spicileg. rom. iii. 739. His writings were: In Hexaëmeron, Disp. de Paschate [ed. B. Corderius. Vienne. 1630. 4, more correctly printed in Gallandi, xii. 471], de Aeternitate mundi contra Proclum lib. (Venet. 1535), Commentaries on Aristotel. — Among other lost book was one adv. Synod. Chalcodemensem (Photius Cod. 55). Fabricii Bibl. gr. vol. ix. p. 359, ss. (ed. Harles, vol. x. p. 609, ss.)

26 Leontius de Sectis act. v. § 6, makes Philoponus say to the church: Εἰ δὲν λέγετε φύσεις ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀνάγκη λυώς καὶ δὸν ὑποστάσεις εἶπότε, —ναι ταύτῃ ἐπτί φύσεις καὶ ὑπόστασις. Εἰ δὲν πάλιν ἡ ἐκκλησία: οἱ ταύτῃ ἐπτί φύσεις καὶ ὑπόστασες, οἴκους λέγομεν.
tion, drawn from the Aristotelian philosophy, among the Monophysites (Philoponiaci, Trithitei; on the other side, Condobauditae and Cononitae) in opposition to whom Damian, patriarch of Alexandria, appeared to fall into the Sabellian error (Daminitae). At the same time, the doctrine of Stephanus Niobes, who removed all distinction of natures in Christ after their union, was condemned by the other Monophysites (Niobitae).

§ 111.

CONTROVERSIES UNDER JUSTINIAN I.

Justinian I. (527–565), a zealous adherent of the council of Chalcedon endeavored to restore unity and order both in state and church by means of laws; for which purpose he tried to bring back the Monophysites in particular, into the church. These endeavors were turned to advantage by a secret Monophysite court party, at whose head stood his spouse, Theodora, who exercised great influence over him, and who, in the hope of bringing the Catholic Church, step by step, to Monophysitism, persuaded the emperor that the Monophysites took offense simply at points in the Catholic Church, which could be removed without a violation of orthodoxy. But since the dominant church had also its representatives at court, the emperor was led sometimes by the one party, sometimes by the other, to enact regulations, whose natural consequence was to increase rather than remove the causes of dispute.


27 Timotheus in Cotelerii Monum. eccl. gr. iii. 413. Philoponos's book περὶ ἀναστάσεως (Photius Cod. 21) is lost. Ritter, ii. 511.


A new memorial of it is his λόγος δογματικός πρὸς τός ἐν τῷ ἐννέα τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέως μοναχοῖς, which Majus Scriptt. vet. nova coll. vii. i. 293, has published.

Respecting her see Procopii Hist. arcana, c. 9.
The conferences between Catholic and Monophysite bishops, which Justinian\(^3\) caused to be held, were, on the whole, fruitless. The original Monophysite formula—"God was crucified"—which had been approved by many, even among the Catholics in the east (\(\thetaεοπασχίται\)),\(^4\) but which some Scythian monks under Justin I. had in vain attempted to introduce both at Rome and Constantinople (519–521),\(^5\) was declared orthodox by Justinian (533), with the evident purpose of conciliating the Monophysite.

---

\(^3\) The protocol of the one A.D. 531: Collatio Catholicorum cum Severianis, ap. Mansi, viii. 817. — Johannes Asiss. Asise speaks of several in Assemani Bibl. orient. ii. 69.

\(^4\) See Walch’s Ketzerbist. vii. 291, 311, ff.

\(^5\) Walch, vii. 292. Under Anastasius the addition in the Trisagion (see § 110, note 12), was also introduced at Constantinople (see Zacharias Hist. eccl. ap. Assemani Bibl. or. ii. 59, and in Maji Nova. coll. x. 375, comp. Diocuri. Liber. ap. Hornisham ap. Mansi, viii. 480). Its abrogation during the reaction under Justin doubtless occasioned the monks to deliberate the formula. Hornisitae Ep. Rom. Epist. ad Possessorem Episc, Afric. Constantinopoli exulantes (ap. Mansi, viii. 498): Ubi non varie tentationis aculei? Quales per hunc ferre jugem annum quorumdam Scytharum, qui monachos praec fecerant specie non veritatis, professione non opere, subtili tecta caliditate versatibus, et sub religiosis obtenta famulantia odios suis venena pertulimus.—Nuncup am pud os caritas novo comendata praecepi, nuncupam pax dominico relicta discessit: una pertinacis cura propensi, ratione velle imperare, non credere: contentores auctoritatum veterum, novarum cupidis quaestionum; solam putantes scientiae rectam viam, quilibet concepta facultate sententiam: eo usque tumoris etatis, ut [ad] arbitrium suum utrisque orbis potius incenadam esse judicium, etc. The answer of one of the Scythian monks to this, Io. Maxentii ad Epist. Hornisitae responsio (Bibl. PP. Lugdun. t. i. p. 390, ss.):—Non est facile credendum, hanc esse epistolam cujus furtur nomine tisulata, praecertim cum in eo nihil, ut diximus, rationis nunc consequentiae repperintur, sed tota criminationibus obstruetur-busque vanis—videatur retorta.—Quod monachis responsum quaerentibus Romani Episcopi dare omnino distulerit, coedeunde post multa maris pericula, longique itineris vexationem, nec non etiam afflictionem proximi temporis, quo eos apud se detinuit, vacuo et sinuullo effecto ad has partes venire compulerit, quod omnibus paene catholicae notum est, nec ipsi quenque haeretici denegare.—Nam et ipsi haeretici ad hoc ubique hanc ipsam, cui respondimus, epistolam profecerunt, quatenus et seepidictis monachis invidiam concident, et omnes quasi ex auctoritate ejusdem Romani Episcopi prohibebantur Christum filium Dei unum confiteri ex trinitate. Sed quis hanc sententiam catholicam non esse ausus est profitteri, quam universa veneratur et ampliissim Dei ecclesia? Confidenter etemum dicere audeo, non quod, si per epistolam, seu quod, si vivas voces hic in praescienti posimus idem Romanus prohiberetur Episcopus Christum filium Dei unum confiteri ex sancta et indivisa trinitate, nuncumque idem Dei ecclesia acquirereceret, nuncquam ut Episcopum catholicum veneraretur, sed omnino ut haereticum penitus exsecraretur. Quis quisquis hoc non confecerit non est diabum, quod Nestorianae peridiae tenebris ececaetus, quarta et extraeunum a sancta et ineffabili Trinitate cum, qui pro nobis crucem sus-tinevit, praedicaret contemnatur.—An forte illos rationi credere, non imperare judicaret, qui Christum unam personam quidem ex Trinitate, non autem unum ex Trinitate esse fatus-tur? Sed bi qui hoc dicere putius ratione velle imperare, non credere, penitus convincuntur, etc. The Episcopi Africani in Sardinae exules also sided with the Scythian monks: comp. their book composed by Fulgentius Rapsenius lib. de incarnatione et gratia Dom. nostri J. C. ad Mon. Scyth. (Fulgentius Opera ed. Paris. 1684. 4. p. 277, ss.). Fulgentius Ferrandus Dac. Carthag. ad Anatolium. Liber. Rom. Dionysius Exiguus praed. ad versionem epistolae Procli Archip. Const. ad Armenos (ap. Mansi, v. 419).
sites. This step, however, was without success. In Egypt the Monophysites continued to be the prevailing party, though Justinian (536) again appointed a Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, Paul. But, on the other hand, the secret endeavors of Theodora to spread Monophysitism in Rome and Constantinople were equally fruitless. Anthimus, who had been promoted to the see of Constantinople by her (535), was soon after (536) deposed for being a Monophysite. Vigilius, elevated to the see of Rome, with the secret understanding that he was to de-

4 The Monophysites accused the orthodox, before the emperors, of not acknowledging dominum passum carnis, vel unam cum eis de sancta Trinitate, nec ejusdem esse personae tam miracula quam passiones (cf. collatio Cathol. cum Sever. ap. Mansi, viii. 832). The Acacianæ did really deny esse confitendum, b. Mariam vero et proprie Dei genetricem; et unam de Trinitate incarnatum et carnis passum (Liberatus, c. 29), evidently misled by their adherence to Rome (San. Basnage Annual. politico-eccles. iii. 701). Justinianii lex A.D. 533 (Cod. i. l. 6).—Unius ac ejusdem passiones et miracula, quae sponte pertulit in carne, agnoscentes. Non enim aliqu Deum Verbum, et aliquum Christum novimus, sed unum et eundem.—Mansit enim Trinitas et post incarnatum unum ex Trinitate Dei verbum: neque enim quartae personae adiunctionem admitit sancta Trinitas.—Anathematizamus.—Nestorium anthropolatram, et qui eadem cum ipsa sentiunt.—qui negunt nec confitentur Dominum nostrum J. C. filium Dei et Deum nostrum incarnatum et hominem factum et crucifixum unum esse ex sancta et consubstantiæ Trinitate.—Epist. Ioannis Ep. Romæ ad Justin.) ibid. i. 8, et ap. Mansi, viii. 797): Comperimus, quod fideli. populus propositus Edicent amore fidei pro submovenda haereticorum intentione, secundum apostolicam doctrinam, fratum et Conciliorum nostrorum interventiuæ consensum. Quod, quia apostolicae doctrina convenit, nostra acceptitate confirmamus. The formula, however, was still suspected in the west of being Monophysite, and Bishop Cyprian of Toulon (about 550) was obliged to defend himself against Bishop Maximus of Geneva, quod beati Vestra imperitiam nostram judicat esse culpandum, eo quod Deum hominem passum dixerim (the document is communicated by Schmidt in Vater's Kirchenhist. Archive für 1826, S. 307). The addition to the Trihagion (§ 110, note 12) continued to be used by the Catholics in Syria (see Ephraem. Patr. Antioch. about 530, apud Photius Cod. 238. Asseniani Bibl. Orient. i. 518), till it was rejected by the Conc. Quinisextum, can. 81. After that time it was retained only by the Monophysites and Monothelites (Walch's Ketzerhist. ix. 480). Among the Catholics the idea arose that aaternity, instead of a Trinity, was introduced by it. See Jo. Damasc. de Fide orthod. iii. 19. See Royaards in the Nederlandsch Archief voor kerkel. Geschiedenis, ii. 263 (1842).


8 Liberatus, c. 22. In him and in Victora Tunus. Chronic. (ap. Canisius-Basnage, i. 339), is found the Epist. Vigilii to the Monophysite bishops, Theodosius, Anthimus, and Severus, where we read, among other things: Me eam filem, quam tenetis, Deo adjuvante et tenetis et teneatis et significare.—Oportet ergo, ut habe, quas volis scire, nullus agnoscat, sed magis tanquam spectamus me sapientia vestra ante alios existimatem habeas, ut facilius possim habe, quas coepi, operari et perficere. In the Confession of Faith appended to it in Liberatus: Non duas Christum confitentur naturas, sed ex duabus naturis compositum unum filium, unum Christum, unum Dominum. Qui dicit in Christo duas formas, unquam agentem cum alterius communione, et non confitetur unam personam, unam essentialiam, anathema. Qui dicit: quia hoc quidem miracula faciebat, hoc vero passionibus succumbebat (Leo, § 89, note 7): et non confitetur miracula et passiones unius ejusdemque, quas sponte sua sustinuit, carne nobis consubstantiæ, anathema sit. Qui dicit, quod Christus velut homo miserericordia dignatus est, et non dicit ipsum Deum Verbum
clare in favor of Monophysite doctrines (538), soon found it expedient to break through his agreement.

In the mean time, these theological affrays were increased by the revival of the Origenist controversy. Origen had, by degrees, obtained many devoted admirers among the monks in Palestine. One of them, Theodorus Ascidas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who had come to court, and gained the confidence of the emperor, protected the Origenists in propagating their doctrines in Palestine, sometimes by violent means. But at last the opposite party prevailed, by the aid of Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, and obtained from Justinian a condemnation of the Origenist errors (about 544). It was more with the design of diverting attention from Origenism than of being revenged on his orthodox opponents, that Theodorus now persuaded the emperor that the reconciliation of the Monophysites with the orthodox would be much facilitated by a public condemnation not only of Theode of Mopsuestia, who had

et crucifixum esse, ut misericator nobis, anathema sit. Anathematizanmus ergo Paulum Samosatenum, Dioecurum (Leg. Diodorum), Theodorum, Theodoritum et omnes, qui eorum statuta coluerint, vel colant. Soon after this, however, he proved his orthodoxy to the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople. Epist. ad Justinianum, ep. Mansi, i. 35, ad Mennam, ibid. p. 38.


10 The Origenist Domitian, bishop of Ancyra, himself admitted in libello ad Vigilium (in Facund Episc. Hermanianus pro defens. trium capitol. lib. iv. c. 4): Prosiliacerunt ad anathematizandos sanctissimos et gloriosissimos doctores sub occasione eorum, quae de praexistencia et resitutione mota sunt, dogmata, sum specie quidem Origenis, omnes autem, qui ante eum et post eum fuerunt, sancti anathematizantes. Hi vero, qui posseatur hujusmodi dogma defensore, id implore nullo modo voluerent: sed talum rellinguentem conflictum, convenerint, ut moverent adversus Theodorum, qui fuit Mopsvestenus episcopus, et moliri coeperint, quatuos anathematizaretur et ille, ad abolitionem, ut putabant, eorum, quae contra Origenem mota constiterant. Liberatetus, c. 94: Theodorus Caesareo Cappadociae episcopus, dilectus et familiaris principum—cognoscens Origenem fuisse damnatum, dolore damnationis ejus, ad ecclesia conturbationem, damnationem mollius est in Theodorum Mopsvestenum, eo quod Theodorus multa opuscula edidisset contra Origenem, exosusque et accusabilis habetur ab Origenistis.

11 The enmity of the abbot Sabha to him, Vita Sabae (see note 9), c. 72, 74. — A Synod convened for the purpose at Mopsuestia by the imperial command (550), came to the conclusion: Theodorus veterem, qui per istum civitatorem fuit episcopus, in antiquis temporibus
been long in somewhat evil repute among the orthodox, but also of Theodore's writings against Cyril and the letter of Ibas to Maris, though the two latter had been expressly pronounced orthodox by the council of Chalcedon. Justinian accordingly condemned, in an edict (544), the Three Chapters (τρία κεφάλαια, τρια capitula). In the east they very easily coincided with this measure; but in the west it was so much the more obstinately resisted. On this account Justinian summoned Vigilius, bishop of Rome, to Constantinople (546), and prevailed on him there to condemn, in like manner, the Three Chapters (518) in a document called Judicatum. But Vigilius was soon induced to hesitate, by the decided opposition of the greater number of the western bishops; and he refused to adopt the emperor's second edict against the Three Chapters (551).

Justinian now convened the fifth oecumenical council at

extra praedicationem divini mysterii fuisse, et sacris diptychis ejusdem esse: et—in illius vocabulum, inscriptum esse Cyrilium sanctae memoriae (see Mansi, ix. 286). The testimonies of the ancients against Theodorus, collected in the collation v. of the fifth oecumenical council, must be very cautiously received; for instance, Theodore's name, in the two laws of Theodosius II. against Nestorius (p. 249, ss.), is a later addition.


14 I. c., three points, articles: not as J. H. Mücke de tribus capitulis concilii Chalced. Lips. 1766. 4. p. 6, thinks, the three decrees of the council of Chalcedon, for there was no such decree respecting Theodore. The first edict of Justinian is lost, except fragments in Pacuadas, ii. 3, iv. 4. See Norisii Diss. de synode quinta, c. 3. Walch's Ketzerhist. viii. 150.

15 Their leading reasons are given by Fulgentius Ferrandus Epist. vi. ad Pelagium et Anthalium, at the conclusion of the following sentences: Ut concilii Chalcedonensis, vel simillimum nulla retractatio placet, sed quae secum statuta sunt, interemtatoria serventur. Ut pro mortuis fratribus nulla generentur inter vivos scandula. Ut nullus libro suo per subscriptiones plurimorum dare velit nactoritatem, quam solis canonici libris ecclesia catholica detulit.

16 The particulars are related by Pacundus, lib. contra Mociannum scholast.—The Judicatum is no longer extant, except in a fragment in the Latin translation of the Epist. Justin. ad Concilium oecum. v. (ap. Mansi, xi. 181).


18 Or the ἡμολογία πίστεως Ιουστινίου Αποκράτερος, preserved in the Chronic. Alexan. ed. du Fresne, p. 344, ss. ap. Mansi, ix. 537.—Concerning the conduct of Vigilius see especially Epistolae legation Francorum, qui Constantinopolin proficiscens, ub Italiane clericis directis, a.d. 551, ap. Mansi, xi. 151.
SECOND PERIOD.—DIV. II.—A.D. 431-692.

Constantinople (553), 19 at which Vigilius not only refused to attend, but even defended the three chapters in the so-called Constitutum. 20 The Synod, therefore, broke off all Church communion with him, 21 and approved without qualification all the decrees of the emperor hitherto made respecting religion. 22 No farther notice was taken of the Origenists, 23 a circumstance which we shall not be far from the truth in attributing to the artful management of Theodorus Ascidas, who was the leading person at the council. Vigilius at length (554) asented to the decisions of the council, 24 to which step he was doubtless influenced chiefly by the success of the imperial arms in Italy under Narses. Immediately after, he set out on his return to Rome, but died by the way, in Syracuse (555). His successor,


21 Justinian declared, with reference to Vigilius, to the synod in a rescript (in the Acta of the Synod, collatio vii. ap. Mansi, ix. 367) : Ipse semetipsum alienum catholicae ecclesiae fecit, defendens praedictorum capitulum imperietatem, separans autem semetipsum a vestra communione. His igitur ab eo factis, alienum Christianiam judicavit nomen ipsius sacrilegum recitari [leg. resercari], ne eo modo inueniamur Nestorii et Theodori impietati communicantes.—Unitatem vero ad apostolicam sedem et nos servamus, et certum est quod et vos castigaties. Without sufficient reason the Ballerini, in their defensio (Norisii Opp. iv. 1033), declare this writing to be spurious.

22 The thirteen anathemas appended to Justinian's ἡμολογία (ap. Mansi, ix. 357) are for the most part verbally repeated in the fourteen anathemas of the Synod (l.c. p. 376, ss). So also the 6th imperial anathema in the 10th of the council: Εἰ τις οὗξ ἡμολογεῖ τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ κήρυκον ἡμῶι Ιησοῦν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εἶναι θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ κήρυκον τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἐνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀναθήματι ἐστώ. Though as early as Cyrilus Scythopolit. in vita Sabae, c. 90, and Evagrius, iv. 37, the formal condemnation of Origen is attributed to the 5th council by confounding it with the synod under Mennas (see note 19), as was afterward generally believed. See on the other side Walch's Ketzerleh. viii. 290.

Pelagius I., acknowledged at once the authority of the fifth Synod, which led to a tedious schism between several Western Churches and Rome. Among the writers who, during this controversy, opposed the condemnation of the Three Chapters, the most distinguished are Fulgentius Ferrandus, deacon in Carthage († before 551); Facundus, bishop of Hermiane († about 570); Rusticus, deacon in Rome; Liberatus, deacon in Carthage (about 553); Victor, bishop of Tununa († after 565).

Shortly before his death (564), Justinian was misled by his excessive desire to bring back the Monophysites to the Church, so as to elevate to the rank of orthodoxy the doctrine of the Aphthartodocetae. Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople, was deposed for his opposition to this measure; and the like fate awaited Anastasius Sinaita, patriarch of Antioch; when the death of the emperor (565) became the death likewise of the new doctrine.

§ 112.

DEVELOPMENT OF MONOPHYSITE CHURCHES.

The efforts of Justinian to reuni e the Monophysites with the Catholic Church were so far from successful, that the sect


25 By whom is the chief work in favor of the three chapters pro defensione iii. Capitolorum, libb. xii. (about 548), and contra Moesianum scholastici (Opp. prim. ed. Jac. Sirm., Paris. 1629, 8, emendatius in Bibl. PP. Gallandi, xi. 665).

26 Lib. adv. Acephalos ad Sebastianum (in Bibl. PP. apud Gallandii, xii. 37).


28 Chronicon ab orbe condito, only the second part is extant, from 444 to 565 (ap. Cauius-Bannage, i. 331, plur. in locis restitut. ap. Gallandii, xii. 321).

29 Evagrius, iv. 38-40. Eutychii vita, composed by one of his adherents, Eustathius or Eustratus (in the Greek original, Acta SS. April. tom. i. append. p. 39), has been dressed out with praises even to the miraculous. Walch's Ketzerhistor. viii. 578. According to Eustathius, Justinian was misled by Origenists.

VOL. I. —31.
was always becoming more distinct under his reign, and internally established. The later dominion of the Arabians, by which the Monophysites were especially favored, rendered the breach incurable.

Only a small part of the Egyptians followed the Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, who had been appointed by Justinian. The more numerous Monophysites chose another patriarch; and thus they continue till the present day under the name of Copts. The *Ethiopian Church* was always in connection with them.

The Christians in *Armenia* also attached themselves ecclesiastically in the fifth century to the Greek emperors, by whose aid they held out against the Persians, and accordingly agreed to the Henoticon of Zeno. After Monophysitism had obtained acceptance among them, in consequence of these proceedings, they remained all the more faithful to it from the time of Justin I., since the Persians favored all parties separated from the Greek Church. In vain did Kyrion, patriarch of Georgia, endeavor to procure an approval of the council of Chalcedon in Armenia also; a Synod at *Twin* (595) declared itself decid-

---


4 In the year 491, at a synod at Edschaladisian, the Henoticon was adopted, and the decrees of the council of Chalcedon rejected, Tschamtschein, ii. 225. Mémoires sur l’Arménie par J. Saint-Martin, i. 329.

5 See respecting him, Neumann’s *Gesch. d. arm. Lit.* S. 94.

6 Twin (also written Thevpin or Thoquin), in the province of Ararat, at that time the residence of the Armenian kings and patriarchs. Galanus *Hist. arm. c. 10, Le Quien, i.*
edly in favor of Monophysitism; and thus the Armenian Church still continues, to the present day, as a sect separated from the other Monophysite Churches, merely by peculiar customs.

In Syria and Mesopotamia the Monophysites had nearly become extinct by persecution and want of a clergy, when Jacob Baradai, or Zanzalus, by unwearied diligence (from 541 to 578), set in order their churches, and supplied them with pastors. From him the Syrian Monophysites received the name Jacobites.8

§ 113.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN AUGUSTINISM AND SEMIPLEAGIANISM.


The Western Churches were but little disturbed by the Monophysite controversy. On the other hand, the struggle between Augustinism and Semipelagianism continued, especially in Gaul (comp. § 87, note 47, and following) though without leading to actual schisms in the Church. At first the Semipelagians had so much the advantage that their most distinguished defender Faustus, formerly abbot of the monastery at Lerins, afterward bishop of Reji (Reis) († after 490), compelled a certain presbyter, Lucidus, to retract the Augustinian doctrines, and his Semipelagian creed was generally approved at the councils of Arles and Lyons (475). Hence Arnobius the younger, author of the Praeoccupatus (both about 460), and

3 360, and other older writers, place this synod earlier. Comp. however, Ang. Majus in the Spicilegium Rom. x. ii. 450, annotation 3.
7 Comp. Ecl. Armeniacae canones selecti in Ang. Majus vett. Scriptt. nova coll. x. ii. 269. Among the most remarkable of these customs are these, that the Armenians use unmixed wine at the Lord’s Supper, p. 303, and keep the day of Epiphany as the festival of the birth and baptism of Jesus, p. 307.
8 Assemani Bibl. orient. t. ii.—Le Quien, l. e. t. ii.
1 Fausti Rejonais Epist. ad Lucidum, and Lucidi errorem emendantis libellus ad Episcopos sp. Manli, viii. 1098. Comp. Walsh’s Ketzer heist. v. 90.
2 His chief work de Gratia Dei et humanae mentis libero arbitrio lib. 2 (Bibl. Patr. Lugd. viii. 525), was subscribed there. His creed is given by Wiggers, ii. 225.
3 See his Comm. in Psalms (Bibl. PP. Lugd. viii. 248). Wiggers, ii. 348.
4 Prim. ed. J. Sirmond. Paris. 1643. 8 ( occurs in Bibl. PP. Lugd. xxvii. 543, Bibl. PP. Gallandi, x. 357). The first book contains a short sketch of 90 heresies (the 9th that of the Praeoccupatus), the second a liber sub nomine Augustini conflictus, in which the Augustinian doctrine was presented with great exaggeration (as it had been previously
Gennadius, presbyter at Massilia († after 495), express these sentiments without disguise. They had even penetrated to Upper Italy; and Magnus Felix Ennodius bishop of Pavia (from 511 to 521), professed them.

Augustinism was hated in Gaul, especially on account of the doctrine of an unconditional decree of God, which, in the form it had there assumed, distorted by the consequences drawn from it by its obstinate defenders on the one hand, and still more by its too eager opponents on the other, was completely and necessarily fatal to all morality. Some, indeed, did not hesitate to attribute these errors directly to Augustine; but for the

in the capitulis calaminantium, which Prosper refuted, see § 87, note 21. Wiggers, ii. 184, the third a refutation of this book. Valch. v. 297. Wiggers, ii. 329. Perhaps Arnobius was the author, as Sirmond and the Benedictines, Histoire littéraire de la France, ii. 349, suppose. Comp. however, Wiggers, ii. 349.


Of lib. ii. Epist. 19 (see Opera, best in Sirmond Opp. t. i.). Wiggers, ii. 356.

Lucidus was forced to condemn the following propositions: Quod praecipientia Dei hominum violenter compellat ad mortem, vel quod cum Dei percut volutante, qui percutat, alios deputatos ad mortem, nilos ad vitam praedestinatos. The Pseudo-Augustinus Praedestinatus lib. ii. says: Quam voluert Deus sanctum esse, sanctus est, aliqui non erit; quem praecipient esse iniquum, iniquus erit, aliqui non erit. Praedestinatio enim Dei jam et numerum justorum, et numerum constituit pecatorum, et necesse erit constitutum terminum praeteriri non posse.—De Deo Apostolus dicit: Quos vocavit, hos praedestinavit (Rom. viii. 30). Si praecipientem et praedestinatum et vocantem in Apostolo legimus; nobis ut quid impingitis crimen ob hoc, quod dicimus, praedestinasse Deum homines sive ad justitiam sive ad peccatum!—Inviaetus enim in sua voluntate pertinet Deo, cum homo adidit superatur. Si ergo invictum confitemini Deum, confitemini et hoc, qua quod eos voluit ille, qui confudit, alii esse non possunt. Unde colligimus apud animum, quia quos Deus semel praedestinavit ad vitam, etiam ne necessitati, etiamsi peccare, etiamsi nolente, ad vitam perducuntur inviti; quos autem praedestinavit ad mortem, etiamsi currant, etiamsi festinant, sine causa laborant. Cf. § 87, note 21.

Praefatio Praedestinati:—Quis hanc fidem habens sacerdotum benedictionibus caput inclinare desideret, et eorum sibi precibus et sacrificiis credat posse accurr? Si enim hoc nec prodesse volentibus, nec obesse nolentibus incipiant crede, cessabunt omnia Dei sacerdotum studia, et univera monitorum administracu vana videbantur esse figmenta: atque ita unusquisque suis eft vitius occupatus, ut criminae suorum delectionem Dei praedestinationem existimet, et ad bonum a malo transitum, nec per sacerdotum Dei (studia?), nec per conversionem suam, nec per legem dominicam se possere invenire confidat.

Faustus only alludes to him (if Lucidus be not meant, as Wiggers, ii. 292, assume) de Grat. Dei et hum. ment. lib. arb. i. 4: Si ergo mun ad vitam, alter ad perditionem, et asserunt, deputatus est, siue quidam Sancorum dixit, non judicandii nascam, sed judicati. Ibid. c. 11: Igiter dum libros interroget arbitrii in alterutrum partem omnia ex praedestinatione statuta et defnita esse pronunciuit, etc.—Gennadius de Script. eccl. c. 38, speaking of Augustine: Quis tanto studio legat quanta ille scripsit? Unde et multa loquenti accidit, quod dixit per Salomonem Spir. S.: In multioquso non effugius peccatum (Prov. x. 19).—Error tamen illius sermones multo, ut dixi, contractus, lucta
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most part it was usual, in order not to tread too closely on the
honored man, to distinguish between himself and his adherents
at that time,10 that these last could be the more safely con-
demned as heretics under the name of Predestinarians.11

In Rome and Africa, on the other hand, the doctrines of Au-
gustine were strictly followed.12 Thus Gallic Semipelagianism
was threatened with extinction from this quarter, and that the
more readily, inasmuch as even in Gaul were many adherents
of Augustine, and among them two distinguished bishops, Avitus,
archbishop of Vienne (490–523), and Caesarius, bishop of Arles
(502–542).13 Those same Scythian monks who had raised so
much disturbance by their efforts to introduce the formula,
"one of the Trinity was crucified" (§ 111, note 5), also re-
newed the struggle against Pelagianism, which seemed to them
to be closely connected with Nestorianism, and against Semipe-
lagianism.14 After they had been banished from Rome, because
Hormisdas had pronounced judgment too indefinitely on Faustus,
they brought the question of the latter's orthodoxy before the
African bishops living in Sardinia (523); in whose name
Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe († 533), now defended Augustine
against the writings of Faustus.15 In consequence of this,
Semipelagianism was rejected in Gaul also, under the leader-

10 So particularly Praedestinatus. In the praef.: Silem—si non etiam audacter sub
Augustini nomine libros ederent: Quis enim nesciat, Augustinum orthodoxum semper
fruisse doctorem, et tum scribendo quam disputando omnibus haereticis obiisse?

11 Violent controversy in the 17th century on the question whether there ever was a
particular sect of the Praedestinarians, as the Jesuits (particularly J. Sirmond Historia
Praedestinatn. Paris. 1648, in ej. Opp. t. iv., and in Gallandii Bibl. PP. x. 401) and the
older Lutherans asserted, while the Jansenists (especially G. Maugain Accuratiae historiae
443, ss.), Dominicans, and Reformed, denied it. Modern impartial historians agree with
the latter (comp. Semler in the historical introduction prefixed to Baumgarten's Polemik,
iii. 319).—Comp. Sagitarri Introct. in hist. ecc. i. 1148. Walch's Ketzerhist. v. 218.

12 Wiggers, ii. 365.

(Bibl. PP. Lugd. i. 560). Caesarii Opp. (especially homilies, many incorrectly attributed
to him) in the Bibl. PP. Lugd. viii. 819, 860; xxvii. 324. Wiggers, ii. 368.

14 Walch, v. 117. Wiggers, ii. 394.

15 Epistola synodica Episc. Afric. in Sardinia exulum ad Jo. Maxentium, etc. ap. Mansi,
viii. 391.—Fulgentii Ruspensis libb. iii. de Veritate praesthesionis et gratia Dei (his
libb. vii. adv. Faustum are lost) together with his other works (libb. iii. ad Monimum—
several writings against the Arians, and other doctrinal treatises) published. Paris. 1684.
4; in Bibl. PP. Lugd. ix. 16.
ship of Caesarius at the synod of Arausio (Oranges, 529), and the Augustinian system adopted, though in a form essentially modified. Thus also no teacher of Semipelagianism was condemned by name; and not long after the principles were again taught without giving offense, although even rigid Augustinism continued to have its adherents.

§ 114.

HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

After the Roman Empire had been annoyed and overrun by barbarians, the necessity of struggling against paganism no longer calling forth spiritual activity, and the study of the so-called heathen sciences having become increasingly suspicious, especially in the eyes of the monks, scientific cultivation deteriorated more and more, inasmuch as the free movement of the spirit was hindered by the narrowing down of orthodoxy, and attention exclusively directed to single barren speculations, by the disputes carried on with so much zeal. How narrowly:

16 The 25 capitula of the Synod, to which a sketch of the doctrine of grace, in the form of a Confession of Faith, is annexed, ap. Mansi, viii. 711. Here the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, and of grace as the only source of all that is good, are introduced; afterward it is said in the Confession of Faith: Quam gratiam—omnia, qui baptizari desiderant, non in libero arbitrio haberi, sed Christi novimus simul et credimus largitatem conferri. Hoc etiam secundum fidem catholicaem credimus, quod accepta per baptismum gratia omnes baptizati, Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quae ad salutem animae pertinent possint et debeat, si sedet laborare veluserint, adimplere. If sufficient grace be granted to all in baptism, it depends on man to embrace or to resist it, and there is no gratia irresistible and no decretum absolutum. These latter, therefore, do not result, as Wiggers, ii. 441, supposes, as necessary consequences from the positions of the Synod. The Synod does not teach them, because it does not recognize them.

17 Hence Faustus is still honored in Provence as a saint, which is indeed consurmed by some (for example, Baronius, ad ann. 499, § 42), but defended by others. Comp. J. Stilling de S. Fausto comm. hist. in Actis SS. Sept. vii. 651.

18 So by the African bishop Junilius (about 550), de partibus divinae legis (Bibl. PP. Lugd. x.) ii. 12, 15, by Gregory, archbishop of Tours († 595) Miraculorum (Bibl. PP. xi.) ii. 1, vii. 1, 2, 9, 11, 13, by Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome († 604). Comp. G. F. Wiggers, de Gregorio M. ejusque placitis anthropologicis comm. ii. Rostochii. 1838—40. 4.

19 To these belong Fulgentius Ferrandus—see § 111, note 26. Comp. his Paraceneticus ad Regnum comitem; Facundus, bishop of Hermiane—see § 111, note 27, contra Mocianon ap. Gallanius, xi. 811; Isidore, archbishop of Seville († 636), Sentent. ii. 6.

they began in the west to judge of the writings of the older fathers, according to the standard of the new orthodoxy, is proved by the so-called Decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis.\(^2\)

The writers who were engaged in the various controversies have been already named. In the Western Church, *Faustus Rejensis* (§ 113, notes 1, 2), *Fulgentius Rusponsis* (§ 113, note 15), *Fulgentius Ferrandus, Facundus Hermianensis, Liberatus* (§ 111, note 26, fl.); among the Orientals, *Leontius Byzantinus* (preface to § 110), and *Johannes Philoponus* (§ 110, note 25).

There was now less and less of independent investigation; and instead of it men were content with compilations from the highly esteemed older fathers.\(^3\) By way of exegesis began the series of the so-called catenae;\(^4\) in the east with *Procopius of Gaza* (about 520),\(^5\) in the west with *Primacius*, bishop of

---

\(^2\) In some MSS. it is attributed to Damanus (366–384), in the Spanish MSS. to Hormisdas (514–523), but commonly to a Roman SYNOD under Gelasius (492). On the contrary, it is wanting in the Dionysian collection of decrees (525), and in the Spanish (about 690) is placed entirely at the end, behind the decrees of Gregory the Great, which points to a later addition. It is afterward first mentioned, but without the name of an author, by the English bishop Adelphius (about 699) de virginitate, c. 11, first attributed to Gelasias by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims (about 880) Opusc. I. capitulorum, c. 24. That it was gradually enlarged is shown by the different existing texts (three in Mansi, viii. 153). In like manner, the difference of authors may be inferred from the fact that the Opera Cyriani are placed both among the libris recipiendis and the non-recipiendis. At the time of Hormisdas the basis of this list was already in existence (Horn. Ep. ad Possessorum ap. Mansi, viii. 499: Non improvide veneranda patrum sapientia fidelis potestatii quae essent catholica dogmata definiti, certa librorum etiam veterum in auctoritatem recipiendi, sancto Spiritu instante, praefigens), but not in the form of a decree, since, in the latter case, Dionysius would have adopted it. At the time of Hormisdas the *Opera Fausti* were also not yet in it, since Hormisdas hesitates to condemn Faustus. The decree, however, must have received its present form substantially in the first half of the sixth century, because in it no writings and heretics of this century whatever are mentioned, and only the first four general councils. Single interpolations were indeed made afterward. Thus, in Hincmar's time the canones Apostolorum were not yet added among the Apocryphics. Cf. Mansi, viii. 145, 151. Regenbrevh de Canonibus Apostolorum et codice Ecl. hispanie diss. Vras isl. 1822. 8. p. 82.—In this decree, among others, the Historia Eusebii Pamph. the Opuscula Tertulliani, Lactantii, Clementis Alex., Arnobii are reckoned among the libris apocryphis, qui non recipiuntur.

\(^3\) Cassiodorus Instit. div. praef. Quapropter tractores vobis doctissimos indicasse sufficient, quando ad tales remissas competens plenitudi probatur esse doctrinae. Nam et vobis quoque erant praestantius praesumpta novitate non imbui, sed priscorum fonte satissi.


Adrumetum (about 550). Most of the works, too, of Magnus Aurelius Cassidorus Senator († after 562),7 and of Isidore, bishop of Seville († 636),8 are written in this compilation method. The χριστιανικῇ τοπογραφία of the Nestorian Cosmas Indicopleustes (about 535), in its remarkable theologico-geographical part, is only a compilation, chiefly from the works of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodorus of Mopsuestia.9

Distinguished as an independent thinker, in this age of imitation and authorities, was the Aristotelian philosopher Anticius Manilius Torquatus Severinus Boethius († 525), who, however, in his philosophical writings,10 refers so little to Christianity, that one is led to doubt not only of the authenticity of the theological works11 ascribed to him, but even whether he could have been a Christian.12

---

6 Comm. in Epistolas Pauli.
10 His principal work: de Consolatione philosophiae libb. v. Besides this, translations from the writings of Porphyry and Aristotle, and commentaries on the same. He laid the foundation of the production for the Aristotelian philosophy in the west, as John Philoponus did at the same time in the east (§ 110, note 25).
12 Much used in the schools of the middle ages. In the eighth century he was even en rolled among the saints, and in addition to two other Severini, worshiped on the 23d October. That he was a Christian is denied by Gottf. Arnold (Kirchen u. Ketzerhist. Th. i. B. 6, cap. 3, § 7), and Hand, i. c. On the contrary, G. Baur asserts that he was at least outwardly a Christian. Comp. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Philos. ii. 580.
The prevailing dialectic development of Christian doctrine must have been as unsatisfactory as it was injurious to deeper religious spirits, and therefore mysticism, in opposition to it, obtained a fuller and better developed form in the works of Pseudodionysius Areopagita, which appeared toward the end of the fifth century. These writings, banishing the divine essence, in the manner of the New Platonists, beyond all being and knowledge, and representing all things as proceeding in regular gradation out of it as their essence, proposed to teach how man, rightly apprehending his own position in the chain of being, might elevate himself through the next higher order to communion with still higher orders, and finally with God himself. At present they spread but gradually in the oriental church, till they penetrated in the middle ages into the west also, and so became the basis of all the later Christian mysticism.

There were now but few institutions for the advancement of theological learning any where; in the west none whatever. The monkish contempt displayed by Gregory the Great, bishop


14 Cassiod. de. Inst. div. lit. praef.: Cum studia sacculareum literarum magno desiderio fervere cossogerrerm (comp. Sartorius Versuch über die Regierung der Ostgoten während ihrer Herrschaft in Italien. Hamburg. 1811. S. 152, ss.). Manso Gesch. des ostgot. Reichs in Italien. Breslau. 1834. S. 139, ita ut multa pars hominum per ipsa se mundi prudentiam crederet adipisci; gravissimo sum (fator) dolore permutos, quod scripturis divinis magistri publici deessent, cum mundani auctores celeberrima procul dubio traditio pellentes. Nisus sum ergo cum b. Agapito Papa urbis Romae, ut sicut apud Alexandriam multum tempore fuisse traditur institutum, nunc etiam in Nisibi civitate Syrorum ab Hebracius sedulo fertur exponi (see below, § 122, note 5), collatia expensis in urbe Romana professos doctores scholae potius acciperem christiannus, unde et anima susciperei acternam salutem, et casto atque purissimo eloquio fideliium lingua comercetur. Sed cum per bella ferventia et turbulentia nimis in Italic regno certamina desiderium meum nullatenus valuisset impeleri; quamiam non habet locum res pacis temporum inquietis; ad hoc divina caritate probor esse compulsum, ut ad vicem magistri introductorius vobis libros istos, Domino praestante, conficercem, etc. What substitute was adopted may be seen from Conc. Vasaense, iii. ann. 539, can. 1: Hoc enim placitum, ut cænes presbyteri, qui sunt in parochiis constituti, secundum consuetudinem, quam per totam Italiae satis salubriter teneri cognovimus, juniorum lectores—secum in domo—recipient: et eos—psalmos parare, divinis lectionibus insistere, et in lege dominii erudire contendant: ut sibi dignos successores providant. In Spaine we find the first trace of a kind of episcopal seminaries, Conc. Tolet. ii. ann. 531, can. 1: De his, quos voluntas parentum a primis infantiae annis clericatus officio manciparit, hoc statutum observandum, ut max. detoni vel ministerio lectorum cum traditi fuerint, in domo Ecclesiae sub episcopali praesentia a praeposito sibi desinat erudiri.

of Rome (from 590–604), for the liberal sciences, contributed much to the daily increasing neglect of them; but the later traditions of his hostility to all literature, are not to be fully believed.


For example, in the epistles ad Leandrum prefixed to his Exposit. libri Jobi: Non barbarismi confusionem devita, situs mosaica praepositionum casuase servarea contenem, quia indignum vehementer existimato, ut verba cælestis oraculi restrinquam sub regulis Donati.—Lib. xi. Epist. 54, ad Desiderium, Episc. Vienenses: Pervenit ad nos, quod sine verecundia memorare non possumus, Fratres tuis quoniam grammaticam quibusdam exponere. Quam ronita moleste suscepimus, ac sumo vehementem usurpatione, ut ea, quae prins dicta fuerant, in geminum et tristitiam vertere nus: quia in uno se ore cum Jovis libidinis Christi laudes non capimus, etc.


19 Dialogorum lib. iv.; see above, note 15. 20 A. Gallandii de Vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge (Dissertationes of Constant, de Marca, the Ballerini, Berard, Quesnell, etc.). Venetia. 1778. fol. recus. Moqnunt. 1790, t. ii. 4. (L. T. Spittler's) Geschichte des kanonischen Rechts bis auf die Zeiten des falschen Isidorus. Halte. 1778. 8.
the Greek Church, soon after the council of Chalcedon, appeared the so-called apostolic canons, claiming to form the unalterable basis of all ecclesiastical arrangements. About the same time the Christians began to put together the decrees of councils in the order of the subjects, instead of in the old chronological way. The oldest collection of this kind now extant is that of Johannes Scholasticus of Antioch (afterward patriarch of Constantinople, † 578), which was in great repute for several centuries. Justinian's code was also so rich a source for ecclesiastical matters, that particular collections of church laws were made soon after his time, out of his Institutes. Those of John Scholastici were at a later period adapted to Justinian's by a new arrangement of the collection of canons, and thus arose the first Nomocanon.

In the Latin Church there was not even a tolerably complete chronological collection of the canons till that made after the council of Chalcedon, since known as the priscap translatio. A still fuller collection was afterward made by Dionysius Exiguus (about 500) in a better translation, to which was added, in a second part, a collection of the papal decretals. In Spain there had been a collection of canons, between 633 and 636, on the model of that by Dionysius (the Greek ones in a peculiar version), and of papal decretals for the use of the Spanish

22 See Div. I. § 67, note 5.
24 The Collectio lxxxvii. capitulorum, collected by Johannes Scholasticus from the Novellae; the Coll. xxv. capit. from the Codex and Novellae (published in G. R. Heimbach. Anecdota, t. ii. Lips. 1840. 4); and that erroneously published under the name of Theod. Balasmon in Voelli et Justelli Bibli. juris ii. 1223 collectio constittit. ecclesiasticarum, which was compiled at the time of Heradius, perhaps also of Justin II. from the Pandects, Codex, and Novellae. Comp. F. A. Biener's Gesch. d. Novellen Justiniana. Berlin. 1824 8. S. 156.
25 In this form it is found in Voelli et Justelli Bibli. ii. 603.
Church, which was afterward called the collection of Isidore, because it was erroneously ascribed to the most celebrated man of that time, Isidore, archbishop of Seville († 636). The laws respecting penance had gradually become so numerous as to require a separate work. Johannes Jejunator (ὁ νησσοντής), patriarch of Constantinople (from 585–593), wrote the ἀκολούθια καὶ τάξις ἐπὶ ἐξομολογημένων, the first libellus poenitentialis (rules of penance).

THIRD CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE HIERARCHY.

§ 115.

PRIVILEGES OF THE CLERGY.

The clergy, and particularly the bishops, received new privileges from Justinian. He intrusted the latter with civil jurisdiction over the monks and nuns, as well as over the clergy. Episcopal oversight of morals, and particularly the duty of providing for all the unfortunate (§ 91, notes 8–10), had been established till the present time only on the foundation of ecclesiastical laws: but Justinian now gave them a more


30 According to Eichborn, p. 113, since Pseudo-Isidora.


1 Novellae Justin. 79 et 83 (both A.D. 539). More particular notices are given in Nov. 123, cap. 21: Si quis aetem litigantum intra x. dies contradicat iis, quae judicata sunt, tunc locorum judex causam examinat.—Si judicis sententia contraria fuerit iis, quae a Deo amabilis Episcopo judicata sunt: tunc locum habere appellationem contra sententiam judicii.—Si vero crimen fuerit, quod adversus quamlibet memoratarum reverendissimiarum personarum inforatur.—Judex utoinem ei inferat legibus congruentem. Further, in a criminal accusation: Si Episcopus distulerit judicium, licentiam habet acto criminali judicii admone adire. Cf. B. Schilling de Origine jurisdictiosis eccles. in causis civilibus. Lige. 1825. 4. p. 41, sq.
general basis, by founding them on the civil law also.\textsuperscript{2} He made it the duty of the bishops, and gave them the necessary civil qualifications, to undertake the care of prisoners, minors, insane persons, foundlings, stolen children, and women;\textsuperscript{3} and invested them with the power of upholding good morals\textsuperscript{4} and impartial administration of justice. It is true that he established a mutual inspection of the bishops and of the civil magistrates; but he gave in this respect to the latter considerably smaller privileges than to the former.\textsuperscript{5} For example, he gave the bishops a legal influence over the choice of magistrates,\textsuperscript{6} and security against general oppression on their part;\textsuperscript{7} allowed them to interfere in case of refusal of justice;\textsuperscript{8} and, in special instances, even constituted them judges of those official personages.\textsuperscript{9} In like manner, he conveyed to them the right of concurrence in the choice of city officials,\textsuperscript{10} and a joint oversight of the administration of city funds, and the maintenance of public establishments.\textsuperscript{11} Thus the bishops became important personages even in civil life; and were farther honored by Justinian, in freedom from parental authority,\textsuperscript{12} from the necessity of appearing as witnesses, and from taking oaths.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{3} Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. iv. de episcopali audiencia (i. e. judicio) l. 22.—l. 30.—l. 37. l. 28.—l. 24.—l. 33.
\textsuperscript{4} In addition to their former powers against pimps (Cod. Th. xv. viii. 2) and sorcerers (Cod. Th. ix. xvi. 12), Justinian gave them also the privilege of interfering against gaming (Cod. Just. i. iv. 25).
\textsuperscript{5} The Praesides provinciarum were obliged to see to it that bishops observed ecclesiastical laws relating to ecclesiastical things (Cod. Just. i. iii. 44, § 3, Nov. cxxxiii. c. 6), particularly those relating to the unalienableness of church possessions (Nov. vii. in epil.) and the regular holding of synods (Nov. cxxxvii. c. 6). They could only, however, put the bishops in mind of their duty, and then notify the emperor.
\textsuperscript{6} Nov. exil. c. 1.
\textsuperscript{7} Cod. Just. i. iv. 26, Nov. cxxxiv. c. 3.
\textsuperscript{8} Nov. lxxvi. c. 1.
\textsuperscript{9} Nov. lxxvi. c. 4 (A.D. 539): Quasi contingat aliquem ex subditis nostris ab ipso clarissimo provinciae praeside injuria affici, jubeamus eum sanctissimum illius ubris Episcopum adire, ut ille inter cler. praesidem, eumve, qui se ab eo injuria affectum putat, judicet. If the president (of a province) were condemned, and gave no satisfaction, the matter was referred to the emperor, and in case he found the episcopal sentence just, the president was condemned to death. According to Nov. viii. c. 9, cxxviii. c. 23, every magistrate, after laying down his office, was obliged to remain fifty days in the province to satisfy any claims that might be made against him. If he removed sooner, every one injured might complain to the bishop.
\textsuperscript{10} Cod. Just. i. iv. 17, Nov. cxxvii. 16.
\textsuperscript{11} Cod. Just. i. iv. 26.
\textsuperscript{12} Novell. lxxxli. c. 7.
Finally, *Heracleius* committed to them jurisdiction over the clergy in criminal cases also (628).  

§ 116.

**Dependence of the Hierarchy on the State.**

Notwithstanding these great privileges, the hierarchy became still more dependent on the State. As the emperors sent their civil laws to be promulgated by the Praetorian prefects, so, in like manner, ecclesiastical laws went forth from them to the patriarchs, and the magistrates were directed to watch the observance of them by the bishops. None doubted the emperor's right to enact laws touching the external relations of the Church, and even subjects connected with its internal constitution; but it was more suspicious when the emperors began

---

14 The law issued to the patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius, of which merely the contents are given in the Constitut. Imper. appended to the Codex Justin. is found complete in Jn. Leucclavi Jusir Graeco Roman. (nomi ii. Francof. 1596. ed.), i. 73, and in Voëli et Justelli Biblioth. juris can. ii. 1261: The offenses (ηγκλήματα) of clergy were to be judged by the bishop, i.e. by the synods; the bishop's sentences were to be sealed, etc. Sapiens, etc. 1 Thy name is the strength of thy king, and the glory of thy princes. 2 For example, Nov. 6, epil. 3: Sanctissimi igitur Patriarchae cujusque diocesis haec in sanctissimis Ecclesias sub se constitutis proponant, et Dei amantisimis Metropolitane quae a nobis sancta sunt nota faciant. Hic vero ipsi in sanctissima Ecclesia metropolitana haec rursus proponant, et Episcopis, qui sub ipsis sunt, manifesta faciant. Quilibet vero illeum in Ecclesia sae haec proponat, ut nemo in nostra sit republica, qui ca—ignorat. P. A. Biener's Gesch. der Novellen Justinian's. Berlin. 1824. S. 31, f. comp. S. 25, ss.

3 Bieon. l.c. S. 157, ss. 161, ss. Thus Justinian, Nov. 123, c. 3, where he fixes the amount to be given by the bishops pro inhominiis, uses the expression: Κελευθερίως τοίνυν τα προ ναρισταίς αρχιερείσσης και πατριαρχέως, τοιούτως τῆς προκριμίνας Ρώμης, καί Κωνσταντινούπολες, καί Αλεξανδρίας, καί Θεοδοσίως, καί Ισορολάμως. When the Emperor Maurice had made a law, ut quibus publicis administrationibus fuerit implicatus, e i neque ad ecclesiasticum officium venire, neque in monasterium converti licent: Gregory the Great, lib. iii. Ep. 65, ad Mauricum Aug. renonstrated against the second part of the prohibition. Ex. gr. Ego vero haec Dominis meis loquens, quid sum nisi pulvis et vermis? Sed tamen quia contra auctorem omnium Deum haec intendere constitutionem sentio, Dominis tacere non possum.—Ad haec ecco per me servum ultimum suum et vestrum respondite Christus dicena: Ego te de notario comitem excurturus, de comite excurturus, Caesarum, de Caesaribus Imperatorum, nec solum hoc, sed etiam patrem Imperatorum feci. Sacerdotes meos tuas manus commisi, et tu a meo servitio milites tuos subtrahis? Respondes, rogo, plissime Domino, servo tuo, quid vociunt et haec dicent? responsurus es in judicio Domino tuo?—Ego quidem iussioni subjectus cædēm legem per diversas terrarum partes transmitti feci: et quia lex ipsa
now to decide questions of faith by edicts, and when Synods were assembled almost entirely for the purpose of adopting imperial articles of faith. The Greek bishops became more and more accustomed to sacrifice their conviction to circumstances; but the bishops of Italy, favored by the political condition of their country, were able for the most part to assert a firmer position.

§ 117.

HISTORY OF THE PATRIARCHS.

Ever since the beginning of the Monophysite controversy in the East, the sees of Alexandria and Antioch had become so weak, that the patriarchs of Constantinople only, upheld by the privileges granted them at the council of Chalecedon, were able to vie with the Roman patriarchs. But while the former were dependent on imperial caprice, and constantly harassed by the Greek spirit of controversy, the latter enjoyed the most perfect freedom in ecclesiastical things, and the advantage of standing at the head of the west, which was less inclined to controversies about faith, and therefore more united. After the extinction of the West Roman empire (476), by which, however, they had never been molested, but often furthered, the Roman

omnipotentem Deo minime concordat, ecce per suggestionis meae paginam serenissimis Dominis nutiavi. Utroque ergo quae debui exsolvi, qui et Imperatori obedientiam praebui, et pro Deo quod sensi minime tacui.


1 The Monophysite party which predominated under Basiliscus, suspended these privileges in part, Evagrius, iii. 6: (Timothaeus Aclurus) ἀποδήσει τῷ Ἐφεσίων καὶ τῷ πατρι-αρχίσκῳ δίκαιον, ὡς αὐτὸν ὁμήρει ἡ ἐν Χαλκηδώνι σύνοδος: but by the law Cod. Justin. i. 11. 16 (by Zenon, not, as the title has it, by Leo), the decrees of Chalcedon were revived, to be in force ever after.


3 See vol. i. pp. 383, 384.
bishops became subject to German princes, who left them at perfect liberty to manage all affairs within the Church according to their pleasure. This was particularly the case with Theoderich, king of the Arian Ostrogoths (493–526), 5 to whom the schism between Rome and Constantinople gave sufficient security from all dangerous combinations of the Catholic hierarchy. And when, on the death of Bishop Anastasius, there was a contested election between Symmachus and Laurentius (498), 6 he waited till required by both parties to decide, 7 and then quietly allowed a Roman synod under Symmachus to declare all interference of the laity in the affairs of the Roman Church entirely inadmissible. 8


7 Anastasii Lib. pontificalis, c. 53, in vita Symmachii: Et facta contentione hoc constituerant partes, ut ambo ad Ravennam pergerent ad judicium Regis Theoderici. Qui dux ambo introuisset in Ravennam, hoc judicium aequitatis invenerunt, ut qui primo ordinatus fuisse, vel ubi pars maxima cognosceretur, ipse sedetur in sede apostolica. Quod tandem sequitas in Symmacho invenit.

8 Synodus Romanae iiii. sub Symmachi (in the collections cited erroneously as the Syn. Rom. iv. s. palmaris, see Pagi ad ann. 593 num. 3, ss.) ap. Mansi, viii. 306, ss. The protocol of a synod held after the death of Pope Simplicius was here read, and the decrees passed at it declared nugatory as proceeding from a layman. This protocol is given in the Acta of the Synod referred to, and runs thus: Cum in unum apud b. Petrum Apostolum resedisset, sublimis et ominantissimus vir, praefectus praetorio atque patricius, agens etiam vice praecelentissimi regis Odocirsis, Basilissi dixit: Qua eumque studii nostri et religionis interist, ut in episcopatus electione concordia principaliter securit ecclesiae, ne per occasionem seditionis status civitatis vocetur in dubium: tamen admodum benignissimi Papae nostri Simplicii, quam antea oculos semper habere debemus, hoc nobis monemissis sub obtestatione fuisse mandatum, ut propter illum strepitum, et venerabilis ecclesiae detrimentum, si cum de haec fuisse transire conterit, sine nos nostra consultatione cujuslibet celebratus electo. Nam et cum quid confusionis atque dispendii venerabilis ecclesia sustineret, miramur praetermissa nobis quidquid fuisse tentatum, cum etiam secerdote nostro superstite nihil sine nobis debusset assumi. Quaeris si amplitudinis vestrae vel sanctitati placet, inclemia omnis, quae ad futurum antistitum electionem respicient, religiosa homonatiorum servumus, hanc legem specialiter praferentes, quam nobis harenolibusque nostris Christiane mensis devotione sancimus: Ne eumque praedium, seu rusticum seu urbanum, vel ornamenta aut ministeria ecclesiariam—saeculis qui mare antistes sub electione communis fuerit ordinandus, et illis qui futurus secusulus sequatur, quomqueque titulus atque commento alienentur. Si quis vero aliquis eorum alienare voluerit, loci Địax atque iritum.
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Thus the Roman bishops were so far from being hindered by any superior power, that it proved an advantageous circumstance to them in the eyes of their new civil rulers, that they steadfastly resisted innovations of faith made in Constantinople, till they gained a new victory over the changeable Greeks under the Emperor Justin. The natural consequence of this was, that while the patriarchs of Constantinople were constantly sinking in ecclesiastical esteem on account of their vacillation in these controversies, the bishops of Rome still maintained their ancient reputation of being the defenders of oppressed orthodoxy. 9

Under these favorable circumstances, the ecclesiastical pretensions of the Roman bishops, who now formed the only center of Catholic Christendom in the west, in opposition to the Arian conquerors, rose high, without hindrance. They asserted that not only did the highest ecclesiastical authority in the west belong to them, but also superintendence of orthodoxy and maintenance of ecclesiastical laws throughout the whole Church. These claims they sometimes founded on imperial edicts 10 and decrees of synods; 11 but for the most part on the peculiar rights

judicetur; sitque facienti vel consentienti, accipientique anathema, etc. At this enactment the following voices were now raised at the synod under Symmachus: Perpendat s. Synnodus, uti praetermissis personis religiosis, quibus maxime cura est de tanto pontifice, electionem laici in suum redegerint potestatem, quod contra canones esse manifestum est. —Scriptura evidentissimis documentis constat invalida. Primum quod contra patrum regularas a laicis, quanvis religiosis, quibus nulla de ecclesiasticis facultatibus aliquid dispensandi legitur unquam attributa facultas, facta videtur. Delinde quod nullius praeclarus apostolicae sedis subscriptione firmata docetur. The arrangement was declared null, and, on the contrary, another of similar import was passed by the synod to secure ecclesiastical property.

9 Cod. Just. i. i. 7, below, note 23.

10 Hilarii P. Epist. xi. (Mansi, viii. 939): Fratri quin nostro Leonitio nihil constitui a sanctae memoriae decessore meo juris potitus abrogari: —quia Christianorum quoque principum lege decreatum est, ut quidquid ecclesiis earumque rectoribus—apostolicae sedis antistes suae pronunciasset examinum, venorantur accipienda tenaciterque servari, cum suis plebisibus caritas vestra cognoscercet: nec unquam possent convelli, quae et sacerdotali ecclesiastica praeceptione fulcirentur et regia.


VOL. I.—32
conferred on Peter by the Lord. After the *synodus palmaris*, called by Theoderich to examine the charges newly raised by the Laurentian party against Symmachus (503), had acquitted him without examination, in view of the circumstances;
the apologist of this synod, Ennodius, bishop of Pavia (511),
first gave utterance to the assertion, that the bishop of Rome is
subject to no earthly judge. Not long after an attempt was
made to give a historical basis to this principle by supposititious
Gesta (acts) of former popes; and other falsifications of older
documents in favor of the Roman see now appeared in like
manner. Still the Roman bishops (or as they were already
called in Italy, by way of distinction, Papa) did not yet demand
any other kind of honor than was paid to the other
apostolic sees, acknowledging that they were subject to gen-

PP. xi. 47) libellas apologeticas pro Synodo iv. Romana (Mansi, viii. 274) Non nos b.
Petrum, scit dictis, a Domino cum sedis privilegii, vel successores ejus, pecunii judici-
camus licentiam suscepiisse. Ile perenneum meritorum dotem cum haereditate inocentiae
misit ad posteros: quod illi concessum est pro actuum lace, ad illos pertinet, quos per con-
versationis splendor illuminat. Quis enim sanctum esse dubitet, quem apex tantae digni-
tatis attollit? in quo si desint bona acquisita per merita, sufficient quae a lociecessore
praesentatur: aut enim clares ad luce fastigia erigis, aut qui eriguntur illustri. Prae-
noscit enim, quid Ecclesiariwm fundamento sit habile, super quem ipsa moles imitatur.
P. 284: Aliorum forte hominum causas Deus voluerit per hominum terminare: sedis istius
presa om suu, sine quaestione, reservavit arbitrio, in direct contradiction to the Epist.
Rom. Conc. a.d. 378, above, s. 93, note 15.

15 Namely Conc. Sinumassanum de Marcellin P. condemnationis (qua thurifississet) pre-
tended to be held a.d. 303. (Mansi. i. 1249, ss. The bishops say to him: Tu eris judex:
ex te enim damnaberis, et ex te justificaberis, tamen in nostra praesentia. Prima sedes
non judicabatur a quoquam): Constitutio Silvestri Episc. urbis Romae et Domini Constam-
tini Aug. in Concil. Rom. pretended to be in 324 (Mansi. ii. 615, ss. Cap. 29: Nemo enim
judicabit primam sedem, quoniam omnes sedes a prima sedes justitiam desiderant tempore-
rae. Neque ab Angasto, neque ab Ebni cler; neque a regibus, neque a populo judex
judicabitur): Synodi Rom. (alleged to be held a.d. 433) acta de causa Sistii III. stupro ac-
cusati, et de Polycronii Hierosolym. accusatione (Mansi. v. 1161). Comp. P. Constantin.
Diss. de antiquis canonum collectionibus, § 97-99 (in Gallandii de Vetustis canonum collec-
tionibus dissertationum sylloge, i. 99).

16 Thus the passage in Cyprian’s lib. de unit. ecc. (see Div. I. § 65, note 10) appears
already corrupted in Pelagii II. Ep. vi. ad Episc. Istriae (Mansi, ix. 898).

17 Thus, for instance, as early as in the councils held under Symmachus (see above, notes
8 and 13) and in Ennodius (see note 14. Sirmund ad Emnod. lib. iv. Ep. 1): In the other
regions of the west, however, the title Papa continued for a long time to be a name of honor
applied to every bishop (Waladrid Strabo, about 849, de Rebus ecc. c. 7, in Histor’p
Collection. p. 395: Pabal a Papa, quod cujusdam paternitatis nominem est, et Clericorum
congrut dignitiatu) till Gregory VII. forbade it, a.d. 1075. Comp. Jo. Diecmann de vocis
Papae acta tabius diss. ii. Viteberg. 1671. 4. In the east Папа was especially the title
of the patriarchs of Rome and Alexandria. Just as in Italy the see of Rome was especially
Sedes apostolica; in other countries of the west every episcopal see was so styled; cf.
Gregorii Tar. Hist. Franc. iv. 26: Presbyter—Regia praesentia adit et hanc effatus est:
Salvo, Rex gloriose, Sedes unam apostolicaem inuentiunias tace salutem mittit uberrimam.
Cui Illa, nunquam, ait, Romanam salutem urbe, ut Pape illus nobis salutem delereta? Pater,
inquit Presbyter, tuus Leontius (Ep. Burdelegalis) cum provincialibus suis salutem
tibi mittit.

18 Pelagius I. ad Valerianum (Mansi, ix. 739): Quotiens aliqua de universaliter synodo al-
quibus dubitatio nascitur, ad recipiendam de co quod non intelligent rationem, — ad apos-
eral councils, 19 and that the bishops were bound by duty to hear them only in case of delinquency. In other respects, they admitted that these bishops were equal to them in dignity. 20

tolicas sedes pro recipienda ratione conveniant.—Quisquis ergo ab apostolico divius est sedibus, in schismate eum esse non dubium est. Comp. above, § 94, note 5. Gregorii M. lib. vii. Ep. 49, ad Eulogium Episc. Alexandr.: Suavissima mihi Sanctitas vestra multa in epistolis suis de S. Petri Apostolorum principis cathedra locuta est, dicens, quod ipsa in ea nunc usque in succesoribus sedeat.—Cuncta qua dicta sunt in co libenter accepti, quod illo mihi de Petri cathedra locutus est, qui Petri cathedram tenet. Et cum me specialis honor nullo modo delocet, valde tamem lactatus sum, quin vos, sanctissimi, quod mihi impietatis, lobametipisipis desistis.—Cum multi sint Apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu solo Apostolorum principis sedes in auctoritate convallati, quos in tribus locis unius est. Ipsa enim sublimavit sedem, in qua etiam quiescere, et presentem vitam finire dignatus est (Rome); ipsa decoravit sedem, in qua Evangelistam discipulum misit (Alexandria); ipsa firmavit sedem, in qua septem annis, quamvis discessurus, sedit (Antioch). Cum ergo unius atque unam sit sedes, cui ex auctoritate divina tres nunc Episcopi prae- dent quidquid ego de vobis boni audito, hoc mihi imputo. Si quid de me boni creditis, hoc vestris meritis imputate, quin in illo unum sumus, quin sit: Ut omnes unum sint, etc. (Jo. xvii. 21). Cf. Wiggers de Gregorio M. ejusque placitis anthropologicis comm. ii. Hestoch. 1838. 4. p. 29. The flattery of Eugenius may be explained by his strained condition, which Gregory relieved even by presents (cf. lib. vi. Ep. 60; vii. 40; vii. 29). Isidorus Hisp. Etymol. vii. 12 (in Gratiani Decret. dist. xxii. c. 1): Ordo Episcoporum quadrupartitus est, id est in Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Metropolitanis atque Episcopis. Patriarcha graecae linguae summus patrum interpretatur, quia primus, i. e. apostolico retinet locum: et idcirco quia summo honore fungitur, tali nomine consuetur, sicut Romanus, Antiochenus et Alexandrinus. Here, therefore, the pope still stands in the same rank completely with the other patriarchs.

19 Gelasius Ep. xiii. (Manei, viii. 31): Confidimus, quod nullus jam veraciter Christiani ignoret, uniuscumque synodi constitutum, quod universalis ecclesiae probavit assensum, non aliquam magis exaequum sedem praebet caeteris oportere, quam primam, quae et una, quamquam synodum sua auctoritate confirmavit, et continuata moderatione custodit, pro suo scilicet principatu, quem b. Petrus apostulus domini voce perceptum, ecclesiam nihilominus subsequente, et tenet semper et retinet.

20 Gregorii M. lib. ix. Epist. 59, ad Joh. Episc. Syracus.: Si qua culpa in Episcopis inventur, necesse quia ei (Sedi apostolicae) subjectus non sit: cum vero culpa non exigit, omnes secundum rationem humiliatis sequeantur. —Lib. xi. Ep. 37, ad Romanum defensorem: Pervenit ad nos, quod si quis contra clericos quodlibet causam habeat, despicere eam Episcopis, coelest clercis in tuo facias judicium exhiberi. Quod si ita est, quia valde constat esse incongruum, habi tibi auctoritate praecipimus, ut hoc demum facere non praecumus.—Nam si tua unicaque Episcopo jurisdictione non servatur, quid aliud agitur, nisi ut per nos, per quo ecclesiasticus custodiri debuit ordo, confundatur? (Lib. ii. Ep. 52: Mihi injuriam facio, si fratum meorum jura perturbo).—Lib. viii. Ep. 30, ad Eulogium Episc. Alexandr.: Indicare quoque vestra Beatiudinem studi, jam se quibusdam (the patriarch of Constantinople) non scribere superba vocabula, quae ex vanitatis radice prodierunt, et mihi logutur, dicens: sicut jussisti. Quod verbum jussioni peto a meo audito re- moveo, quia scio, qui sum, qui estis. Loco enim mihi fratres estis, moribus patres. Non ergo jussi, sed quia utile visa sunt, indicare curavi. Non tamen invenio veniam Beatitudinem hoc ipsum, quod memorine vestrae intuit, perfecte retinere voluisse. Nam dixi, nec mihi vos, nec cuiquam alteri talo aliquid scribere debere: et eceo in praefatione epistolae, quam ad me ipsum qui prohibi dirixistes, superbae appellationis verbum, universalem me Papam dicentes, imprimerne carissim. Quod peto dulcissima mihi Sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat, quia vobis substrabitur, quod alteri plus quam ratio exigit praebetur.—Nec honorum esse deputo, in quo fratres meos honorum sumum perdere cognosco.—Si enim universalem me Papam vestrae Sanctitas dict, negat se hoc esse, quod me facttor
After ecclesiastical peace had been restored between Rome and Constantinople, the kings of the Ostrogoths became suspicious of their Catholic subjects generally, and, in particular, of the Romish bishops, who still had unbroken communication with Constantinople. John I., indeed, in his capacity of regal ambassador, procured the restoration of their Churches to the Arians in the Greek Church; yet he was obliged to end his life in prison. The kings maintained a strict oversight of the choice of the Catholic bishops, reserving to themselves the confirmation, or absolute appointment of them. Yet even now the Gothic rule was not so dangerous to the papacy as the Byzantine, which latter began after the conquest of Italy (553–554). It is true that Justinian honored the Roman see, but he also distinguished the Constantinopolitan with no less favor, and

universum. Sed abit loc. Recedant verba, quæ vanitatem infanct et caritatem vulnerant.

23 Justinian, D. D. 533, to the patriarch of Constantinople. Cod. Justin. i. i. 7: Ἡ πόλις γὰρ ἀνεχθέναι τι τῶν εἰς ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ὀρέων καταστασιν, μη καὶ τῇ αὐτῶ (τοῦ πάσα τῆς προσβολῆς ᾑρῶς καὶ πατριαρχῶν) ἀνάφερεσθαι μακραίωτα, ὡς κεφαλὴ οὐκέτι πάντων τῶν ὁσιωτάτων τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερῶν, καὶ ἐπετίθη, οὕτως, ἐν τούτοις τοῖς μέρεσιν αἰρετικοὶ ἀνάφεραν, τῇ γεώργι καὶ ὄρθω κρίσιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σεβασμοῦ θρόνον καταργοῦσαν. Ibid. l. 8, Justinianus ad Ioannem II. P.: Nunc enim patrimon quicquam, quod ad Ecclesiarum statum pertinet, quamvis manifestum et indubitatum sit, quod movetur, ut non etiam vestrae innotescat sanctitati, quae caput est omnium sancturarum Ecclesiarum. Per omnia enim (ut dictum est) properamus, honorem et auctoritatem cresce vestrae sedis.
24 Cod. Justin. i. ii. 25: Ἡ εἰς Κονσταντινουπόλει εκκλησία πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἑτέρα κεφαλὴ. On the other hand, the right of the highest ecclesiastical court, which was conveyed to the patriarch of Constantinople at Chalcedon (comp. above, § 83, note 15), if indeed it ever extended beyond the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, appears to have fallen into oblivion. The right of appeal is thus fixed by Justinian Cod. i. iv. 29: Bishop—Metropolitan and his Provincial synod—Patriarch. From the decision of the last, as from that of the Praetorian prefect, there could be no appeal (Cod. Just. vii. liii. 19). No complaint is to be brought before the patriarch first, πλὴρος εἴ μὴ τὴν αἰτίαν τις ἐπὶ τοῦτον θείη, ἐπὶ τοῦτον αἰτίαν τις σεβάσθη τῆς χάρας τοῦ θεοφιλεστῶτος ἐπισκόπου· ταχυδρομεῖ γὰρ ὡς ἤπαιν θεός τὸν θεόφιλον ὑποτίθεναι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεοφιλεστῶτοις πατριαρχίς, i.e., unless accompanied with the petition that the matter shall be delegated to the bishop of the province. For in that case it shall be allowed to bring the complaint before the patriarch. Then, § 2: Εἰ μὲντοι παραπλεονεία τῆς ὑποθέσεως παρὰ τοῦ θεοφιλεστου του πατριαρχοῦ ἢ τινι τῶν θεοφιλεστῶν μητροπολίτων, ἢ ἄλλω τῶν θεοφιλεστῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἐνεχθέθη ψύχη, καὶ μὴ στρέψθη παρὰ δικαίων μέρων, ἐκλήσιος τοῦ τε γένεσθαι· ταχυδρομεῖ εἰπὶ τῶν ἀρχιερατικῶν ὅμιλον (Vers. lat. ad Archipiscopalem ὑπὸ οἰκου) φέρεσθαι τὴν ἔφεσιν, κάκειος κατὰ τὸ μέριμν τῶν κρατῶν ἐξετάζομαι, i.e.,
endeavored in the end to convert both merely into instruments to enable him to rule both in church and state. Two of his creatures, Vigilius and Pelagius I., successively filled the Roman see; and in the controversy concerning the three chapters it soon became apparent how hazardous to Rome this dependence on Byzantium was. For a long time in the Western Church the rejection of the Three Chapters was considered a violation of orthodoxy; and on this account the bishops of the diocese of Italy broke off communion with Rome. The bishops of Milan and Ravenna were indeed reconciled; when, oppressed by the Arian Lombards, they were compelled to set greater value on communion with the Catholic Church (570–580); but the archbishop of Aquileia (who, since the incursions of the Lombards into Italy (568), resided on the island Grado) and the Istriean bishops were more obstinate, and did not renew their fellowship with Rome till the year 698.

But even this dangerous period of dependence on Byzantium ceased for Rome, after the incursion of the Lombards into Italy (568). From that time the Greek dominions in this country were confined to the exarchate of Ravenna, the Duchy of Rome and Naples, the cities on the coast of Liguria, and the extreme provinces of Lower Italy. Continually threatened by the Lombards, and often forsaken by the Greek emperors, these districts were frequently obliged to protect themselves. At the head of all measures for defense appeared the popes, as the richest possessors, whose own interest it was to avert the rule

if the complaint is delegated by the patriarch to a metropolitan or another bishop, and a sentence passed which the one party is dissatisfied with, and an appeal is made; then the appeal shall be to the archbishop (consequently with the omission of some intermediate courts, according to the rule Cod. Just. vii. lxii. 32, § 3: Eorum sententia appellacione suspensis, qui ex delegatione cognoscant, necesse est cum aestimare—qui causas delegaverint judicandas). ‘О ἀρχεπατικός θρόνος, is every delegating patriarch, not exclusively (as has been assumed after the Latin translation of Anton. Augustinus, which in this law is entirely false) the patriarch of Constantinople. Even Ziegler Geschichter der kirch. Verfassungsgesch. S. 332, ss. has entirely misunderstood this law.


26 As the emperors called their fortunes patrimonium (namely patrimonium privatum s. dominicum their private property, and patrim. sacratam s. divinae doinos, their domains. See Guthenus de offic. dom. Aug. lib. iii. c. 25. Pancirolius ad notit. dignitatum Imp. orient. c. 87), so the churches called their possessions patrimonium of their saints. That of the Roman church was therefore patrimonium S. Petri; at the same time also the single-
of those Arian barbarians. Thus they not only gained great political influence in Grecian Italy, but also obtained a more independent position in ecclesiastical matters in relation to the Greek emperors. As citizens, they remained subject to the Greek emperors, and their representatives, the exarchs of Ravenna.

Toward the end of this period the flame of controversy was again kindled between the two first patriarchs of Christendom, when John Jejunator began to assume the title of a Patriarcha estates which were managed by defensoribus or rectoribus were called patrimonii. Cf. Zaccaria disser de patrimonii a Rom. Eccl. in his commentationes de rebus ad hist. atque antiquit. Ecclesiae pertinentibus dissert. latinac. (Fulginiac. tomii. ii. 1781. 4.) ii. 68. Planck's Gesch. d. christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf. l. 628. C. H. Sack de patrimonii Eccl. Rom. circa finem sæculi vii. in his Commentationes, quae ad theol. hist. pertinent, tres. Bonnac. 1821. l. p. 25, sq. For an account of the activity of the Popes in protecting Italy, comp. Gregorii M. lib. v. Ep. 91, ad Constantinum Aug.; Viginti autem jam et septem annos ducimus, quod in hac urbe inter Langobardorum gladios vivimus. Quibus quam multa hac ab Ecclesia quotidianis diebus egressa, ut inter cos vivere possimus, suggerenda non sunt. Sed brevior indicio, quia sicut in Ravennae partibus Dominorum Pictas apud primum exercitum Italici saecellarium habet, qui causis superveniensibus quotidianis expensas faciat, ita et in hac urbe in causis talibus eorum saecellarium ego sum. Et tamen haec Ecclesia, quae uno eodemque tempore clericis, monasteris, paup. populos, populo, atque in eisuper Langobardis tam multa inde signantur et adhibitu ex omnibus Ecclesiisamum primum alligatio, quae de hac unius hominix (Johannis Jejunati) superbia multaem gemunt, etiam nilii dieere praesumunt.

57 Gregorii M. lib. ii. Ep. 31, ad suos milites Nepoletanum: Sumus militiae haec inter alia bona meritam haec est, obedientiam sanctae Reipublicae utilitatis exhibere, quodque sibi utiliter imperatum fuerint, ottemperare: sicut et nullius devotionem vestram fecisse diciebat, quae epistolis nostris, quibus magnificum virum Constantinum Tribunum custodice civitatis deputavius praecessit, paruit, et congrua militia devotionis obedientiam monstravit. Unde scripsit vos praeritatis curavimus admodum, uti praedicto vire magnifico Tribuno, sicet et fecistis, omnem debentis pro sacerdotiorum Dominorum utilitate, vel conservanda civitate obedientiam exhiberie, etc. Comp. the excerpt from the acts of Honorius I. (625, 635) by Muratori, Antiquit. Ital. v. 894, from Concil Camerarii lib. de consibus, and published more fully by Zaccaria, l. c. p. 131, from the collect Cam. of Cardinal Deuuid. Ideo in eodem (i.e., Honorius in suo Register) Gudisso Notorio et Anstollio Magistro militem Nepoletanam civitatem regendam committit, et qualiter debeat regi, scriptis informat. It does not follow from these passages, as Dionysius de St. Martin in vita Gregorii, lib. iii. c. 9, no. 6 (Gregg. Opp. iv. 271), and Zaccaria, l. c. p. 112, 131, conclude from them that the city of Naples belonged to the patrimonium S. Petri; but that the popes who had important possessions there (a patrimonium Nepoletanum and Campanum, Zaccaria, p. 111), when the city was hard pressed (cf. Gregor. M. lib. ii. Ep. 46, ad Johannem Episc. Ravennae: De Nepoletana vero urbe, excellentissimo Exarcho instantur imminente, vobis indicamus, quia Arigis—valde insidiatur eadem civitate, in quam si celeriter dux non mittatur, omnino jam inter perditas habentur, and required speedy aid, took the necessary measures instead of the exarch. Cf. Sack. l. c. p. 32.

23 Cf. Gregorii M. lib. iii. Ep. 65, above, § 116, note 3. For the official authorities concerning the relations of the ecclesiastical to the civil power, especially concerning the right of the exarchs to confirm the choice of a pope, see the liber diurnus Romanorum Pont. See on this subject on the following period.
universalis, οἰκουμενικός (587). Even Pelagius II. grew very warm respecting it, and still more Gregory the Great. These popes rejected that appellation altogether, as anti-Christian and devilish; without, however, making the desired impression on the Emperor Maurice and the court patriarch. So much the more, therefore, did Gregory thank Providence when Maurice's murderer Phocas (602) ascended the throne, and Phocas


repaired the pope’s favor by taking his part against the patriarch, though after him that disputed title was constantly used by the see of Constantinople.

At this time the popes also began to bestow the pallium (which all bishops in the east received at their consecration) on the most distinguished bishops of the west, for the purpose of symbolizing and strengthening their connection with the Church of Rome.


Tertiis est Papa Bonifac us ille benigneus,
Qui petit a Phocae munia per secula dignum,
Ut sedes Petri prima sit; ille dedit.
Prima prius fuerat Constantinopolitana;
Est modo Romana, meliori dogmate clara.

Even Heraclius, successor of Phocas, in his laws gives again this title to the patriarch of Constantinople. See Leunclavius Jus Graeco-Romanum, t. i. p. 73, ss.

The oldest document on the subject is Symmachii P. Ep. ad Theodorum Laurentensem (Mansi, viii. p. 298) about 501: Diebus vitae tuae palli usum, quem ad sanctificalis officii decorem et ad ostendendarum unanimitatem, quam cum b. Petro Apostolo universum gregem dominicarum ovium, quae ei commissae sunt, habere dubium non est, ab apostolica sede, sicut ducrit, poposciit, quod utpote ab eisdem Apostolis fundatae ecclesiae majorum more libenter indulsumus ad ostendendarum a magistrum et archiepiscopum, tumque sanctorum Laurentorum ecclesiam provinciarum Panoniorum sedem eorum metropolitam.

Id circiter pallium, quod ex apostolica caritate tibi destinatus, quo uti debes secundum morem ecclesiae tuae, soleretur admodumque pariterque volubus, ut intelligas, quae ipse vestitas, quo ad missarum solemnitas oraris, signum praestet crucis, per quod scito te cum fratribus debere compati ac mundilibus illecebris in affectu crucifigi, etc. (The formula in the liber diurnus, cap. iv. tit. 3, is abbreviated from this epistle.) According to Vigilii P. Ep. vii. ad Auxanum Arlatensem (Mansi, ix. p. 49), Symmachus also invested Caesarius, bishop of Arles, with the pallium. These investitures became more frequent under Gregory the Great, not only of metropolitanos, as John of Corinth, Leo of Prima Justianianae, Vigilius of Arles, Augustine of Canterbury, but also simple bishops, as of Donus of Massina, John of Syracuse, John of Palermo, etc. See Portsch. L. c. p. 134, ss. Though Vigiliius P. Ep. vi. ad Auxanum Arlatensem (Mansi, ix. p. 49), writes: De his vero, quos Caritas vestra tam de usu pallii, quam de alias sibi a nobis petit, debere concedi, libenti hoc annimo etiam in praeents facere sine dilatatione potissimum, nisi cum christianissimi Domini filii nostris imperatori hoc, sicut ratio postulat, voluisse semper perfecte notitia; and Gregorius i. lib. ix. Ep. 11, ad Brunichilidem Reginam, while he mentions to Synagrius, bishop of Autun, gifted with the pallium, the necessity of the imperial approbation; yet it was probably sought for only when hostile relations existed with the kingdom to which the
FOURTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF MONACHISM.

§ 118.

THE LITERATURE MAY BE SEEN IN THE PREFACE TO § 95.

In the east, monachism continued in its manifold forms.¹ Justiniān favored it by his laws,² though he endeavored to restrain the irregular wanderings of the Coenobites.³ While pallium was sent. See Persch, I. c. p. 196, ss. That a tax was early connected with this investiture, see Gregorii i. lib. v. Ep. 57, ad Johannem Episc. Corinth. (Also spr. Gratianus dist. C. c. 3): Novit autem fraternitas vestra, quia prius pallium nisi dato commoto non dabatur. Quod quoniam incongruam erat, factō Concilio tam de hoc quam de ordinatiōnibus aliquid accipire sub dictā dictā interdictiones vetuimus. The decree referred to is in Mansi, ix. p. 1297.

¹ Comp. the description, Evagrius, i. 21. The spirit of the oriental monks of this period may be gathered from Johanni Moschi (about 630) λεγμον, prætrām spirituālēm (in Latin in Herib. Rosseuydi Vitae patrum. Antverp. 1615. fol. p. 853, ss. The Greek original, though defective is found in Frontonis Ducaeii Auctarium bibl. PP. ii. 1057. The chasms are supplied in Cotelerii Monum. Eccl. Gr. ii. 541). Even here complaints of the decay of monachism appear, ex. gr. c. 130: Οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὴν ἐγκράτειαν καὶ τὴν ἀκτιμο- σύνην μέχρι βασιλέως ἐπήρθησαν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπελατύναμε τὰς κούλλας ἡμῶν καὶ βαλανία, κ. τ. λ. Cf. cap. 52 and 168.


³ Novella v. de Monachis (A.D. 535), cap. 4: Ει δε της ἀπας θαυμων καθυστερος της μοναστηριον, και τω σχηματω τυχων, εταν αναχωρησαι της μοναστηριων βουληθηναι, και ιδιωτη τυχων ελθον ξημερωναι: αυτως μεν λεγει, ποιαν επει δυοτου δουσι τω θεω την ἀπο- λογια, τα πρώγαμα μεντοι ὑποσα ου χρημα της μοναστηριων εισήγη, τοπα της δεσποτειας έται της μοναστηριων και ουδ’ οτιον παντελως δεξατε. Cap. 7: Ει δε ἀπο-
the Stylites in the east still attracted the highest wonder, especially one Daniel, in the neighborhood of Constantinople, under the Emperors Basiliscus and Zeno, an attempt in the neighborhood of Treves to imitate them was interdicted by the bishops of the place. On the other hand, the κατευχωμένοι of the east, found many admirers especially in Gaul, (Reclusus, Recluses).

§ 119.

BENEDICTINES.


In the west, Benedict, a native of Nursia in Umbria, gave a new form to the monastic life. After he had long lived a hermit’s life, he founded a convent on a mountain in Campania, where the old castrum Cassinum was situated (hence called monasterium Cassinense, monte Cassino). Here he introduced a new system of rules (529) which mitigated the extreme

λιπὼν τὸ μοναστήριον, καθ' ὅπερ τὴν ἴσκησιν εἶχεν, εἰς ἔτερον μεταβαίνειν μοναστήριον, καὶ ὤθη μὲν ἡ αὐτὸς περικύκλῳ μενετό τε καὶ ἐκλίκειον ἐπὶ τοῦ προτέρου μοναστήριον, ἐναθ' ἀποτάξιμον τούτῳ κατέληξεν. προσήκον δέ λοιπὸ τῆς ἐποδηστέτης ἐγκομίους μὴ ἐλειδέσασθαι τὸν τούτο πρότοτον. 4 Acta Daniellis, ap. Sorium ad d. 11 Dec.


5 His biographer is Gregorius M. in Dialogorum lib. secundo.

rigor of the eastern monks, 3 prescribed a variety of suitable
employments, 4 but was distinguished especially by this, that it
exacted a promise from all who entered, never to leave the
monastery again, and strictly to observe its rules. 5 This system
was soon diffused in Italy, Gaul, and Spain. Instead of the
former diversity of monasteries, unity now appeared; and thus
arose the first proper monastic order or association of many
monasteries under a peculiar rule. The straitening of vows in
this Benedictine rule was followed by the declaration of marriage
being invalid in the case of monks; 6 while the monks and nuns

vitae aeternae, non ut aliquid imperatam a majore fuerit, ac si divinitus imperetur, moram
pati nesuitum in faciendo.

3 Cap. 39, appoints for the daily food cocta duo pulmentaria (ut forte, qui ex uno non
poterit edere, ex alio reficiatur). Et si fuerint inde poma aut nascentia leguminum, addur-
taet tertium. Farther panis libra una, and, cap. 40, hemina vini (different opinions con-
cerning the hemina, see in Martene Comm, in Reg. S. Bened. p. 539, ss.). On the other
hand, carnium quadrupedum ab omnibus abstineatur comestio, prater omnino debiles et
segregos. Cap. 36: Balneorum usus infirmis, quotes expedit, offeratur. Sanis autem, et
maximo juvenibus, tardius concedatur.

4 Cap. 48: Otiositas inimica est animae, et ideo certis temporibus occupari debent
fratres in labore manuum, certis iterum horis in lectio divina. Between these the horae
canonicorum, namely the Nocturnae vigiliae, Matutinae, Prima, Tertia, Sexta, Nona,
Vespera, and Completorium (see respecting them cap. 8-19). Cap. 16: Sedit in die
diem dixi tibi, and v. 62: Media nocte surgam ad confitemendum tibi. Comp. § 85, note 8.

5 Cap. 59: After ordering a probation time of the noviter venientibus ad conversiones, si
habita securum deliberatione promiserit ut omnia custodire et cuncta sibi imperata servare,
tone suspicatiur in congregazione, scient se jam sub lege regulae constitutum, quod ei ex
illa die non licet egredi de monasterio, nec collum excutere de subjugo regulae, quam
sub tam morosa deliberatione licuit aut excusare, aut suscipere. Suscipiendus autem in
oratorio coram omnibus promittat de stabilitate sua, et conversione morum suorum, et
obedienciam coram Deo et sancta ejus, ut si aliquote alteri fecisset, ab eo se damnamendum
sciat, quem irritet. De qua promissione suum faciat petitionem ad nomen Sanctorum,
quorum reliquiae ibi sunt, et Abbatia praesentis. Quam petitionem manum suam scribat,
aut certo, si non scit literas, alter ab eo rogatus scribat, et ille novitius signum faciat,
et manum sua eam super altare ponat. Cap. 59: Si quis forte de nobilibus offert filium
suum Deo in monasterio, si ipse puer minori aetate est, parentes eum faciant petitionem,
quam supra diximus. Et cum oblatae ipsam petitionem et manum puere involvunt in
palla altaris, et sic eum offerant. Cap. 66: Monasterium autem, si posit fit, ita debet
constri, ut omnia necessaria, id est, aqua, molendinum, hortae, pistrinum, vel artes di-
versae intra monasterium exerceantur, ut non sit necessitas Monachii vagandi foras, quae
omnino non expedit animabus eorum.

6 The older appointment (see § 95, note 49), that the breaking of the vow should be
punished with church-penance, is still repeated by Leo 1, Ep. 90, ad Rusticum, c. 19.
(Propositum monachi—descri non potest absque peccato. Quod enim votit Deo, debet
et reddere. Unde qui relicta singularitatis professione ad militiwm vel ad naptias dovo-
latus est, publicae populentiae satisfactione purgrandus est), and Gelasius 1, Ep. 5, ad
Episc. Lucanie (ap. Gratian. Causa xxvii. Qu. 1, c. 14). Also Conc. Aurelian. i. ann. 511,
c. 21, pro-supposes the validity of marriage. (Monachus si in monasterio conversus vel
gallium comprobatus fuerit acceptos, et postea uxori fuerit societas, tantae praeventia-
flosis reus nunquam ecclesiasticus gradus officium sortiatur.) On the contrary, first, the
who had left their monasteries began to be violently brought back into them. 7

Of literary pursuits among the monks we find no trace, either in Benedict's rule, or among the first Benedictines. 8 It was Cassiodorus who made the first attempt of this kind in the convent built by him called Vivarium (Coenobium Vivariense, 538) near Squillacei in Bruttia, whither he had withdrawn; 9 and where in addition to other useful employments, an endeavor was made to introduce learned occupations also into a monastery. 10 The Benedictines, already accustomed to a well regulated ac-

Conc. Turonicum ii. ann. 567, c. 15: (Monachas) si-uxorem duxeris, excommunicet, et de uxoris male societae consortio etiam judicis auxilio separetur.—Qui infelix monachas, —et illi, qui cum exciperint ad defensandum, ab ecclesia segregentur, dente reverteratur ad septa monasterii, et indietam ab Abbate—ugat poenitentiam, et post satisfactionem rever-
tatur ad gratiam.

7 Thus Gregory the Great ordered, with reference to a married nun (ep. Gratian c. xxvii. Qu. 1, c. 15), and with reference to another who had merely returned ad sacellum habi-


9 That he introduced the rules of Benedict into his convent, as the Benedictines (see Garcius in the vita Cass. prefixed to his Opp. p. 27) supposed, has been justly denied by Baronius ad ann. 494.

10 For this purpose he wrote in particular his works de Institutione divinarum litterarum, and de Antibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum, comp. § 114, note 7. He exhorts, above all things, to study the Holy Scriptures and the fathers. But then he adds, de Instit. div. litt. c. 28: Verutumtamen nec illud Patres sanctissimi deceverunt, ut sanctuarium litter-

ara perfecta possit erudiendi: aliqua tam et scientiae mediocritate suffultos, eligat certe quod sequitur:

Rara mihi et rigui placesant in vallibus annis.

Quia nec ipsum est a Monachis alienum hortos colere, agros exercere, et pomorum foci-
cunditate gratulare. Cap. 30: Ego tamen fateor votum meum, quod inter vos quacumque
possunt corporo labore compleleri, Antiquariorum mihi studia (si tamem veraceiter scribant)
non immerito forsas plus placere; quod et tamen nescam reliegeandos scripturas divinas
salutbrer instruant, et Domini praecepta scribendo longe latum disseminem. (Comp.
the directions for copying and revising manuscripts, cap. 15, and the treatise de ortho-
graphia.)—Cap. 31: Sed et vos alaquor fratres egregios, qui humani corporis salutem
sedulua curiositate tractatis, et confugiuntibus ad loca sanctorum officia bestiae pietatis
impenitentis. Et ideo discete quidem naturas herbarum, commixtionesque specierum sol-
licita mente tractate. He recommends to them the writings of Dioscorides, Hippocrates,
and Galen. Comp. Stöadlin in the Kirchenhist. Archive für 1825, S. 413, ss.
tivity, very soon followed this example; and thus they could now be useful to the west in many ways.

They reclaimed many waste lands, actively advanced the cause of education, handed down to posterity the history of their time in chronicles, and preserved it by their copyists, for the most part indeed as dead treasures, the writings of antiquity.\(^{12}\)

§ 120.

RELATION OF THE MONKS TO THE CLERGY.

Though the clergy continued to be very often chosen from among the monks, yet there were in the convents no more ordained monks than were required by the necessities of the monks' congregation; and many convents had no presbyter whatever.\(^1\) The old rule that all convents should be under the inspection of the bishops of the dioceses in which they were situated,\(^2\) was first departed from in Africa, where many put themselves under the superintendence of distant bishops, especially the bishop of Carthage, to keep themselves secure against oppression.\(^3\) In the remaining part of the west, the duty of the

---

\(^{1}\) The permission to undertake the care of pueros oblatos, given by Benedict in his rule c. 59 (see above, note 5), was soon and often taken advantage of. See Gregory M. dial. ii. cap. 3: Coepere etiam tune ad eum Romanae urbis nobilis et religiosis concurrere, suosque ei filios omnipotentem Deo nutriendos dare. For these puere oblati in particular, the monastery schools were erected, of which the first intimation is found in the so-called Regula Magistri, c. 50 (ap. Holstenius-Brockie, t. i. p. 266), composed about 100 years after Benedict, where it is prescribed that in the three hours from the first to the third, infantuli in decada sua in tabulis suis ab uno litterato litteras medieatur.


\(^{1}\) Presbyters were sent into the convents by the bishops (directi, deputati) ad missas celebrandras. Gregor. M. lib. vi. Ep. 46, viii. 43.—Abbotts prayed and received permission in monasterio Presbyterum, qui sacra Missarum solemnia celebrare debebat, ordinari. Ibid. vi. 49, ix. 32: or a presbyter was appointed to the convent, quem et in monasterio habitare, et indo vitae subsidia habere nescesse fuit, ibid. iv. 18.—On the other hand Gregory libb. vi. Ep. 56, praises a convent of which he had heard, et Presbyteros et Diaconos cunctamque congregationem unanimes vivere ac concordes.

\(^{2}\) Conc. Chaced. c. 4:—Εδεξε μηδένα μὲν μηδαμοῦ ὀλοκληρωμένῳ μηδὲ συνεστάξει μοναστήριον ἢ εὐκτάτων ὀλίγων παιδα γενόμενον τῷ τῆς πόλεως Ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ ἔδω καὶ έκάστη πόλιν καὶ χώραν μονάστηρας ὑποτετάματο τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ. Can. 8: Οἱ κληρικοὶ τῶν πτωχείων καὶ μοναστηρίων καὶ μαρτυρίων ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Κελίας πόλει Ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐξόντων, κατὰ τῷ τῶν ἄγων πατρίων παράδοσιν, διαμενόμενοι, καὶ μὴ κατανθαδαζόμενοι ἢ ἀφίσιν τοῦ ιδίου Ἐπισκόπου.

\(^{3}\) Conc. Carthag. ann. 525, dies secunda (ap. Mansi, viii. 648). The prayer of Abbas
monasteries to be spiritually subject to the diocesan bishops was still strictly enforced. On the other hand, synods and popes took them under their protection, in opposition to episcopal oppression, and made it a fundamental principle that the bishops should not interfere with their internal administration. Gregory the Great, in particular, was distinguished for his protection of convents.


4 Conc. Aurelian. i. (511) can. 19. Episcopense (517) can. 19. Arelatense v. (554) can. 7.

5 So first Concil. Arelatense, iii. A.D. 456 (Mansi, viii. 907), which limited the rights of the bishop of the diocese in the convent of Lerins as follows: Ut clericis, atque altaris ministri a nullo, nisi ab ipso, vel cui ipse injunxerit ordinament; chrisma non nisi ab ipso speretur; neoplyti si fuerint, ab eodem confirmantur; peregrini clericis absque ipsius praecesso in communione, vel ad ministerium non admittamur. Monasterii vero omnis laica multitudin ad curam Abbatis pertinent: neque ex ea sibi Episcopus quidquam vindict, aut aliquem ex illa clericum, nisi abbate potente, praesumat. Hoc eum et rationem et religionem plenam est, ut clericis ad ordinationem Episcopi debita subjectione respicient: laica vero omnis monasterii congregatio ad salum ac liberam Abbatis proprii, quem sibi ipso elegerit, ordinationem dispositionemque pertinent; regulae, quae a fundatore ipsius monasterii dudum constituta est, in omnis custodita.

Comp. especielle Greg. M. lib. viii. Ep. 15, ad Marinianum Ravennae Episc.: Nullus adeat de reditibus vel chartis monasterii minuere.—Defuncto Abbate non extraneus nisi de eodem congregazione, quem sibi propria voluntate congregatio elegerit, ordinaret.—Invito Abbate ad ordinanda alia monasteria aut ad ordines sacros tolli exinde monachi non debent.—Descriplo rerum aut chartarum monasterii ad Ecclesiasticas fieri non debit. —Quin hospitandi occasionem monasterium temporibus decessoris vestri nobis suisse nuncio- tum est praegravitum: operet ut hoc Sanctitas vestra decenter debat temperare. He orders a bishop to restore what he had taken from a convent xenii quasi specie, lib. viii. Ep. 34. On the other hand he admonishes all bishops to keep a strict watch over the discipline and morals of the convents, lib. vi. Ep. 11; viii. Ep. 34.—Other privileges which Gregory is alleged to have granted to convents, for instance the celebrated privilege of monasterii S. Modarri in Soissons (see appendix to his letters in the Benedictine edition, no. 4) are spurious. Cf. Launani Opp. iii. ii. 90. Thomassinus, F. 1. lib. iii. c. 30.
FIFTH CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 121.

How much the sensuous tendency of public worship, of which we have already spoken, was farther developed in this period, and how many new superstitious notions sprung from it, is best seen in the writings of Gregory the Great, a man who, with much real piety, had also very many monkish prejudices and great credulity; while by his high reputation in the Western Church, he did much to introduce new forms of worship, and diffuse a multitude of superstitions.

The chief part of the reverence paid to saints came more and more to consist in the superstitious worship of relics, of whose

1 For it there is a decree, Gregorii M. (Opp. ed. Maur. ii. 1258. Mansi, x. 434, also in Gratianus dist. 93, c. 2) characteristically: In sancta Romana Ecclesia—datum consuetudo est valde reprehensibilis exorta, ut quidam ad sacri altaris ministerium Cantores eligantur et in Diaconatus ordines constituti modulationi vocis inserviant, quos ad praedicationem officium eleemosynarumque studium vacare congruebat. Unde fit plerunque, ut ad sacrum ministerium dum blanda vox quareritur, quaera congrua vita neglegatur, et cantor minister Deum moribus stimulet, cum populum vocibus delectat. He therefore arranges that not deacons but sub-deacons and minores ordinaries should be employed in the singing.


3 Gregor. M. lib. iv. Ep. 30, ad Constantinem Aug. (Sermonitas vestra—caput S. Pauli Apostoli, aut alii quid de corpore ipsius, sive ad se jussionibus a me praecipuit debere transmiti.—Major me moestitiam tenuit, quod ille praecipitus, quae facere nec possunm, nec unde. Nam corpora, SS. Petri et Pauli App. tantis in Ecclesiis suis consueant miraculis atque terribus, ut neque ad orandum sine magno illic timore possit accedi.—Examples. Among other things, that in opening the grave of Laurentius mouuchi et mansionarii, qui corpus ejusdem Martyris viderunt, quod quidem minime tangere praeusumorunt, omnes intra x. dies defuncti sunt (Exod. xxxiiii. 20).—Romanis consuetudo non est, quando Sanctorum reliquias dant, ut quidquid tangere praesumam de corpore: sed tantemmodo in pyxide brandeum mittitur, atque ad sacratissima corpora Sanctorum posuit. Quod levatum in Ecclesia, quae est dedicata, debita cum venerandio reconditur: et tantae per hoc ibidem virtutes sunt, ac si illic specialiter eorum corpora deferant (in illo maner Gregor. Taron. de gloria Martyr. i. 28). Unde contigit, ut b. recordantibus Leonis P. temporibus, sicut a maioribus traditur, dum quidam Graeci de talibus reliquiis dubitarent, praedictus Pontifex hoc ipsum brandeum allatis forficiis inciderit, et ex ipsa incensione sanguis effluxerit. In Romani namque vel toto Occidentis partibus omnino intolerabile est atque sacrilegum, si Sanctorum corpora tangere quisquam forasse voluerit. Quod si praesumserit, certum est, quia haec temeritas impunita nullo modo remanebit.—Sed quia
miraculous power the most absurd stories were told. The consequence of this was, that the moral aspect of saint-reverence was still farther lost sight of by an age which longed only for the marvelous. As this tendency now began to give rise to imposition in introducing false relics, it had also the effect of developing the legends of the saints, to a greatly increased extent, in consequence of the love of the miraculous. The old martyrs, of whom for the most part the names alone were handed down, were furnished with new descriptions of their lives, while the new saints were dressed out with wonderful narratives; even martyrs, with the histories of martyrs, were entirely fabricated anew.

In the worship of saints, angels were now without hesitation made to participate, to whom also churches were dedicated.\footnote{Gregor. M. lib. iv. Epist. 30, ad Constantinum Aug.: Quidam Monachi Graeci hunc ante bicennium venientes nocturno silenter juxta ecclesiam S. Pauli corpora mortuorum in campo jacentia effodiabant, atque eorum ossa recondebant, servantes sibi dum recedebant. Qui cum tenui, et cur hoc facerent diligentior fuisse fuerint discussi, confessi sunt quod illa ossa ad Graeciam essent tamen Sanctorum reliquias portatarum. Concil. Caesareo-August. ii. (592) can. 2: Statuit S. Synodus ut relique in quibuscumque locis de Ariane haeresi inventae fuerint, prolatae, a Sacerdotibus, in quorum ecclesias reperiantur, postificibus praesentataae igne probentur (the old German order).}

\footnote{Gregor. M. lib. vii. Ep. 59, see Div. I § 53, note 46.}

\footnote{The writings of Gregory, archbishop of Tours, afford abundant proofs of all this. See above § 114, note 18. Among many other things we find also in him for the first time (De Gloria marty. i. 93), the legend belonging to the Decian persecution de septem domincibus apud urbem Ephesum. It had been derived from an old tradition which is even found in Pliny Nat. hist. vii. 52; but which being afterward transferred to Christian martyrs, was differently localized. Thus it appears in the Koren (Suras 18) to be transplanted into Arabia, subsequently it was carried into Gaul (Pseudo-Gregor Tur. Epist. ad Sulpic. Bituric.), to Germany (Nicephori Call. Hist. eccles. v. 17), and also to the north (Paulus Diacon. de Gestis Longob. i. 4).

\footnote{Comp. § 98, note 34. As presents had been made to the deities in heathen Rome, so now they were frequently made to saints and angels. Cf. lex Zononis (Cod. Just. i. ii. 15): Si quis donavorit aliquam rem— in honorem Martyris, aut Prophetae, aut Angeli, tanquam ipsi postea oratorium adedicaturas,— cogitor opus, quamvis nondem inchoatum fuerit, perlicere per se vel per heredes. Justinian, A.D. 530 (I. c. i. 26): In multis jam testamentis invenimus ejusmodi institutiones, quis habet aut ex asso quis scripserat Dominum nostrum Jeann Christum heredom: then the inheritance of the church of the place was to}
Pictures became more common in the churches. In the east authentic likenesses of Christ now appeared in public,¹ and were the principal means of establishing there the worship of images;² but in the west the latter was still rejected.¹⁰

Justinian was distinguished for building splendid churches.¹¹

To the festivals were added the two feasts of Mary, festum purificationis (ἐπαναντῇ) on the second of February; and festum annunciationis (ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελισμοῦ ημέρα) on the 25th of March.¹²

On the three days before the ascension (jecunium rogationum), Mamercus or Mamertus, bishop of Vienne (452), had instituted solemn rites of penance and prayer, accompanied by fasting and public worship (litiaeae, rogationes), appointed for the three days

be applied to the benefit of the poor. Si vero quis unius ex Archangelis meminerit, vel venerandorum Martyrum, in that case the nearest church dedicated to him shall be heir.

¹ The picture of Christ by Luke first mentioned by Theodoreus Lector about 518, which was soon followed by pictures of other holy persons from the same hand. But after this appeared the elhýnēs ἀχειροποίητοι, a counterpart of the ἡγάματα ἐπαναντῆ of heathenism, first noticed in Evagrius, iv. 27. See Div. I. § 21, note 4.

² Apologia pro Christianis adv. Judaeos in the Acts of the Conc. Nic. ii. ann. 787, Act. 4 (Mansi, xiii. 43), where he defends προσκύνησις before the pictures, mentions even ἄθρατων ἔσσεις εἰς ελάχιστοι and designates the pictures as πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν καὶ τείμην καὶ εὐφράτειος ἅλληλησίων προζωμέναι καὶ προσκυνομέναι. Neander's Kirchengesch. ii. 627, ss.


¹¹ Procopius Caesaris in De Aedificiis Justiniani libr. vi.

before the ascension (jejunium rogationum). To this festival Gregory the Great added new ceremonies (litania septiformis). He also improved the church-music (cantis Gregorianus).

Justinian first transferred to the spiritual relationship (cognatio spiritualis) between the god-father and the god-child, the civil consequences arising from corporeal affinities.

Gregory the Great, in his Sacramentarium, gave that form to the Roman liturgy relative to the Lord’s Supper, which it has substantially preserved ever since. The earlier notions of this rite, and of its atoning power, became more exaggerated in proportion as the idea became general, which was thrown out by Augustine as a conjecture, that men would be sub-

---


14 Appendix ad Gregorii Epistolas, no. iii. and Sermo tempore mortalitatis (in the older edition, lib. xi. Ep. 3).


16 Ideas of regeneration in baptism, of spiritual generation, of the brotherly relation of Christians, had before led men to compare the relations of the baptizer, of the godfather, and the baptized, with corporeal relationship. Cf. Fabii Marii Victorini (about 360) Comm. in Ep. ad Gal. (in Maij Script. vett. nova coll. iii. i. 37) : Per baptismum, cum regeneratio sit, ille qui baptizatam perfect, vel perfectum sasipicit, pater dicitur. Cf. Gotthof. Arnoldi Hist. cognationis spiritualis inter Christianos receptae. Goslar: 1739. 8. p. 44, ss. From this now proceeded the decree of Justinian, Cod. lib. v. tit. 4, de nuptiis, l. 26: Ea persona omnimodo ad nuptias venire prohibenda, quam aliquis—a sacrosancto suscepit baptizant: cum nihil aliud sic inducere potest pateram affectionem et justam nuptiarum prohibitio- nem, quam hujusmodi nexus, per quem Deo mediante animae eorum copulatam sunt. This was considered as a sort of adoption. See du Fresne Glossar. s. v. Adoptio et Filiolatus.


18 Entirely distinct from the purifying fire of the last day, the belief in which has been frequent since Origen (see Div. I. § 63, note 12), and in which even Augustine seems to believe, August de Civ. Dei, xx. 25, apparens in illo judicio quasdam quernam purgato- rias poenas futuras. On the other hand, liber de vii. quaestionibus ad Dulcitium, § 13: Tale aliquid (igreem, tribulationis tentationem) etiam post hunc vitam sibi incredibile non est, et utrum ipsa sit, quare potest, et aut invivere aut latere, nonnullas fideles per ignem quondam purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona percutia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari. De Civ. Dei, xxii. 26: Post istius sane corporis mortem, donec ad illum veniatrum, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicimus purper- pati,—non redarguo, quia forsitan verum esset. Dallaei de Poesis et satisfactionibus humanis lib. vii. Amst. 1649. 4. J. G. Chr. Hoefner de Origine dogmati de purgatorio. Hal. 1792. 8. Münchener’s Dogmengeschichte, Th. 4 S. 425.
jected to a purifying fire immediately after death. 19 Gregory the Great did much to confirm these notions by descriptions of the tortures of departed souls, and the mitigation of such tortures by the sacrifice offered in the Supper. 20 In proportion as the latter assumed the form of a tremendum mysterium, the more seldom did the people partake of it, so that it was necessary for the Church to enact laws on the subject. 21 In other respects the ideas of the nature of the elements in the Supper suffered no change (§ 101, note 15). 22

19 Caesarius Arcat. Hom. viii. on 1 Cor. iii. 11-15 (in Bibl. PP. Lugd. viii. 826), has the Augustinian distinction between peccata capitalia and minuta, and teaches that the latter are expiated by an ignis transitorius or purgatorius; but yet he places the latter in the time of the final judgment. Ille ipse purgatorius ignis durior erit, quam quicquid poestumurum in hoc seculo sunt cogitari, aut videri, aut sentiri. Et cum de die iudicii scripturam sit, quod erit dies unus tanquam mille anni, et mile anni tanquam dies unus: unde scit unusquisque, utrum diesbus aut mensibus, in forte etiam et annis per illum ignem sit transitorius. Et qui modo unum digitum suum in ignem mittere timet, quare non timet, nec necessit sit tunc non parvo tempore cum animo et corpore (consequentem after the resurrection) cruciatur? Et ideo totius viribus unusquisque laboret, ut et capitalia crimina possit evadere, et minuta peccata ita operibus bonis redimere, ut aut parum ex ipsis, aut nihil videatur remanere, quod ignis ille possit absuamere.—Onnes sancti, qui Deo fidelter serviant,—per ignem illum—obsolet ultra violentia transfusant. Ili vero, qui quamvis capitalia crimina non admititant, ad perpetrandam minuta peccata sinit faciles, ad vitam aeternam—venturi sunt; sed prius aut in saeculo per Dei justitiam vel misericordiam amarissimis tribulationibus exoquendui, aut illi ipsi per multas eleemosynas, et dum inimici elementi indulgent, per Dei misericordiam liberauti, aut certe illo igne, de quo dixit Apostolus, longo tempore cruciandi sunt, ut ad vitam aeternam sine macula et ruga perveniant. Ili vero, qui aut homicidium, aut sacrilegium, aut adulterium, vel reliquis his similis commiserunt, si eis digna poenitentia non subveniret, non per purgatorium ignem transire merebantur ad vitam, sed aeterno incendio praecipitabantur ad mortem. Cf. Oudins de Scripturis eccl. i. 1514.

20 Greg. M. Dialog. lib. iv. c. 39: Quod si quisquis egreditur, talis in judicio praesentatur. Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpibus esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est, pro eo quod veritas dicit, quia si quis in S. Spiritu blasphemiam dicerit, neque in hoc seculo remittetur ei, neque in futuro (Matt. xii. 31). In qua sententia datur intelligi, quasdam culpas in hoc seculo, quasdam seculo vero in futuro posse laxari.—Instances of such tormented souls, ibid. ii. 33, iv. 40, especially iv. 55: Si culpae post mortem insalubiles non sunt, multum solut animas etiam post mortem sacra oblatio hostiae salutaris adjuvare, ita ut hanc nonnamquam ipsae defensorum animae expectare videantur, with two examples. Peter, listeneth, artlessly asks (iv. 49): Quid hoc est, quas, quod in his extremis temporibus tam multa de animabus claerescant, quae ante latuerunt: ita ut apertis revelationibus atque ostensionibus venturam suaeulum inferere se nobis atque aperire videantur? To which Gregory replies (c. 41): Iste est: nam quantum praesens suaeulum propinquat ad finem, tantum futurum suaeulum ipsa jam quasi propinquitatem tangitur, et signis manifestioribus aperitur.

21 Conc. Agathense [506] can. 18: Sacraeiores, qui natale domini, paschus, et pontecosten non communicaverint, catholicis non credentur, nec inter catholicos habeantur.

22 Gelasius P. de Daubus in Christo naturis adv. Entychen et Nestorium (cited as genuine even by his contemporaries, Gennadius de Script. c. 94, and Fulgentius Resp. in Epist. xiv. ad Fulgentium Ferrandam, cap. 19, in Gallandi Bibl. t. xi. p. 334, and therefore doubted without reason by Baronius, Bellarminus, and others. It is found in the Bibl.
SIXTH CHAPTER.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY, AND ITS CONDITION WITHOUT THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

I. IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

§ 122.

During the reign of Justinian I., the people dwelling on the Black Sea, viz., the Abasgi, Alani, Lazi, Zani, and Heruli, declared themselves in favor of Christianity, and for the Catholic Church. But the Nestorians and Monophysites made much more important acquisitions to the cause, during this period, in Asia and Africa.

The Nestorians\(^1\) not only maintained themselves in Persia, where they enjoyed exclusive protection (§ 88, at the end), but also spread themselves on all sides in Asia, particularly into Arabia\(^2\) and India,\(^3\) and it is said, in the year 636, even as

---

\(^1\) Concerning them, compare especially Jos. Sim. Assemani Diss. de Syris Nestorianis, Part ii. tom. iii. of the Biblioth. orientalis.

\(^2\) Assemani, l. c. p. 607, s.

\(^3\) Cosmas Indicopleustes (about 532) Christ. topographiae, lib. iii., says that there was a Christian Church in τῇ Ταπροβάν ηῆσαν ἐν τῇ ἑσσοτέρᾳ Ἰνδία (namely lib. xi.: Ἑκκλησία τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῶν Περσῶν χριστιανῶν with a πρεσβέτερος ἀπὸ Περσίδος χειροτονοῦμενος): σὺν οἴσα δὲ εἰ καὶ περιστέρῳ. So too in Male. But ἐν τῇ Καλλιάνῃ—ἐπίσκοπος ἐστιν ἀπὸ Περσίδος χειροτονοῦμενος. So also ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλλιμένῃ Διοσκορίδων—ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ Βάταρρος, καὶ Ὀλυμπος, καὶ Πέρσας, καὶ λοιπὰς Ἰνδίας, καὶ Περσαρ-κενίων, καὶ Μήδοις, καὶ Ἐλλάνταις καὶ πάση τῇ χώρᾳ Περσίδος καὶ ἐκκλησίαι ἑπειροί.
far as China." Along with the theological tendencies of the Syrian Church, whence they had come forth, they preserved its learning likewise; and were thus the introducers of Greek science into Asia. Their school in Nisibis was the only theological institution of Christendom in the sixth century.

The Monophysites, on the other hand, spread themselves from Alexandria toward the south. Among the Hamshars or Homerites, Christianity had been early established (§ 107); though it did not become general till the time of Anastasius. But when Dhu-Nowas, a Jewish king of this people, afterward persecuted the Christians with violence (522), the Aethiopian king Elesbaan came to their aid (529); in consequence of which the Homerites were subject to Aethiopian rulers for seventy-two years. As the Homerite Christians were Mono-

---

'Et que, que, l'antique monasté, que a devenu genuine, which is said to have been erected A.D. 721, and discovered 1633 in the city Si-an-fu, in the province Shen-si, copies of the inscription on it having been sent to Europe by the Jesuit missionaries. First published in Athens, Kircheri Prodromus Copticus, Rom. 1636. 4. p. 74, and in other works. China illustrata, ibid. 1667. fol. p. 43, ss., also in Mosheim Hist. Tartarorum ecc. Helmst. 1741. 4. App. p. 4. The genuineness of the monument has always been doubted by many. So in particular by La Crozé, against whom Assemanus Bibl. Orient. ii. 538, defends it. Remanot Anciennes relations des Indes et de la Chine. Paris. 1718. p. 298; Mosheim Hist. Tart. eccl. p. 9. Deguignes Untersuchung über die in Tien Jabuh. in Sina sich aufhaltenden Christen. Greifsw. 1769. 4; Abel Remusat Nouveaux mélanges. Paris. 1829, ii. 189; and Saint Martin on Lebeau Hist. du Bas-Empire (new edition. Paris. 1824, vol. xi) vi. 69, hold it to be genuine. On the contrary, Beaussobre (Hist. de Manichéen, c. 14), Neumann in the Jahrb. f. wiss. Kritik, 1829, S. 592, and Von Bohlen (das alte Indien. Königsberg. 1830, Th. 1. S. 383), have once more declared it to be a work of the Jesuits.

It was formed at the end of the fifth century out of the excluded remains of the school of Edessa (comp. § 88, at the end). Respecting it comp. Asseman Bibl. orient. iii. ii. 997, ss., cf. p. 60, and the passage of Cassiodorus given above, § 114, note 14. The African bishop, Junilius (about 550), relates in the preface to his work de partibus divinae legis respecting the origin of it, that he had become acquainted with quendam Paulum nomine, Persam genere, qui in Syrorum schola in Nisibi urbe est electus, ubi divina lex per magistros publicos, sicut spad nos in mundanis studiis Grammatica et Rhetorica, ordine ac regulariter traditur. He had read drawn up by him, regulas quasdam, quibus ille discipulorum ars, divinarum scripturarum superficiis instructos, primumque expositionis profunda patefaceret, sedebat imbore, ut ipsarum interim causarum, quae in divina lego versauer, intentionem ordinemque cognocercen, non sparsim et turbulente, sed regulariter singula disceret. These regularia instituta he gives here with some alteration of the form.

Theodori Lect. Hist. eccl. ii. where they are called 'μουρτοι.

Comp. the varying accounts of the contemporaries: Johannis Eipse. Asine in Assemani Bibl. orient. i. 359; Simeonis Eipse. in Perside Epist., preserved in Zachariae Hist. eccl. sp. Assemani, i. c. p. 364, and in Maji Coll. x. i. 370; and Procopius de Bello Persico i. c.
physites, the Monophysite doctrines were carried to other parts of Arabia. Under Justinian the Nubians were also converted to Christianity by the Monophysites of Alexandria.

II. AMONG THE GERMAN NATIONS.


§ 123.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE GERMAN NATIONS.

The first German people converted to the Christianity of the Catholic Church were the Franks, who since 486 had been masters of the greatest part of Gaul. Clovis, king of the Salian Franks, influenced by his queen Clotildis, and by a vow made at the battle of Tolbiacum (Zulpiach, 496), was baptized by Remigius, bishop of Rheims, and his people followed his example.


From the Franks Christianity was propagated among the Alle-
manni, who were subject to them.2

So far as the inclination of all Romans that had been sub-
jected to the yoke of the Germans leaned immediately to the
Franks as Catholic Christians,3 the latter obtained an important
predominance of influence over the other German people. For
this reason the others successively came over at this time to the
Catholic Church.4 This took place in regard to the Burgund-
ians, under their King Sigismund (517); the Suevi, under their
Kings Carrarich (550–559) and Theodemir I. (559–569);5 the
Visigoths, under their King Reccared at the council of Toledo
(589).6 Since under Justinian the Vandal kingdom in Africa
(534), and that of the Ostrogoths in Upper Italy (553), had been
destroyed, Arianism also lost its dominion in those territories.

On the contrary, it revived under the rule of the Lombards
in Italy (from 568), and was longest maintained among this
people.7

In other parts, the amalgamation of the German conquerors
with the older inhabitants of their land,8 and the development
of the new European nations, were universally effected by
similarity of faith.9

2 Bishopric of Vindonissa (now Windisch in the canton Aargau) transferred to Constance
in the 6th century. Sostratus, the first known bishop of Augsburg, A.D. 583. C. J. Hefele's

3 Gregor. Tur. Hist. ii. 36: Multi jam tunc ex Gallis habere Francos dominos summò
desiderio cupiebant. Unde factum est, ut Quintianus Rutenorum [Rodez] Episcopus per
hoc odio ab urbe depleretur (by the Visigoths). Dicebant enim ei: quin desiderium
tuum est, ut Francorum dominatio possidant terram hanc. Hence Chlodowich gave his
war against the Visigoths the appearance of being undertaken chiefly from religious zeal.
He said to his people, l. c. c. 37: Valde molestae fero, quod hi Ariani partem tenent
Galliarum. Eamus cum Dei adjutorio, et superatis religiosis terram in di sermon nostram.

4 A history of Arianism among the German nations in Walsh's Ketzerhist. ii. 553.
5 The history of Carrarich's conversion in Gregor. Turon. de miraculis S. Martini, i. c. 11;
but Theodemir first propagated the catholic faith among the people, and therefore Isidorus
Chro. Suevirum even makes him the first catholic king of the Suevi. See Ferrera's
span. Geschichte, Bd. 2.

7 Paulus Warnefridi, Diaconus (about 774): de Gestis Longobardorum libb. vi. (best in
Muratori Scriptor. Ital. Tom. i. Mediol. 1723, fol.)
8 Formerly marriages between the two parties were universally forbidden by the
Church; but among the Visigoths they were also prohibited by the civil code: See leges
Visigothorum (best edition: Fuero yugo en latin y castellano, por la real Academia
española. Madrid. 1815. fol.) lii. i. 2 (a law of King Reccesvinth from 649–672): Priscae
legis remota sententia hac in perpetuum valitura lege sanctissas, ut tam Gothus Roma-
ni, quam etiam Gotham Romanos, si conjugem habere voluerint,—facultas eis nobendi
subjecta.

9 H. I. Roynaard's über d. Gründung u. Entwicklung der neuneurop. Staaten im Mittel-
At the end of this period began the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain. Augustine, sent thither by Gregory the Great with forty Benedictines (596), was first received by Ethelbert, King of Kent, through the influence of his Queen Bertha, who was a Frank. From Kent Christianity was gradually diffused in the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.  

§ 124.

HIERARCHY IN THE GERMAN EMPIRE.


Although the ecclesiastical constitution and code which had been formed in the Roman Empire were adopted by the German nations, yet the relations of the hierarchy received a peculiar form. The kings soon saw how much their power could be supported and strengthened by the reputation of the clergy; and they endeavored therefore to bind more closely to themselves the heads of the clergy, the bishops and abbots. Churches and monasteries received considerable possessions from their hands, while the bishops and abbots, as the temporary


1 As all conquered nations lived according to their own law (Lex Ripuariorium, tit. xxi. § 3), so the clergy, according to Roman law, Lex Ripuar. tit. Iviii. § 1 : Legem Romanam, qua Ecclesia vivit. Comp. Eichhorn, i. 173, 817.


possessors, became the vassals (ministeriales) of the king, were often employed in affairs of the state, and were thus invested with a very important political influence. The possessions of the Church were only by degrees, as exceptions, freed from all taxes; but, though exempted from contributions to the royal exchequer, continued to be devoted to military services, which were in some instances rendered in person. Besides, the kings regarded church property as feudal tenures (beneficia), and frequently did not scruple to resume them. It was stipulated by law that the choice of a bishop should be confirmed by the king, but for the most part, the kings themselves appointed to vacant sees.


4 Fredegarii (about 740) chron. c. 4: Burgundiae barones, tam Episcopi quam caeteri leudes. C. 76: Pontifices caeterique leudes. G. I. Th. Lut on the influence which the feudal tenure system has exercised on the clergy and papacy in Illgn's Zeitschr. f. Hist. Theol. 1841, ii. 89.

5 Gregor. Tur. v. 27: Chilpericus rex de pauperibus et junioribus Ecclesiae vel basilicae bannos jusset exigii, pro eo quod in exercitu non ambulassent. Non enim erat consuetudo, quod hi ullum exsolvarent publicam functionem. From this it does not follow, as Löbell says (p. 339), that in general the church was not required by duty to furnish troops from its estates. Rather does the erat show that it had not been usual only till the time of Chilperic. Comp. Planck, ii. 222. Montag, i. i. 314. Eichhorn, i. 293, 506, 516. Siegenheim, i. 315.

6 In a battle against the Lombards (573) there were the bishops Salonius and Sigittarius, qui non crusse cadasti muniti, sed galea ant loco aeculari armati, multos munisbibus propriis, quod peius est, interficiisse referantur. Gregor. Turon. iv. 43 (al. 37).

7 Conc. Arvernense (at Clermont) ann. 535, c. 5. Quae reiculum ecclesiae petant a regibus, et horrendae cupiditates impulsum agementum substantiarum rapiant; irrita habentur quae obtinent, et a communione ecclesiae cujus facultatem asserere cupiunt, exclusantur. Comp. Conc. Parisienses. (about 537) against those who facultates ecclesiae, sub specie largitatis regiae, improba subversione pervaserint. Even judicial miracles take place, ex. gr. when Charibert, king of Paris (562-567) wished to take away a property belonging to the church at Tours. Gregor. Tur. de miraculis S. Martini, i. 29. Planck, ii. 206. Höllmann, S. 123, ff.

8 Conc. Aurelian. v. ann. 549, c. 10: Cum voluntate regis, juxta electionem cleri ac plebis—a metropolitano—cum comprovincialibus pontifex consecetur.

9 Ex. gr. Gregor. Turon. de SS. Patrum vita c. 3, de S. Gallo: Tunc etiam et Apocelius Treverorum episcopum transitit. Congregatique clerici civitatis illius ad Theodoricium regem (king of Austrasia 511-534) S. Gallum petebant episcopum. Quibus ille ait: Abscedite et alium requirite, Gallum enim diacronus alibi habeo destinatum. Tunc eligentes S. Nectarium episcopum accipientur. Arverni vero clerici consensu insipientium facto cum multis manuslibus ad regem venerunt. Jam tunc geremon illud inequum cooperarum pullulare, ut succedatiam aut venderetur a regis, aut compararetur a clericis. Tunc ille radiavit a regis, quod S. Gallum habendar essent episcopum.—The Concil. Paris ann. 615, wished indeed (can. 1) to have the choice by canons restored; but king Chlotarius II. modified that decree in his confirmatory edict, as follows (Mansi, x. p. 548): Episcopo decedente in loco ipsius, qui a metropolitano ordinari debet cum provincialibus, a clero et populo eligatur; et si persona condigna fuerit, per ordinacionem principis ordinetur: vel certe si de palatio eligitur, per meriti personae et doctrinae ordinetur. Comp. the formulas in
Synods could not assemble without the royal permission; their decrees had to be confirmed by the king, being previously invalid. In the mean time they began to consult about the affairs of the Church, even in the meetings of the king's vassals or council (Placitum regis, Synodus regia, Synodale concilium). Synods became more rare, and at length ceased entirely.

This arrangement completed the downfall of the metropolitan system, which had been already weakened in many ways. The king became the only judge of the bishops. But in proportion as they rose higher in civil relations, the other clergy sank so much the deeper. No free man was allowed to enter the clergy without the royal permission. Hence the clergy were chosen for the most part from among the serfs; and on this very account the bishop acquired an unlimited power over them, which frequently manifested itself in the most tyrannical conduct. The administration of justice among the clergy was at first conducted according to Roman principles of legislation, as they were in force before Justinian (§ 91, note 5, ff.), till the Synod of Paris (615) gave the clergy the privilege of being brought before a mixed tribunal, in all cases which hitherto belonged to


11 Just. F. Runde Abhandlung u. Ursprung der Reichsstandeshau der Bischöfe u. Äbte. Göttingen. 1775. 4. (The treatise on the same subject, appended, p. 93, is by Herder, and is also reprinted in his works on philosophy and history, Carlsruhe edition, Part 13, p. 919.) Planck, ii. 126. Höllmann, S. 186, ff. Montag, i. ii. 54.

12 See Marculfi Formularum, lib. i. c. 19 (Baluzii Capitul. ii. p. 380), and Bignon's remarks on it (ibid. p. 901).

13 Even before this time it appears that monks had been punished with blows by their abbots, Cassian. Collat. ii. 16. Palladii Hist. Lanainca, c. 6, Benedicti Regula, c. 70. Bishops were now instructed by synods to punish in this manner also the offenses of the inferior clergy. See Concil. Agathense, ann. 506, c. 41. Epaconum, ann. 517, c. 15. The Concil. Matiscomense, l. ann. 531, c. 8, prescribes the Mosaic number uno minus de quadruginta iectas. How the bishops often treated their clergy may be seen from Concil. Carpentracense (527): Hujusmodi ad nos querela ponruit, quod ea quae a quibusque edelibus consiliorum et ab aliquibus Episcopis praeusuantur, ut natum, aut proprie nihil ecclesiae, quisbus collata fuerant, relinquatur. Concil. Toletanum, iii. (589) capitul. 20: Cognovimus Episcopos per parochias suas non sequentes etiam deservire. sed crusajter deservire.

14 Planck, ii. 161. Montag, i. ii. 106. Schilling de Orig. jurisdictionis eccles. in censis civilibus. Lips. 1825. 4. p. 46.
the civil judge alone. A wider influence was given to the bishops by committing to them an oversight of the entire administration of justice, while their spiritual punishments were made more effectual by connecting with excommunication civil disadvantages also. On the other hand, in the application of their discipline they were bound to regard the intercession of the king.

Under these circumstances, the popes could not directly interfere in ecclesiastical matters; and their communication with the established church of the country depended entirely on the royal pleasure.

15 In the Edictum Clotarii II., confirming this synod, we have: Ut nullus iudicium de quolibet ordine clericos de civilibus causis, praeter criminalia negotia, per se distingueret aut dammare presciret, nisi convictur manifestus, excepto presbytero aut diacono. Qui vero convicto fuerit de crimine capitali, juxta canones distinguisheret, et cum pustificibus examineret. Comp. Planck, ii. 185. Rettberg’s Kirchengesch. Deutschl. i. 294.

16 Chlotarii Regis constitutio generalis, a.D. 500 (in Baluzii Capitularia Regum Franc. i. 7. Walter Corpus juris Germ. ant. ii. 2): VI. Si iudex aliqua contra legem iustae damnaverit, in nostris absint ab Episcopis castigetur, ut quod perpero judicavit, versatim medias discussiones habita emendare procuret. Conc. Tolentini, iii. (589) cap. 18: Judices locorum vel actores fiscalium patrimonii cum ex decreto gloriosissimi domini nostru simul cum sacerdotali concilio autem aliquem tempore dieKal. Nov. in unum conveniant, ut discant, quam placere et justaque cum populis agere debeat, ne in angarii aut in operationibus superfluus sive privatum onerent, sive fiscalem gravent. Sint enim prospectores episcoporum secondum regiam admonitionem, quales judices cum populis agant; ut aut ipsos praemonito corrigant, aut insolentias eorum auditibus principis minutingant. Quodsi corrupto emendare nequiverint, et ab ecclasia et a communione suspendant.


19 Hence Pelagius I. was obliged to use the utmost pains in defending himself to king Childebert against the suspicion of heresy which he had drawn on himself by condemning the three chapters. Pelagii I. Ep. 16, ad Childeb. Reg. (Mansi, ix. p. 728): Since one must give no offense even to the little ones: quanto nobis studio ac labore satagendum est, ut pro auferendo suspicionis scandalo obsequium confessionis nostrae regibus ministrum sit: quibus vos etiam subtilites esse sanctorum Scripturarum praeclarius? Veniems etiam Rullius vir magnificus, legatus excellentissimæ vestrae, confiderent a nobis, ut decuit, postulavit, quatenus nobis aut beatæ recordationis papae Leoæ tomum a nobis per omnà conservari significi deberemus, aut propriis verbis nostrae confessionem fidel desinu-
§ 125.

MORAL INFLUENCES OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE GERMAN NATIONS

As is usual among rude people when coming into closer contact with the more enlightened, there proceeded from the Romans, then greatly corrupted, pernicious influences rather than cultivation to the Germans, which were exhibited among the latter in the roughest form, less hidden in their case by the external rites prevalent among the Romans. Christianity, as it was then proclaimed, a series of dogmas and laws, could not restrain this corruption. Since it offered expiations for all offenses, along with its prohibitions of them, there was opened up to wild barbarity a way of first enjoying the lust of sin, and then of procuring exemption from the guilt of it. There was little concern for instruction. The public services of religion by means of their pomp and the use of a foreign, i.e., the Latin language, awakened obscure feelings rather than right ideas. As the grossest notions were entertained of hell, so also were similar ideas prevalent respecting the power of the church, the influence of the saints, the merit of ecclesiastical and monkish exercises, the value of alms to the church and to the poor. These notions

are. Et primam quidem petitionis eujus partem, quia facilius fuit, mox ut dixit, implievimus.—Ut natum nullius deinceps, quod absit, suspicionis resideret occasio, etiam illum amicum partem, quam memoratus vir illustris Rufin us admonuit, facere mutavi, sic licet propriis verbis confessionem fidel, quam tenemus, exponens. Then follows a diffused confession of faith, in which, however, he mentions only four ecclesiastical synods, not the fifth. At the same time he writes to Sapaundus Episc. Arelat. (Ep. 15, I. c. p. 727) praying, ut, si epistole, quam—ad—Childebertam regem direximus, in qua de institutione beatissimorum patrum nostrorum fidem catholicam nostro per Dei gratiam sermone deprompimus, tam ipsi gloriosissimo regi, quam caritati tuae, vel alis fratribus coepiscopis nostris, plausui, rescripto tuae caritatis celoris agnoscamus. Cf. Preuves des Libertés de l’Église Gallique, c. 3. Planck, ii. 673.

1 Even under them an aristocracy was formed. When the Hans approached Metz (Gregor. Tur. Hist. ii. 6), St. Stephen implored in the heavenly regions the Apostles Peter and Paul to protect the town, and received from them the answer: Vade in pace, dilectissime frater, oratoriam tautum tuum carebit incendo. Pro urbe vero non obtinemus, quia dominicae sanctionis super eam sententia jam procassit.

2 Cf. vita S. Eligii Episc. Noviomensis lib. iii. written A.D. 672, by his contemporary Andoennus Archieg. Rotomagi, in Luc. d’Achery Episcopium, ed. ii. tom. ii. p. 76, ss. Eligius, bishop of Noyon, was considered a man of extraordinary sanctity (Vita, lib. ii. c. 6, p. 92: Huic itaque viso sanctissimo inter caetera virtutum suarum miracula id etiam a Domino concessum erat, ut sanctorum Martyrum corpora, quae per tot saecula addita
were strengthened by legends and miracles, which were certainly in part an imposition of the clergy, but were far from exerting any good moral influence on the people. Crimes of the grossest kind were common among the clergy, as well as the kings and

popilia hactenus habebantur, eo investigante ac nimio ardore instante, patefacta prodecente: sic quidem nonnulla venerabantur prius a populo in locis, quibus non erant, et tamen quo in loco certius humata tegentur, prorsus ignorabantur. The more remarkable, therefore, is his exhortation, contained in the Vita, lib. ii. c. 15, p. 86, ss. He first refers to the judgment-day, then to the points of faith, then to the duty of performing opera christiana, and thus continues: Illo itaque bonus Christianus est, qui nulla phylacteria, vel adinventiones diaboli credit. Illo, inquam, bonus Christianus est, qui hospitibus pedes lavet, et tamquam parentes carissimos diligat; qui justa quod habet pauperibus eleemosynam tribuit; qui ad Ecclesiam frequentius venit, et oblationem quae in altari Deo offerentur exhibet; qui de fructibus suis non gustat, nisi prius Deo alicubi offerat; qui stateras dolos et mensuras duplces non habet; qui pecuniam suam non dedit ad usuram; qui et ipse casta viva, et filios vel vicinos docet, ut caste et cum timore Dei vivant; et quoties sanctae solemnitates adveniant, ante dies plures castitatem etiam cum propria uxore custodit, ut sequa consecratio ad Domini altae accedere possit; qui postremo symbolum vel orationem dominicam memoriter tenet, et filios ac filias eadem docet. Quis talis est, sine dubio verus Christianus est. Ecco auditis, fratres, quales sint Christiani nobis! Ideo quantum potes tis cum Dei adjutorio laborare, ut nomen christianum non sit falsum in vobis. Sed ut veri Christiani esse possitis, semper praecipue Christi et cogitato in mente, et implete in operatione. Redimite animas vestras de poena, dum habetis in potestate remedia; eleemosynam juxta vires facite, pacem et charitatem habete, discords ad concordiam revocate, mandacium fugite, perjurium expavescite, falsam testimonium non dicite, fortum non facite, oblationes et decimas Ecclesiae offerte, luminaria sanctis locis justa quod habetis exhibete, symbolum et orationem dominicam memoriet, et filios vestris insinuate. Ad Ecclesiam quoque frequentius convenite, Sanctorum patrocinia humiliter expetite, diem dominicum pro reverentia resurrectionis Christi abaque ullo servili opere colite, Sanctorum solemnitates pio affectu celebrate, proximos vestros sicut vos ipsos diligite, etc. Quod si observaveritis, securi in die judicij ante tribunal suorum judicis venientes dicitis: Da, Domine, quia dedumis: miserere, quia misericordiam fecistis; nos implevimus quod jussisti, tu redde quod promisisti.

2 The Arians blamed the Catholic clergy for this. So Gregorius Turon. de Glor. mart. i. 25: Thedegisibus hujus rex regionis, cum vidisset hoc miraculum, quod in hac sanctis Deo fontibus gereretur, cogitavit in se dicere, quin ingressum est Romanorum (Romanni enim vocitand homines nostrae religionis) ut sit accidat, et non est Dei virtus. C. 26: Et enim populos illo haereticis, qui videmus haec magnalia non compunguntur ad credendum, sed semper collide divinarum praestationum sacramento nequissimia interpretationem garrulitibus non desinit impugnare. On the contrary, the Catholics related many impositions of miracles wrought by the Arian priests, Gregor. Tur. Hist. ii. 3, de Glor. Confess. c. 13. Comp. the miraculous histories in Lobb. p. 274, and the judgment delivered respecting them, p. 392. The reason why cures performed at the graves of saints should be credible it is impossible to perceive. The presents which these gifted with miraculous power had to expect from pious simplicity induced deception even here.

Gregor. de Glor. mart. i. 26. While a person was filling his vessel with that wonder-working water from a priest, manum alterius extendit ad balteum, cultrumque faraturn est.—How holy rites were made instrumental in crime may be seen from the words of the monstrous Fredegundis, the spouse of Chilperich, to the assassins she had hired to murder king Sigbert (575. See Gesta Regum Franc. c. 33, in Bouquet Rec. Gall. script. t. ii. p. 569): Si evasitis vivi, ego mirifice honorabo vos et sobolem vestrum, si autem corrueritis, ego pro vos eleemosynas multas per loca Sanctorum distribuam.

Löbell's Gregor. v. Tours, S. 399.
the people, without shame for them being exhibited, while public opinion did not declare against them in a manner conformable to the spirit of Christianity. The moral influence of Christianity on the multitude was confined to the external influence of church laws and church discipline, so far as these were respected. The period of legal restraint, as a preparation for the Gospel, had now returned.

Though every thing heathen was strictly forbidden, yet secret idolatry and apostasy from Christianity frequently appeared. It was still more common for the new Christians to be unable en-

---

6 Assassination was an everyday occurrence, and even the clergy were employed as instruments: Gregor. Tur. Hist. Franc. vii. 20, viii. 29. Several Frankish kings lived in polygamy; Chlotar, for instance, with two sisters, Gregor. Tur. iv. 3. Dagobert tres habebat ad instar Solomonis reginae maxime et plurimas concubinas. Fredegarii Chronicum, c. 60. Löbéc S. 21.

7 Thus Gregory Tur. relates, without disguise, the crimes of Chlodowich, and yet he passes this judgment on him, ii. 40: Prosternebat enim quotidian Deus hostes ejus sub manu ipsius, et augebat regnum ejus, eo quod absolveret recto corde coram eo, et faceret, quae placita erant in oculis ejus. Löbéc’s (p. 263) exculpation of this judgment is of no avail. It is nothing but moral barbarousness, when Gregory admits and disapproves the crimes of Clovis, and yet designates him as pious on account of his confession. Comp. iii. 1: Velim, si placet, parumper conferre, quae Christianis beatam contendentibus Transtataet prospera succursent, et quae haereticis eosdem schadenstibus fuerint in ruinae. Hanc Chlodovechus Rex confessus, ipse haereticos adjutorio ejus oppressit, regnumque suum per totas Gallias dilatatit: Alaricus hanc debens, a regno et populo, atque ab ipsa, quod majus est, vita multatur externa. Moral barbarousness is also shown in the sentiments expressed concerning Guntramms Basso v. 14: Guntrammanus alias sane bonus, nam ad perjuriam niumin praeparatus erat. Comp. ix. 10: Fuit in actis levii, avare sine hians, rerum alienarum ulo modum cupidus, omnibus jurans, et nulli promissa adimplens. In like manner, concerning king Theudebert, iii. 25: Magnum se atque in omni bonitate praecipuum reddidit. Erat enim regnum cum justitia regns, sacerdotes venerans, Ecclesias munera, pauperes elevans, et multa multis beneficia pia ac dulcisima accommodans voluntate. Omne tributum, quod in fisco sua ab Ecclesiis in Arverno sitis reddubatur, elementer indulsit. Comp. de vitis Patrum, c. 17, § 2: Nam Theudebertus—cum multa iniquae exerceret, et ab eodem (Nicetio) plurimum corripuerat, quod vel ipsa perpetrator, vel perpetrantes non argueret, etc.

Theodoorid’s prohibition, see § 109, note 4. Childerib I. law, de abolendis idololatriae reliquis a.D. 554, in Baluzii Capitul. i. 5.

8 Even as late as the time of Gregory of Tours, an image of Diana was worshiped at Treves. (Greg. Tur. Hist. viii. 18.) In Herbadilla at Nantes, about the same time, were statues of Jupiter, Mercury, Venus, Diana, and Hercules. (Mabillon Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. i. 683.) In like manner there was found in Luxovium, when Columbans came thither about 590, imaginum lapidearum densitas, quas cultu miserabiliter rituque profano vetusta paganorum tempora honorabant (Jonas in vita Columbani, c. 17, in Mabillon Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. i. 13). Martianus Ep. Bracaraunis (about 570) wrote de origine idolorum (ed. A. Majus Classicon auctorum, iii. 379), pro castigatione rusticorum, qui aduerso pristina paganorum superstitione detentis, cultum venerantios ab daemoniis quam Deus persolvunt. The Roman names of deities were frequently transferred to Celtic and German deities also; and therefore the peculiar character of this worship can not always be perceived. Beugnot Hist. de la destruction du Paganisme en Occident. (Paris. 1833) ii. 307.

16 Conc. Aurelian. ii. ann. 533, can. 20.
tirely to lay aside reverence for their old gods, and the power they were supposed to possess. Thus the remains of old pagan superstition were preserved among the people along with Christianity. In civil legislation, all traces of heathenism were likewise rejected, though the most extended freedom of divorce remained.


14 By the lex Burgund. tit. 34, c. 3, the husband could put away an adulteress, maleficam, vel sequellerum vitiorum necesse without ceremony; if he does so without these reasons, he was obliged to make her indemnification (c. 3, 4, and Lex Bajuvar. tit. v. c. 14). By agreement of both parties, however, marriage could be annulled without any difficulty. See the formule in the formulis Andegavensisibus (from the sixth century prim. ed. Mabillon Analec. iv. 234) c. 56, and Marcelli Formularum, lib. ii. c. 30. The libellus repudi adopted by Marcellus thus: Certa rubus et praxis causis inter maritum et uxorem repudiandi locus patet. Idcirco dum et inter illo et conjuge sua ilia non caritas secundum Deum, sed discordia regnat, et ob hoc pariter conversare minime possunt, placit utrisque voluntas, ut se a consortio separare deberent. Quod ita et fecerunt. Propter eam has epistolas inter se uno tenere conscripsit fieri et adhiriare decreverunt, ut mutuisque ex ipsis, sive ad servitium Dei in monasterio, aut ad copulam matrinonii se sociare voluerit, licentiam habet, etc.
and the ordeal still continued. The attempt of Gregory the Great to adopt into the services of the church particular heathen rites, at the time of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, stands quite alone.  

III. OLD BRITISH CHURCH.

§ 126.

Since the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons, ecclesiastical as well as social order had been subverted among the Britons, who manfully strove for their freedom. But the Irish Church was still in a very prosperous state. Their convents were distinguished for their discipline and learning, as well as their efforts to diffuse Christianity toward the north. The monk Columba in particular (about 565, † 597) converted a great part of the northern Picts, became their spiritual leader as abbot of the monastery.

15 Which was used even in questions belonging to Christianity itself. Comp. Can. Caesaraugust. § 121, note 4.—Gregor. Tur. de Glor. mart. i. 81: Arianorum presbyter cum diacono nostris religiosis altercationem habebat. At ille—adjectum dicens: Quid longis sermocinationum intentionibus fatigantes? Factis rei veritas adprobator: succedatur igni aeneae, et in ferventia aqua annulas ejudam proiciscatur. Qui vero eum ex ferventia unda sustulerit, ille justitiam consequi comprobatur: quo facto pars diversa ad cognitionem hujus justitiae convertatur, etc.

16 Gregor. M. lib. xi. Ep. 76, ad Mellitum Abbatem (also in Bedae Hist. eccl. Angl. i. 30): Cum vos Deus omnipotens ad—Augustinum Episcopum perduxerit, dixit eis, quid diu mecum de causa Anglorum cogitans tractavi, videlicet, quia fana Iulorum destrui in eadem gente minime desebant, sed ipsa, quae in eis sunt, idola deservantur. Aqua benedicta fiat, in eadem fania aspergatur, altaria construatur, reliquiae ponantur: quia si fana eadem bone constructa sunt, necesse est ut a cultu daemonicum in obsequium veri Dei debant commutari: ut, dum gos Ipsa eadem fana non videt destrui, de corde erorum depomat, et Deum vomur cognoscant te adorans, ad loca, quae consuevit, familiari concurreat. Et quia hoves solent in sacrificio daemonicum multos occidere, debet his etiam hac de re aliqua solemnitas inmutari: ut die dedicationis vel nativitys SS. Martyrum, quorum illic reliquiae ponantur, tabernacula sibi circa eadem ecclesias, quae ex fania commutatae sunt, de ramis arborum faciant et religiosis convivias solemnitatum celebrant. Nec diabolui jam animalia immolent, sed ad laudem Dei in eum suum animalia occidunt, et donatori omnium de satisfate sua gratias referant: ut, dum eis aliqua externus gaudia reservantur, ad interiora gaudia consentiunt facilius valeant. Nam duris mentibus simul omnia abscedere impossibile esse non dabitum est: quia is, qui locum summum ascendetere nititur, necesse est ut gradibus vel passibus, non autem saltibus elevetur.
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founded by him on the island *Hy* (*St. Iona*), and transmitted this relation to his successors. 3

Close as the union was between the British and Irish Churches, they could yet have little connection of importance, on account of their remoteness, with other Churches. Hence they had retained many old arrangements, and developed them in a peculiar way, after such usages had been altered in other countries. 4

3 Beda Hist. eccl. iii. 4: Habere autem solet ipsa insula rectorem semper Abbatem Presbyterum, aquis jari et omnis provincia, et ipsi etiam Episcopi, ordine insinitato, debeat, esse subjecti, juxta exemplum primi doctoris illius, quia non Episcopus, sed Presbyter exstitit et Monachus.

4 These appear in the following controversy, and relate to (a) the reckoning of Easter. The Britons were by no means Quartodecimani, though they were often called so from ignorance (ex. gr. Bedæ Chron. ad. ann. 4591), and afterward, themselves, to John and the Asiatics (for example, Colman, Beda, H. E. iii. 25). Beda Hist. eccl. iii. 4: Paschae diem non semper in luna quartadecima cum Judæis, ut quidam rebantur, sed in die quidem dominica, alia tamen quan decebat hebdomada, celebrabant. Namely, ii. 2: Paschae diem a decima quarta usque ad vicecem num lunam observabant. Quae computatio octoginta quatuor annorum circulo continetur. The Romans on the other hand (ii. 19), adstruebant, quia dominicum Paschae dies a quinta decimae luna usque ad vicecem primum lunam operaret inquiri. The difference therefore, was, that the Easter festival fell on different Sundays in several years. The cause of this was, that owing to the previous confusion on the subject, and for the purpose of removing it (see above, § 105, note 13), the Aquitanian Victorius first (457), and afterward the Roman abbott, Dionysius Exiguus (523), had made new Easter tables, which, in succession, were brought into use, first in Italy, and then in the other western churches (see Ideler’s Chronologie, ii. 273). On the contrary, the British church had retained the old cycle of 44 years. The state of the controversy is more minutely developed by J. Usserius Britannicarum Ecclesiarum antiquit. Dublin. 1639. 4. p. 295. Humphr. Prideaux Connection of Scripture History. ii. 273. Ideler’s Chronol. ii. 295. (b) The tonsure. The Roman clergy were in common attussi; the British, as also the monks elsewhere, in older times, see Paulini Nol. Ep. vii., had the fore part of the head bald. The former called their tonsure tonsuram Petri, and that of the Britons tonsuram Simonis Magi (Beda H. E. v. 21). Usserii Brit. Eccl. antiqu. p. 921. (c) Lanfrancus Episc. ad Terdelvacum Hibern. regem, writen 1074 (in J. Usserii Vett. epistolaram hibernicarum sym. Dublín. 1632. 4. p. 72), accuses them, quod quisque pro arbitrio suo legittimo sibi copulatam uxorern, nulla canonicas causa intervenientem, relinquit, et aliam quamlibet, secu sibi vel relictae uxorii consanguinitate propinquum, sive quan alius similis improbitate deseruit, maritali seu fornaciarum leges, punita sibi tementiae conjunctit. Quod Episcopi ab uno Episcopo consecrator. Quod infantes baptismo sine chrismate consecrata baptizantur. Quod sacri ordines per pecuniam ab Episcopis dantur. But from these the abuses 1 and 4, which afterward prevailed, may have sprung. We have also to direct attention to the following peculiarities of the British-Irish church, which are not touched on in the disputes. They had (a) no celibacy of the priests. Patrick himself was sprung from priests; see Patricii confesse: Patrem habui Calpurnium Diaconum, filiam quondam Petiti Presbyteri. Synodus Patricii abint 456, can. 6 (in D. Wilkins Concilia Magnae Britannie et Hiberniae, i. 9): Qui quemque clericus ab ostiario usque ad sanctotem—si non moro romano capilli ejus tussi sit—(i.e., cut short generally, the differences of tonsure arose subsequently), et uxor ejus si non velato capite anbulaverit, pariter a laicis contemnatur, et ab Ecclesia separatur. Synodus Hibern. in d’Achery Spicilegium. i. 493: Quia ab accessu adolescentiae usque ad trigesimum annum acetas sue probabiliter vixerit, una tarnum uxor virginum surma contentus, quique annus Subdiaconus, et quique annus Diaconus, quadragesimo anno Presbyter, quinquagesimo anno Epis-
Since the condemnation of the Three Chapters, a great mistrust of the Romish orthodoxy had arisen here also. When Augustine formed a new Church with Roman arrangements among the Anglo-Saxons, he required the British clergy (Culdees) to adopt the Roman ecclesiastical arrangements, especially with regard to the mode of reckoning Easter; and to yield to him, as archbishop of Canterbury, the primacy of all Britain. But the negotiations at two meetings led to copus stet. The Irish Clement defended the marriage of a bishop as late as the eighth century. Bonifaci Ep. 67. (b) A peculiar liturgy. Usser. Brit. Eccles. Antiqu. p. 916. (c) The monks had a peculiar system of rules. Usser. p. 918.—That the British-Irish Church derived its origin from Asia Minor, and had preserved a purer, simpler Christianity, are mere empty conjectures, which have been carried to an extravagant length, especially by Münter in the Theol. Studien n. Krit. 1833, iii. 744. The opinion that the Britons, as Quartodecimani, had the Asiatic mode of celebrating the passover, an opinion which principally lies at the foundation of that belief, is obviously false.

4 Comp. § 111, note 25; § 117, note 25; § 124, note 19. Gregorii Magni Ep. ad Episcopos Hiberniae, A.D. 592 (lib. ii. Ep. 36): Redivca cartesam vestram tandem integritas vide ad matrem, quae vos generavit, Ecclesiam. Nam in Synodo, in qua de tribus capitis actum est, aperto licet nihil de fide convulsum esse vel aliquatenus immutatum, sed (sicut scitis) de quibusdam ills solummodo personis est actatuum. Quod autem scribitis, quia ex illo tempore inter alias provincias maxime flagellatur Italia, non hoc de ejus debitis interquere expirobrum, quantum scriptum est: quem diligat Dominus castigat.—Ut igitur de tribus capitulis animis vestris ablatae dubictate possit satisfaci abundanter infundi, librum, quem ex hac re sanctae memoriae decessor meus Pelagius Papa scripsisset, vos obiisse judicavi promittere. Quem si deposito voluntarie defensionis studio, purae vigilantia et corde saepius volavitis relegere, cum vos per omnia secturos, et ad unitatem nostram reveraures nihilominus esse confido. However, at a later period, Columbanus defended, with zeal, the three chapters against Boniface IV. See below, note 13.

5 Keledel, Kyeldel, Latinized Coldei, the British appellation for priests and monks (Kelo-Dei, i.e., servus Dei, as elsewhere too, for example, in Gregory the Great, the clergy are often called servi Dei). When the Roman regulations were subsequently adopted generally in these lands, the name continued to be applied principally to the clergy, who in their corporations held fast by the old British modes. It was, however, given also to all priests to the time of the Reformation, by those who spoke in British. See Hector Bot- thius Hist. Scotorum, lib. vi. p. 95: Invaluit id nomen apud vulgus in tantum, ut sacerdotes omnem ad nostras paene temporae vulgo Culdei, i.e., cultores Dei, sine discrimine vocantur. Comp. historical account of the ancient Culdees of Iona, and of their settlements in Scotland, England, and Ireland, by John Jamieson. Edinburgh. 1811. 4. J. W. J. Braun de Culdeis comm. Romae. 1840. 4.

6 Gregory the Great had conferred this on him (lib. xi. Ep. 63. Beda H. E. i. 29 : Tua vero fratrum-oblatum Britanniae sacerdotis habeat—subjectos. He derived the right of doing so from this fact, that he held the British Church, as well as the Anglo-Saxon, to be a daughter of the Roman (see note 5).

7 Respecting them, see Beda H. E. ii. 2. The Britons had not only a different mode of celebrating the Easter festival, set et alia plurima unitati ecclesiasticae contrariam faciebant. Qui cum, longa disputatone habita, neque precibus, neque hortamentis, neque incentioibus Augustini ac sociorum ejus assensum praebere voluissent, sed suas potius traditiones universas, quae per orbem sibi in Christo concordant, ecclesias praefuisset, sanctus pater Augustini—sine facit. At the second meeting Augustine said to them: Qaia in multa quidem nostrae consuetudini, in uno universalis Ecclesiae, contraria geritis; et tamen si in tribus his mibi, obteneraro voluntas, ut Pascha suo tempore celebretis, ut
no agreement; they gave rise rather to bitter hatred between the two parties.⁹

At this time the Irish monk Columbanus came into the kingdom of Burgundy (about 590), where he acquired great reputation by his strict piety and cultivated mind, and founded several convents, particularly that at Luxovium (Luxeuil). Here he not only introduced a peculiar system of monastic rules, but also continued faithful to the peculiarities of his mother Church, and defended the Irish mode of celebrating Easter with great zeal.¹⁰ At length he displeased King Theodorich II., on account of his boldness; was banished (about 606); labored some years in the conversion of the Alemanni at the lake of Constance; then transferred this task to his pupil Gallus; founded the con-

ministerium baptizandi—juxta morem sanctorum Romanææ et apostolicae Ecclesiae completiæ, ut genti Anglorum una nobiscum verba Domini prædicetis; cætera quæ agitis, quamvis moribus nostris contraria, aequanimitatem cuncta tolerabimus. At illi nihil horum se facturos, neque illum pro Archiæpiscopo habitis esse respondes. The papal primacy was not at all a subject of dispute. The first rank among the bishops was conceded to the popes by the Britons, but they believed so in an erroneous way (see note 5). But the popes themselves did not yet lay claim to a greater ecclesiastical power than that of other apostolic sees (see § 117, notes 18-20); and so one appealed against the Britons, not to papal authority, but to the statutes canonica quarranæ sedia Apostolica, Romanææ videlicet, Hierosolymitanae, Antiochenæ, Alexandrinae, to the old councils, and to the universalis Ecclesiae catholicae unanimum regulam (see Cummani Ep. ad Seguiænum huicsem Abbatem, in J. Usserii Vett. epist. hibernicarum sylygo, p. 27, 28). The Britons did not consider the pope as the sole successor of Peter, but all bishops. Gildas de excidio Britanniæ, P. ii. cap. 1, describes bad priests as sedem Petri Apostoli immundis pedibus usurpantes [comp. § 94, note 36]. That the Britons acknowledged no ecclesiastical power of the pope over them, is proved by their opposition to the Roman regulations, an opposition which continued in Ireland down to the twelfth century. Speelman (Conc. Brit. i. 109) has published for the first time, from a Cottonian MS. in the old British language, the following declaration of Dluoth, abbot of the monastery of Bangor, which he is said to have made to Augustine: Notam sit et absque dubitatione vobis, quod nos cunnuus et quilibet nostrum obedientes et subditae ecclesiae Dei, et Papae Romææ, et unicumque vero Christiano et pio, ad amandum unumquemque in suo grando in caritate perfecta, et ad juvenandum unumquemque eorum verbo et facto fore filios Dei. Et aliam obedientiam, quam istam, non solebimus ei, quem vos nominatis esse Papam; nec esse patrem patrum vindicari et postulati: et istam obedientiam nos sumus parati dare et solvere ei et cuique Christiano continuo. Praeterea nos sumus sub gubernatione episcopi Caerlonis super Osca, qui est ad supervindendum sub Deo super nobis, ad faciendum nos servare viam spiritualæ. It is however spurious. See Döllinger’s Gesch. d. chri. Kirche, i. ii. 218. Stevenson on Bedæ H. E. ii. 2, p. 102.

⁹ Thus Augustine’s successor, Laurecias (Beda, ii. 4), complained that the Scottish bishop, Dagusmus, ad nos veniens, non solium cibum nobiscum, sed nec in eodem hospitio, quo vescebamur, sumere voluit. Comp. Beda, ii. 20: Usque hodie moris est Britonum, fidem religionemque Anglorum pro nihil habere, neque in illicuo ob magis communicare quam paganis.

vent *Bobium* in a valley in the Apennines in Liguria, where he inspired the same desire for learning for which the monks of his country were chiefly distinguished.\(^1\) He died A.D. 615.\(^2\) His letter to Gregory the Great on the subject of the celebration of Easter, as well as that to Boniface IV. against the condemnation of the three chapters, still attest the free spirit of the Irish Church.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Cf. Antiquissimae quattuor Evangeliorum Codex Sangaliensis, ed. H. C. M. Rettwig, Turici. 1836. 4. praeef. Hence the important discoveries of modern times in the Codex Bobiensibus, ut present very much scattered. See Amad. Payron de bibliotheca Boecius comm. prefixed to his Ciceronis orationem fragmenta inedita. Statut. et Tubing. 1824. 4.


\(^3\) Ep. ad Gregor.: Forte notam subire temenas Hermagoricae novitatis, antecessorum et maxime Papae Leonis auctoritate contentus es. Noli te queso in tali qusestione humilitati tantum aut gravitati cedere, quae saepe falluntur. Melior forte est canis vivus in problemata Leonem mortuos (Eccl. ix. 4). Vivus nuncque sanctus emendare potest, quae ab altero majore emendata non fuerint.—non mihi satisfacit post tantos, quos legi auctores, una istorum sententia Episcoporum dicens tantum: “Cum Judeis Pascha facere non debemus.” Dixit hoc olivm et Victor Episcopus, sed nemo Orientale suum receptum commentum. Epist. 5, ad Bonifacium, iv. cap. 4: Vigilia itaque queso, Papa, vigila, et iterum dico, vigila: quia forte non bene vigilavit Vigilia, quem caput scandalist clamtant, qui vobis culpam iniquitant. C. 10: Ex eo tempore, quo Deus et Dei filius esse dignatus est, ac in saecular illis ferventissimis Dei Spiritus equis, Petro scilicet et Paulo Apostolis—per sua gentium equitans, turbavit aequas multas, et inaunabulabilium populorum millibus multiplicavit quadragas; supremus ipse aurgia currus illius, qui est Christus,—ad nos usque pervenit. Ex tunc vos magni estia et clari, et Roma ipsa nobiler et clarior est; et, si dicit potest, propter Christi geminos Apostolos—vos prope caelestis estia, et Roma orbis terrarum caput est ecclasiarum, salva loci dominicae resurrectiois singulari praerogativa (comp. Firmilianum, Div. I. § 68, note 12. Augustinus, § 94, note 5). Et ideo sicut magnus honor vester est pro dignitate cathodrae, ita magna cura vobis necessaria est, ut non perdatis vestram dignitatem propter aliquam perversitatem. Tandiu enim potestas apud vos erit, quamdiu recta ratio permanerit: ille enim certus regni caelorum clavicularis est, qui dignus per verum scientiam aperit, et indignis claudit. Aliquid, si contraria fecerit, nec aperire nec claudere poterit. C. 11: Cum haec igitur vera sit, et sine ulla contradicicione ab omnibus vera sapientibus recepta situt (licet omnibus notum est, et nemo est qui nesciat, quid Salvator noster sancto Petro regni regni cornum contulit claves, et vos per hoc forte superciliose nescio quid, prae caeteris vobis majoris auctoritatis, ac in divinis rebus potestatis vindicatis); noveritis minorem fore potestatem vestram apud Dominum, si vel cogeris hic in cordibus vestris: quia unitas fideli in toto orbis unitatem fuit potestatis et praerogativas: ita ut libertas veritati ubiue ab omnibus detur, et aditus errori ab omnibus similibus abnegetur, etc.
THIRD DIVISION.


FIRST CHAPTER.

RESTRAINING OF THE CHURCH IN THE EAST.

§ 127.

Though the Persians tolerated the Nestorians, they hated the Catholic Christians, as was apparent in the war which Kesra (Chosrões) II. Purvecz carried on against the East Roman empire from A.D. 604, and especially in the taking of Jerusalem (614). On this account the victories of Heraclius from 621, ending with the dethronement of Chosrões by his son Schirujeh (Sirões) (628) were of importance in relation to the Church. Besides, Heraclius brought back the wood of the true cross which had been carried off; and instituted a festival in commemoration of it, the σταυρώσιμος ημέρα, festum exaltationis (14th of September).†

In the mean time, a far more dangerous enemy of the Church had appeared in Arabia. Muhammed, in the year 611, began to preach Islamism, at first in private, and then publicly among the Koreish in Mecca. At first, indeed, he was obliged to give way to his enemies (15th July, 622, Hegira),‡ but gained over the city Yatschreb (Medina al Nabi) in his favor; extended his dominion and his doctrines thence, prince and prophet in one person, till they spread far into Arabia; at length conquered Mecca (630); consecrated the Caaba as the chief temple of Islamism; and bequeathed to his successors (Chalifs) Arabia,

† Theophanis Chronographia p. 245-273, among other things says, of the conduct of Chosrões in the conquered lands, p. 263: Ἡμῖνέγκρατε τούς Χριστιανούς γενέσθαι εἰς τὴν τοῦν Νεστορίου θρησκείαν πρὸς τὸ πλῆξαι τῶν βασιλέως.
‡ Edeler’s Chronologie, Bd. 2, S. 482, ff.
as a country completely subject to their faith and their dominion († 632).  

Islamism, whose holy writings are contained in the Koran, collected by Abu-Bekr, was, in its chief doctrines, a compound of Judaism and Christianity. But it made the doctrine of the infinite sublimity of God its basis, in a way so one-sided that an absolute dependence of man on God resulted from it; and ideas of a likeness and an inward union between man and God, and consequently the fundamental principles of all the higher morality, found no place in the system. By making it a religious duty to wage war on unbelievers, by its fatalism, and its sensual promises, it excited among the rude and powerful people of the Arabs so unconquerable a spirit for war, and so wild a desire for conquest, that the two neighboring kingdoms, the Persian and the Byzantine, could not withstand such resistance, amid their internal weaknesses. The provinces of the Byzantine empire, which lay nearest, were the more easily conquered, inasmuch as the greater number of the inhabitants consisted of Monophysites who joyfully met the Arabians as their deliverers. The conquest of Syria was begun under the first Chaliph Abu-Bekr († 634), and completed under the second, Omar (639), under whom the valiant Amru also overcame Egypt (640). Under Othman the Persian empire was conquered (651). Dur-

---


6 See a representation of the influence of his faith on the middle ages by K. E. Oelsner. Frankfurt a. M. 1810. 8. Mohammed's religion by Döllinger, see note 5.
The reign of the Ommeyades, their general Musa, brought first the entire northern coast of Africa (707), and then Spain also (711), under the Arabian dominion; while, on the other side, the Arabs advanced several times as far as Constantinople, and twice besieged the city for a long time (669 till 676, and 717 till 718).

Jews and Christians were tolerated by the Arabs on condition of paying a poll-tax; and though sometimes severely oppressed, yet they were not compelled to change their religion. Still, however, the advantages held out to those who adopted Islamism attracted many converts; and thus Christianity not only lost all political importance in the conquered provinces, but the number of its confessors was always diminishing in proportion to that of the Moslems. The catholic patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, remained unoccupied; for their possessors, living in the Greek empire, were merely titulars.

7 Mohammed was tolerant at first of other religions (cf. Sura, ii. et v.); afterward, however, he made it the duty of believers, by the 9th and 67th Surats, to carry on religious war, for the purpose of exterminating idolaters and making Jews and Christians tributary (comp. Gorock’s Christologie des Koran, S. 118). Before this he had granted the Christians of some parts of Arabia, as well as the Jews and Sabaeans, letters of freedom, though doubtless both the Testamentum et pactiones initae inter Mohammedem et christianos fidei cultores (first brought from the East by the Capuchin Pacificus Scaliger, and printed at Paris 1630, 4to, and often afterward), and the Pactum Muhammadis, quod indulsit Monachi montis Sinai et Christianis in universum (in Pococke Descr. of the East, Lond. 1743. fol. i. 268, translated into German, 2d edition, Erlangen. 1771. 4. i. 393), in which distinguished privileges are secured to all Christians, are spurious. The humiliating terms under which Omar, at the taking of Jerusalem, 637, allowed freedom of religion to the Christians there (Le Beau Hist. du Bas-Empire, xii. 421), express, on the contrary, the spirit with which the subjugated Christians were treated at a later time. Cf. Th. Chr. Tychaeus comm. qua disquisitur, quotunque Muhammades nitarum religionum sectatores toleraverit, in the Commentationes Soc. Reg. Gotting. xv. 152.
SECOND CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 128.

MONOTHELETIC CONTROVERSY.


A fresh attempt to bring the Monophysites back to the Catholic Church was followed by no other consequence than that of introducing into the latter a new element of controversy.

When the Emperor Heraclius (A.D. 611–641) during his Persian campaign abode in Armenia and Syria (from 622), he thought he perceived that the Monophysites were particularly stumbled at the consequence arising from the catholic doctrine, viz., two manifestations of will (ἐνέργεια) in the person of Christ. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, having been applied to the point, declared that the adoption of one active will, and one manifestation of will, was not inconsistent with the received creed of the Church; and therefore the emperor, as well as several bishops, decided in favor of this opinion. But when one of these bishops, Cyrus, whom the emperor had appointed patriarch of Alexandria, reunited (633) the Severians.

of that place with the Catholic Church by articles of agreement, in which that doctrine of one will was expressed; Sophronius, a Palestinian monk, who happened to be there at the time, raised the first opposition to this doctrine, which he afterward continued with zeal after he became patriarch of Jerusalem (634).² Sergius now advised that nothing should be said on the disputed point.⁴ Pope Honorious agreed with him, not only in this advice, but in the doctrinal view of the matter.⁵ Sophronius was quieted by the incursions of the Arabs; but the spark which had fallen on spirits so susceptible of dogmatic speculation could not be extinguished. In vain did the emperor now issue the Ἐκδήσεις (638),⁶ composed by Sergius for the purpose of putting down the controversy. The west, too, now rose up against the new doctrine. The monk Maximus,⁷ a

---

² Sophronii Synodica ap. Mansi, xi. 461.—His other extant writings (saints' lives, discourses, etc.), to which many have been added in the Spicilegium Romanum t. iii. and iv. (1840) do not refer to Monotheletism.

⁴ Sergii Ep. ad Honorian (ap. Mansi, xi. 329), contains the most credible account of the beginning of the controversy. He assures Cyrus that his advice was, μακάτο τοῦ λοιποῦ τινα συγκυρισῆ, μιᾶν ἤ διόν πρὸςβίείν ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμῶν· ἄλλα μάλλον, καθάπερ αὐτή ἡγεία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ παραδόξησις σύνοδος. Ενα καὶ τὸν τούτων νόον μονογένη τοῦ κύριον ἁμῶν Ἰ. Χ. τὸν ἁλαστικὸν θεὸν ἐνεργείαν ὁμολογεῖ ταῦτα τῆς Θείας καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, καὶ πάσαν θεοπρεπὴ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπὴ ἐνεργείαν ἐκ ἐνός καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ συσταφοκριέναι θεοῦ λόγον ἑνὸς ἑνίατος προφέτευται, καὶ οὐκ Επικουρία αὐτοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄνωθεν θεοθετεῖ διὰ τὸ τῆς μᾶς ἐνεργείας φωνὴν—δοκεῖ τοὺς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐνφανισθῶμεν, ὥσπερ ἐναντίον τούτων προφέτευται τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ· ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ὁ διά θεοῦ ἡμῶν· ὡσπερ διὰ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐνεργείας ἡμῶν παλλοῦς σκανδαλίζων· ἐπιθυμεῖ ταῦτα τό θεόν πρὸς ὑποστίλατον ἐνσώματος, τοῖς πάντως ἡγεία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ παραδόξησις σύνοδος. What follows is word for word the same as the passage from Sergii Ep. ad Honor., given in note 4. But he continues, εἰ γὰρ ὁ μαρτυρὸς Ἑκατοντάρχης καὶ παρεπεὶ θείας τῆς θείας τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρώπωσις, καὶ διὸ εἰσήγην υἱοῦ, διὸ θελήματα τούτων εἰπεν εἰκὸν ἑπόμενα, τοῦτον δὲ ταπαθοῦσαν τῶν ἔπει αὐτοῦ θεοπλαστομενῶν δυὸ προσώπων ἐξεστέ, ποῦ δύνατον, τοῖς τῆς θείας ὁμολογούμενος πίστιν, καὶ ἕνα νόον τοῦ κυρίου ἁμῶν Ἰ. Χ. τὸν ἁλαστικὸν θεὸν δοξάζοντας δόκει ταῦτα ἐνανθρώπωσις ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ παραδόξησις; ὥσπερ τοῖς ἐγώις παρασάλειτο ἐπὶ ὑπάτης καὶ τοῦτο κατακολουθήσατο, τὸν πάντως τοῦ κυρίου ἁμῶν Ἰ. Χ.—ὁμολογεῖ, ὡς ἐν μηδείς καὶ τοῦ νοοῦ ἐνφανισθῶμεν αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς κευματίζωμεν καὶ ἔξω οἰκεία ὁμοιότης, ἐνανθρώπως τὸ λέγομεν ἡμῶν αὐτὴ καθ' ὑπόστασιν τοῦ λόγου, τῆς φύσεως αὐτῆς ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἀλλ' ὑπάτης καὶ ὁλαὶ ὁ διὸ αὐτὸς ὁ θεός λόγος ἠδονέθη.

⁶ See Neander's K. G. iii. 344. Ritter's Gesch. d. christl. Phil. ii. 335. His works, for the most part against the Monothelites, were edited by Franc. Comenius. Paris. 1675. 2
former companion of Sophronius, roused up Africa against it; Pope John IV. refused to adopt the Ec theology; and Pope Theodore excommunicated Paul, patriarch of Constantinople (646). Equally unsuccessful was the attempt of Constans II. (A.D. 642–668) to restore internal tranquillity by means of the edict called Τύπος (648), which merely recommended silence on the point, without giving a preference to either view; although that tranquillity was most desirable in the kingdom so severely oppressed from without. Pope Martin I. at the first Lateran synod (649), even ventured to anathematize the doctrine of one will, and the two imperial decrees relating to it. Martin I. indeed was now deposed, and, together with Maximus, brought to Constantinople (653), where both were condemned to end their life in exile after much severe treatment. This had the effect of restoring communion between Rome and Constantinople, vol. 65. Prefixed to the first volume is the Greek life of Maximus, important in the history of the Monothelites. The doctrines of the Monothelites and Monothelites are most clearly represented in contrast, in Maximi Disp. cum Pyrrho, Opp. ii. 159.

6) Johannes Ep. ad Constantinum Imp. in Anastasii Collectan. ap. Mansi, x. 683.

7) Ap. Mansi, x. 1099.—Εγνωμεν εν πολλη καθεστασι αιλιω των ημετερων οδηδοξου λαοι, ως τυνων μεν εν θελημα επι των οικονομια των μεγαλων θεου και σωτηρος ημων ιση τυμβιζωντων, και των αυτων ενεργειαν ταυθεα και τα ινθρωπινα δε διαγνωσταν δοθων αδημωματα και ενεργειας διω επι των αυτων ονασσων του λογου οικονομων και των μεν εν απολογιε προτιμουμενων διω των εν πρασσουσιν υπαρχειν των καιρων ισων ι. Χ. εν δια των φοσειν ουκ αναχωσεων και αδιαιρετων θυλων και ενεργουσι ταυθεα και τα ινθρωπινα των δε διω των αδιαιρετων εστιν αει και ευ διαρωσαν συνελθοντα φοσεως, και των των αυτων σωζοσαν και μενειν διαφοραν, καταλληλως και προσων γος των φασειν των αυτων και ονεα Χριστων ενεργειαν ταυθεα και τα ινθρωπινα—κεκτησε τινων ημετερων υπηκοον—μη δεῖναι εχειν προς άλλους απο του παρουσια περιν ενος δελθουσας ο μιας ενεργειας, δε υπερ ενεργειων και διω δηλωματων, ουκ ομοφωνον προσφερεν αμφιβολης, έρω τε και και νομιμαιναι. There is said to be το προ τω ιονει του νεφελης εντεσον προεληφθουσα φιλονομος ιππαντου φω νοσχει δεμεα. Sharp threats against those who disobey.

8) The opponents declared the Týpos as ἄνενεργητως ἡπτανται καὶ ἀνακελεῖσθιν, τοιοῦ τινι ἄνω, καὶ λέγουν, καὶ διηγοῦντο αὐτῶν τῶν τῆς ὁδὸς θεοῦ τῶν κόρων ἡμῶν ι. Χ. ἰδοναιτόποι, τοῖς τῶν ἔθνων ἀφήξους παπαλήσας εἰς δολούς (Epistola Abbatum et Monaschorum in Synodo Lateranensi, ap. Mansi, x. 908). So too Martin in his address. Ibid. p. 880.

9) The Acts in Mansi, x. 863. On the bad state of the Latin text see Walsh’s Ketzerehist. ix. 222. The twenty canons in the fifth Secretarius, can. x. ss. are directed against the Monothelites. Can. xiv. runs thus: Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, quac ab hereticis impie conficeatur, et dans voluntates pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quae in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salutant, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso praedican tur, de negatur et respuit, condemnatus sit.

10) See Martini Epist. xv. et xvi. and the commemoratio eorum, quae saepe acta sunt in Martinum, given together from Anastasii Collectan., in Mansi, x. 831. Neander, iii. 373. For an account of the sufferings of Maximus see acts and letters ap. Mansi, xii. 3. Anastasii Probab. Epist. ad Theodosiam in Opp. Maxim. i. 57. Neander, iii. 386.
at least for a time, though it was broken off again under Constantine Pogonatus (668-685). To remove this, the emperor summoned the sixth general council (680), where Pope Agatho triumphed in procuring a confirmation by the synod of the doctrine of two wills, as copiously unfolded by him in an epistle, after an examination which terminated in peace and order.


14 Agathonis Epistola ad Imperatores ap. Mansi, xi. 233-236.—P. 239: Cum duas naturas, duasque naturales voluntates, et duas naturales operationes confecerit in uno domino nostro J. Ch., non contrarias esse, nec adversas ad alterum dicimus (sinc a via veritatis errantes apostolica traditionem assensunt, absit hocque impietos esse, nec tamquam separatas in duas personas, vel subsistentibus, sed duas dicimus unum eundemque dominum nostrum J. Ch., sicut naturas, ita et naturales in se voluntates et operationes habere, divinam sollicitet et humanam, etc.—P. 243: Apostolica ecclesia—anum dominum nostrum J. Ch. confecit ex duas et in duas existentem naturas—et ex proprietatis naturalis unamquamque harum Christi naturalum perfectam esse cognoscit, et quidquid ad proprietates naturam pertinet, duplicia omnia confecerit.—Consequeat urba—duas etiam naturales voluntates in eo, et duas naturales operationes essent confeceret et praeceperit. Nam si personalis quisquam intelligat voluntatem, dum tres personae s. Trinitate dictur, necesse est, ut et tres voluntates personales, et tres personales operationes (qua absurdum est et nimirum profanum) dicentur. —Ipsa dominus noster J. Ch.—in sacris suis evangelii protestatur in aliquibus humanis, in aliquibus divina, et simul utrique in alio de se patet:—Orat quidem ad Patrem ut homin, ut calicum passionis transageret, quis in eo nostrae humanitatis natura abaque solo peccato perfecta est, Pater, iniqui, si possit esse, etc. (Math. xxvi. 39.) Et in alio loco, Non mea voluntas, sed tua fiat (Luc. xxi. 42). Further, the passages Phil. ii. 8, obedient usque ad mortem; Luc. ii. 51, obedient parentibus; Jo. vi. 38, descendit de coelo, ut non faciam voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem ejus qui misit me; cf. Jo. v. 30; also from the Old Testament, Ps. xi. 9, Ut faciam voluntatem tuam, Deus meus, volui; Ps. iu. 8, voluntarie sacrificabo tibi. Then follow testimonies from the fathers. On the mode in which the two wills co-operate Agatho says nothing.
An anathema was pronounced on all Monothelites, and also on Honorius; and thus Church unity was restored in the Roman empire.

§ 129.

CONCILIUM QUINISEXTUM.

At the last two general councils, no attention had been paid to the laws affecting the constitution of the Church. To supply this defect, and to obtain a complete synodical code, the emperor Justinian II. (reigned from 685–695, and from 705–711), called a new oecumenical council in the Trullus at Constantinople, in which the Monothelites and Nestorians were condemned, and the doctrine of the Church established. This council is known as the Fifth Lateran Council. The name Monothelites is first found in Johannes Damascus.

16 The name Monothelites was given by the Emperor Justinian II. to those who held the doctrine that Christ had only one will, in contrast to the Nestorians, who held that Christ had two wills.

17 John IV., in the Epist. ad Constantin. (note 8), had endeavored to exculpate Honorius on the ground that he merely asserted quia in salvatore nostro dæsæ voluntates contrariae, id est, in membris ipsius (cf. Rom. vii. 23) penitus non consistant, quoniam nihil viti exstitit et praevaericate primi hominis. So too Maximus in Epist. ad Marium ap. Mansi, x. 687, and in the disputatio cum Pyrrcho, ibid. p. 739. In all the measures afterward taken in Rome against the Monothelites, no mention was made of Honorius. On the other hand, Symmachus, vi. actio xiii. (ap. Mansi, xi. 556), pronounces an anathema on Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Petrus, Paulus, Theodorus, bishop of Phanar, and 'other men of the same mind'. This anathema was repeated act. xvi. p. 629, act. xviii. p. 655, etc. Leo III. in his Epist. ad Constant. Imp. in which he confirms the council (ap. Mansi, xi. 731); Anathematizamus—nec non et Honorium, quia hanc apostolica ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrinarum lustravit, sed profanae profiolatae subvertere contas est. Cf. ejusd. Epist. ad Episc. Hispaniae ap. Mansi, xi. 1053, and ad Erigvigan Regem Hispaniae ibid. p. 1057. Also in the confession of faith subscribed by the following popes at their accession (liber diurnus cap. ii. ft. 9, professo 2), the anathema was pronounced against auctores novi haereticorum dogmatum, Sergium, et alii. una cum Honorio, quia pravos eorum assertionibus fomentum imponit. Anastasius Biblioth. Ep. ad Joannem Diaconum (Collectanea ed. Simondon. p. 3), is the first that mentions Honorius again, after the example of John IV., whose letter he reproduced, to excuse Honorius, licet huic sexta sancta Synodus quasi haeretico anathema dixerit. But later Catholic historians deny even this fact. Platina in vita Honorii I.: Forunt Hormelium—Pyrrhi—et Cyri frandibus deceptam in haeresim Monothelitarum incidevit. Hos tamen postea tanti errores auctores, hortante Honorio et verum ante eolos litteras et nullius ponenti, relegavit Hormelius. According to Baroinus, the acts of the sixth council have been corrupted, and instead of Honorius we should read Theodorus. Bellarmine maintains that the letters of Honorius are either spurious or interpolated. According to Pagi, Garnier, the Ballerini, and others, Honorius was not condemned for heresy, but for negligence; and according to Comenius and others, even with the consent of Pope Agatho. Against all these evasions see Richer Historia concil. general. i. 396. Da Pia de Antiqua eccles. discipl. p. 349. Bossuet Defensio declar. Cleri Gallici. ii. 128.
second period.—Div. III.—A.D. 629-726.

Constantine (692),¹ at which 102 canons were passed, for the most part giving legal expression merely to older Church usages, and repeating older canons. It appears that the Greek bishops had expressly entertained the design, both here and at Chalcedon, of reminding the Roman patriarchs, again exalted by their new victory, of the limits of their power. Particularly unacceptable to the Romans were the six canons concerning the Church laws to be esteemed valid,² the marriage of priests,³

¹ Names: Concilium Trullanum, S. Vindicta, Conc. quindecim. The Greeks consider it merely as a continuation of the sixth council, and call its decisions canones τῆς ἔκτης συνόδου. The Acts are given in Mansi, xi. 921.

² Can. ii. confirms 85 canones Apost., while the Roman church, after Dionysius, adopted only the first 59. This council also sanctioned, as church laws, the canons of the councils of Nice, Ancyra, Nicaea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople in A.D. 381, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Sardica, Carthage and Constantinople, A.D. 394. Also the canons of Dionysius Alexandria, Petrus Alex., Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nyssene, Gregory of Nazianzum, Amphilochius of Iconium, Timotheus Alex., Cyril Alex., and Gennadius patriarch of Constantinople. Lastly, also, of Cyprian and his synod. All other canons are prohibited as not genuine. (Μηδενε ἐκείνων—τέτοιους παραδοθέων κανόνας φιλεπιγράφων ὑπὸ τῶν συνετέλεσθαι τῶν τῶν ἁλίθεων καταλαμενένων ἐπιχειρήσεων.) In that list, however, many western synods, and all decrees of Roman bishops, are passed over.

³ Can. xii.: Εστειλάθη ἐν τῷ Ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν ταῖς κανόνις παραδοθέων διέγνωμεν, τοὺς μελλόντας διακόνους ή πρεσβυτέρους ἐξευδόθησαν χειροτονίας καθαρολογεῖτε, ὡς οὐκ ἔχασας αὐτῶν συνάπτονται γαμεταί. Ἰμεῖς τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἔξωκλοποιόντος κανόνι τῆς ἀπουσιώδεσις ἄρκετεις καὶ τάξεις, τῶν ἱερών ἅρφων κατά νόμους συνοικίσατε καὶ ἀνά τοῦ ποίου ἤρθοσθήν ἐμπλωθήτω μήδεις αὐτῶν τὴν πρὸς γαμετάς συνάφειος διαλέγεστε, ἢ ἀποστροφίστε αὐτοὺς τῆς πρὸς ἁλλήλων κατά καιροὺς τῶν προσόμοντα ὅμιλος. Ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς χειροτονίας τῆς διακονίας καὶ πρεσβυτρίας, ὡς ὁ παραδόθηκεν ἐν τῷ πρῶτον ἐκκλησίας καὶ τούτων ἀρχιερεῖον ὅμιλος, ὡς ἀποστροφίστατε τῆς νομίμου πρὸς τὴν ἀκρίτας γαμετὰ ὅμιλον. Καὶ ἂν ἐνεπεκατεπτάθη τὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐνπάντα τῆς ἐντύχεσεν ἔχαιρεται καὶ ἐνπάντα τῆς ἐντύχεσεν ἔχαιρεται τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνέπεσε ἐνπάντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνέπεσε. Ἡμεῖς ἐνεπεκατεπτάθη τὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐνπάντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνέπεσεν, ἐνπάντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνέπεσεν.
the rank of the patriarch of Constantinople, against fasting on Saturday, against the eating of blood and things strangled, and against pictures of the Lamb. Though the papal legates had subscribed them, yet Pope Sergius I. refused to accept them. Justinian meant to have him brought to Constantinople, but was prevented by the rebellion of the garrison of Ravenna, and soon after by his deposition. Thus this council was acknowledged only in the east, but not in the west; and was the first public step which led to the separation of the two Churches.

§ 130.

FORTUNES OF MONOPHILITISM.

The emperor Philippius Bardanes (711–713) revived once more the Monothelite doctrine, and made it the prevailing faith, though merely for a short time. Only Rome withstood him. But the Greek bishops were as ready to subscribe a Monothelite bishops, though Justinian had forbidden them by a civil law (Cod. i. iii. 48). Cf. Calixtus de Conjugio Clericorum ed. Henke, p. 389, ss.

4 Can. xxxvi., referring to Can. Constant. iii. (§ 93, note 9), and Can. Chaleced. xxviii. (ibid. note 14), and in the same words as the latter. So, too, in Can. xxxvii. the 17th canon of Chaleced. (ibid. note 3) is repeated word for word.

5 Can. iv.: Εσπεριθή θέμαθήκανεν, ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τῆς πασαραινούσις νηστείαις τοῦ τιμίου σάββατος νηστείαις παρὰ τήν παραδοθέαν εκκλησιαστικήν ἁπαθείαν (comp. 93, note 11) ἔπεσε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ὡστε κρατεῖ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἀπαραπαλείπτως τὸν κανόνα τοῦ λέγοντα: "εἰ τις κληρικὸς εὑρεθείη τῇ ἁγίᾳ κυριακῇ νηστείαις ἀ τῷ σάββατον πλην τοῦ ἔνας καὶ μόνον, καθαυτεοικία ἐλθὼν, ἄφθορως." (Can. Apostol. lxvii.)

6 Can. lxvii.: Ἐν ταῖς τῶν σεττῶν εἰδών γραφών ἁμοῦ δικαιότου τῶν προδότων δεκανόμενος ἤχοριατέται (according to Jod. i. 29).—Τῶν τῶν ἀδικότων τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῶν κόσμων ἄμοιο χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶς κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων χρησκόμεθα καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰδών ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντὸς τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἁμοῦ ἀναστηλοῦσθαι ὀριζόµενον. See § 99, note 51.


9 Ap. Beda de Sex centiubus and Paulus Diaec. Hist. Longob. vi. 11, it is called Synodus erraticus. By degrees however, several of the less offensive canons began to be cited, as Canones Syn. vi., those who did so being misled by the example of the Greeks (see note 1). Gratian (Decret. P. i. dist. xvi. c. 6) translates a Greek account of this synod, and then naively adds: Ex his ergo colligatur, quod sexta synodus bis congregata est: primo sub Constantino Imp., et nullus canones constituit, secundo sub Justiniano filio ejus, et praetatos canones promulgavit. Thus, then, he also adopts several of the canons. It was not till after the Reformation that the conciliabulum pseudosextum was again discovered.

Cf. Calixtus, p. 461, ss.

1 The chief authority on this subject is the epilogus ad Acta Syn. vi. of the contemporary Agathon, dean and librarian of the church at Constantinople (prim. ed. F. Combellas in the Nov. nectar. PP. ii. 199, ap. Mansi, xii. 199. Farther, Theophanes, p. 218, ss. Waldh's Ketzerhistor. ix. 449.

confession of faith as they were to return to orthodoxy at the command of the next emperor, Anastasius II.2

In Syria, however, a small party of Monothelites remained for a long time. Here all Christian parties had a political importance. The Jacobites were favorable to the Arabians; the Catholics to the Greek emperors, hence called Melchites (from Μέλχης). On the other hand, an independent party had collected in mount Libanus, about the monastery of St. Maro, who adopted the Monothelite doctrines, chose for themselves a patriarch of Antioch (the first was John Maro, † 701), and under the name of Maronites4 continued to hold the doctrine of one will in Christ till the time of the Crusades.5

2 The miserable spirit of the Greek bishops is particularly expressed in the exculpatory letter which John, who had been elevated to the see of Constantinople by Philippicus, addressed to Pope Constantine, after the state of things had been entirely changed (append to Agatho's Epilogus ep. Combeia. p. 211. ss. Mansl. p. 193, ss.). Among other things he says: Odeôte γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς,—οὐ λέγων ἀντιπόλεμος καὶ σκληρός ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἔννοιας ἀνάγκην ἐν τοῖς τουτοῖς, ἀπεις τίμος τέχνης καὶ περινομιας καθεστηκένης εἰμάρις: ἐπὶ καὶ Νάθαν ὁ προφήτης οὗ ἐκπρακτάτου τὸν ἐλέγχον τοῖς περὶ τῆς μοναχιας τε καὶ τοῦ φόρου ρισάγηγα τῷ Δαμιά, κατασκε καὶ αὕτου τοῦ Δαμιανον ἐφορίαν καθισματι. Кαθά τιτότο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὑπὲρ φησίν του μέγας Βασίλειος, ἐνδεῦνα μικρόν τῷ ἑνὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καθεστῆμεθα, ὡστε τὴν ἐν τοῖς καυρίοις τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίαν, εἰ καὶ μὴ λέξειν, ἀλλαγε τὰς ἑννοιας φιλάτεσθαι ὑπαγαβατον. Οἱ γὰρ ἐν λέξεις ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐν πράγμασιν ἢ ἠλθεία, ὁ θεος Γερηγόριος βασις καὶ σάλτων ἑκατόου καὶ λινά χάρων δισβίζεται, ἵνα τοῦ τῶν ἐννοιας συμπρωτείας. —Καθά τιτότο δὲ τῶν τῆς ὁλοκομοκρατίας καὶ κατὰ περίπτωσιν συμβάσεως τρίτον καὶ τὰ λοιπά τῶν γεγενημένων προκηλέσει πειθόμενοι, ἀγώνατοι, μὴ ἀγγεγνωστὸν ἡμῖν τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦτο τοῦ εὐγλύμα προαγαγείς καθεστήθη ἀλλὰ καν τῆς ἑκατερίας ἡμῖν ἀκατακαταφαίνεται ὑπαγαβατον, τῷ παρατείνει τῶν ἐκ τῶν ἄγων πατέρων ἡμῶν ὁλοκομοκρατίας προεκλήθηντας ἠνεκτόνων καὶ μέγας Εἰρηναίος τακτάρισον. He then appeals to the bishops of the Rubber Synod at Ephesus, who had condemned Flavian unjustly, καὶ ὡς εἰς τῷ κατὰ Χαλκιδίαν ἠγείρεις τοῦτος πρὸς τῆς ἑγερεῖσε τοῦ ἐγκλήματος ὑ ἡ γεγονη ὁμολογίας συνόδους, etc., and concludes that he has offered an ἠγολογῶν ἤγερα τινώς καὶ ἐννοιον. 4 Johann. Danz. Lib. de vera sententia c. 8. Epist. de Hymno trishagio, c. 5. Enyibi Annal. Alex. i. 11. p. 199. 5 The modern Maronite writers, namely, Abraham Echelouned in several works, Faustus Naxion Dia. de origine et religione Maronitarum. Rom. 1679, ss. Egas, Enoplia sibi catholicca. Ibid. 1694, 8. Assemani Bibl. orient. i. 496, have introduced confusion into the history of their sect, 1. By asserting that the Maronites were never Monothelites, but were always orthodox (in addition to the opposite reasons given by Renanod Hist. patr. Alexandr. p. 149, ss. is the testimony of Germans, patriarch of Constantinople, about 725, de Haeresibas et Synodi, in the Speciclegium Romanum, vii. 65, that the Maronites rejected the sixth synod. The grounds given by both parties may be found in M. Le Quien Oriens christ. iii. 1. Walch's Ketzerhist. ix. 474); 2. By identifying the Mardaites (whose name is erroneously derived from Ἱησοῦ) with the Maronites. On the contrary, Anqueij Duperron Recherches sur la narration des Marde, anciëm peuple de la Passe in the Memoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. tome 50, pp. 1, has shown that the Mardaites or Mards, a warlike people in Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantin Polonatus. 676 (Theophanes, p. 293), but withdrawn as early as 655 by Justinian II. (Theoph. p. 362, s.)
THIRD CHAPTER.

HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH.

§ 131.

ECCLESIASTICAL STATE OF ITALY.


The political consequence of the popes in Italy increased, in proportion as the Greek emperors, now pressed by the Saracen

1 The Liber pontificalis has arisen from former Catalogi Pontificum which we know only in part. The first known catalogus, which was composed under Liberius, 354, and contains few other notices besides those relating to chronology, furnished ground for subsequently attributing to Damasus the first collection of the vitae Pontifical. The second known catalogus under Felix IV. (526-530) has taken the former into itself only in part, but enlarged it by other accounts. From these catalogues arose, at the end of the seventh century, the first edition of the Liber pontificalis, which concludes with Conon († 687) and is still extant in a Veronese and a Neapolitan MS. (see Pertz in the Archiv. d. Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, v. 68.) The second edition of it in the Cod. Vatican 3263, concludes with Constantine († 714). The lives that follow were appended successively by contemporaries, and Anastasius can only have composed the last till Nicolaus I. († 868), and have published the book anew in this form. The lives of Hadrian II. and Stephen VI. († 891), subsequently added, are attributed to one Gulielmus Bibliothecarius. From what has been said, it may be seen how even Beda, Rabanus Maurus, Walahfrid Strabo, could cite the Liber pontificalis; and how Pseudo-Isidorus could use it. Just as the older shorter lives, which merely furnish notices of time, and short accounts of ordinations, church buildings, regulations and arrangements of popes, and respecting martyrdoms and heresies, have become uncertain by the mixing up of doubtful traditions with true accounts; so, on the other hand, the more copious lives, from the end of the seventh century and onward, have great historical value, as they were written by contemporaries. Cf. Emm. a Schelstrate de Antiquis Rom. pont. catalogis, ex quibus Lib. pontificialis concinnatus fuit, et de lib. pont. auctore ac praestantia. Jo. Giampini Examen Lib. pontif. Fr. Blanchinii praef. in Lib. pont. all together prefixed to Maratori’s edition. See a description of the city of Rome by Platner, Bunsen, Gerhard, and Rostell, i. 206.

2 This edition, better than that of Garnier, was immediately suppressed by the Romish censors. Its history (see especially Balzaui. not. ad de Marca de Concord Sac. et Imp. lib. l.c. ix. § 8), and an account of its variations may be seen in Schoepliini Communit. hist. crit. Basil. 1741. 4. p. 438, ss. In addition to the two codd. used by Holsten and Garnier, a third is noticed by Laurenzius Diss. de Lazari et Magdal. in provinciam adipus cap. 10, obs. 10.

3 Honorius I. from 625-638, Severinus † 640, John IV. † 642, Theodore † 649, Martin I.
too, were forced to leave to them chiefly the defense of their Italian possessions against the Lombards. Still they continued subjects of the emperors, had to be confirmed by them in office, and paid them taxes. While the Monothelite troubles gave the popes an opportunity of appointing a vicar even in Palestine now overrun by the Saracens, Martin I. was still made to feel bitterly the emperor's power; and Vitalianus was compelled to bow to Monothelitism supported by imperial patronage. But banished 654, † 655, but even in 654 Eugenius I. was again chosen, † 657, Vitalianus † 672, Aëdesiatus † 676, Domnus I. † 678, Agatho † 682, Leo II. † 683, Benedict II. † 685, John V. † 686, Conon † 687, Sergius I. † 701, John VI. † 703, John VII. † 707, Sisinnius † 708, Constantine † 714, Gregory II. † 731.

\[\text{Comp. above, § 117, note 26. Cf. Liber diurnus cap. ii. tit. iv. Account of the Romans de electione Pontificis ad Exarchum: Etideo supplicantes quaesumus, ut inspirante Deo celsae ejus dominationi, nos famulos voti compotes celerriti fieri praecipient: praesortim cum plura sint capitula, et alia ex aliis quotidie proccrentur, quae curae solicitudinem et pontificalis favoris expectant remedium.—Prophetaquantum quoque inimicum orationes, quam nisi sola Dei virtus atque Apostolorum Principis per suum Vicarium, hoc est Rumanum Pontificem, ut omnibus notum est, aliquando monitis comprimit, aliquando vero flectit ac modicerat horatun, singulari interventu indicet, cum huic sola pontificalis monitis, ob reverentiam Apostolorum Principis, parentium offert voluntariam: et quos non virtus armorum humilium, pontificalis increpatio cum obscuratione in clausit. The popes possessed already some small forts; probably erected, in the first place, for protection of their patrimony. Thus Anastasius in vita xc. Gregorii II., relates, that the Lombards had taken from him the Campanum castrum, and that the pope having in vain required them to surrender it, John, Dux Neapolitanus, retook it from them, and gave it back to the former possessor. Pro cumus redempzione lxx. sori libras Ipse Sanctissimus Papa, sicut promiserat antea, dedixit.}

As had become customary under the Ostrogoth kings. Agatho, however, received from Constantine Pogonatus divalem jussionem, per quam relevata est quantitas, quae solita erat dari pro ordinatione Pontificis factiendæ: sic tamen, ut si contingat post ejus transitum electionem fieri, non debeat ordinari qui electus fuerit, nisi prius decretum generaliter introductur in regiam urbem secundum antiquam consuetudinem, et cum eorum conscientia et jussione debeat ordinatio provenire (Anastasius in vita lxxx. Agathonis). Benedict II. received from the same emperor the privilege ut persona, qui electus fuerit ad Sedem Apost. e vestigio abaque tarditatis Pontificis ordinetur (Anastasius in vita lxxxii. Benedict.). Still, however, this did not obviate the necessity of confirmation. See the forms in Liber diurnus, cap. ii. de ordinatione Summi Pontificis. Namely, tit. 1. Nuntius ad Exarchum de transitu Pontificis. Tit. 2. Decretum de electione Pontificis. (Scribed by totus Clerus, Optimates, et Milites seu Clives). Tit. 3. Relatio de electione Pontificis ad Principem. Tit. 4. De electione Pontificis ad Exarchum. On the same subject, tit. 5. ad Archiepisc. Ravennae, tit. 6. ad Judices Ravennae, tit. 7. ad Aposciasium Ravennae, to effect the speedy confirmation. Tit. 8. Ritus ordinandi Pontificis, and tit. 9. Professio pontificii.

Ex. gr. Anastas. in vita lxxxiv. Cononis: Hujus temporalibus pietas Imperialis relevavit per sacram jussionem suam ducenta annosae capita (i.e. capitationem), quae patrimonii custodes Bratiae et Lucaniæ annue persolvabant.

This was done by the popes Theodore and Martin I. during a vacancy in the see of Jerusalem, though the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem protested against it. See lib. Stephani Episc. Dorensis ad Synd. Rom. (Mansi, t. x. p. 899), and Martini P. Epist. ad Johannem Episc. Philadelphiae (ibid. p. 805, 88), comp. Walch's Ketzerhistorie, Th. 9. S. 289, comp. S. 214 and 240.
by their triumph at the sixth synod the popes strengthened anew their ancient calling as defenders of the true faith; and began at this time to attribute to themselves the title *Episcopus Universalis*, which Gregory the Great had declared to be anti-Christian. The *Quinisextum* could no longer humble them in the west. When Justinian II. attempted to bring Pope Sergius I. to Constantinople to compel him to subscribe the decrees of the Quinisextum, the garrison of Ravenna rose in rebellion, and soon after (701) the mere suspicion of such an intention caused a new uproar against the exarch. Hence, in order to confirm his own authority in Italy, Justinian II. invited Pope Constantine to visit him, and overloaded him with exceedingly high marks of honor (710). The loose connection between Rome and the empire was soon after shown in the refusal of the former to obey the heretic Philippicus Bardanes (711–713).

The oppressed Church of Africa now yielded to the claims of Rome without resistance. On the other hand they still met with much opposition in Italy. The bishops of Ravenna

9 Comp. Agathonic P. Ep. ad Imperatores (see above, § 128, note 14) ap. Mansi, xi. p 295: Petrus spirituales oves ecclesiae ab ipso redemptore omnium terrae commendatione pascerendas suscepsit: cujus annuntiate praeidio haec apostolica ejus ecclesia numquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est, cujus auctoritate, utpote Apostolorum omnium principis, semper omnis catholica Christi ecclesia, et universales synodi fideliter amplexentes, in eunctis secessae sunt, etc.

10 So first in the Liber diurnus cap. iii. tit. 6, ap. Hoffmann, ii. 95, in the promissio fidelis Episcopi, which falls between 682 and 685.

11 Anastasius vit. lxxxv. Sergii says: Sed misericordia Dei praevienit, beatoque Petro Apostolo et Apostolorum Princeps suffragante, suamque ecclesiam immutatam servante, excitatam est cor Ravennatis militiae, etc.

12 Anastasii vit. lxxxvi. Ioannis VI.

13 Anastas. vit. lxxix. Constant.: In die estem, qua se vicissim videreant, Augustus Christianissimus cum regno in capite se prostravit, pedes osculans Pontificis.

14 Comp. the letter of the African bishops to Pope Theodore in the Acts of the Conc. Lateran. ann. 649, Secretarius ii. (Mansi, x. 919): Magnum et indeficientem omnibus Christianis salute redundatum, apud apostolicam sedem consistere fontem nullus ambigere posset, de quo rivuli profundum affluenter, universum largissime irrigantes orbem Christianorum, cui etiam in honorem beatissimi Petri patrum decreta peculiarum omnem decreverer reverentiam in requirendis Dei rebus.—Antiquus enim regulis sanctum est, ut quidquid, quanvis in remotis vel in longinquis positis agetur urbe, ab universis conscripto, constat, ut ab auctoritate, juxta quae sacrificium, firmaretur, indeque suturem caeterae ecclesiae velut de natali suo fonte praedicandis exordium, et per diversas toius mundi regiones puritatis incorruptae mancipat fidei sacramenta salutis. Taken almost word for word from the letters of Innocent I and Zosimus to the African bishops. Comp. the passages § 94, notes 29, 33.
ventured to build higher claims on the fact that their city was
the seat of the exarch, in accordance with Grecian principles,
and even maintained for some time the independent manage-
ment of the Church of the exarchate, when Rome would not ac-
commodate herself to the imperial Monothelitism. Among the
Lombards catholicism found many adherents since the time of
Queen Theodelinda and her son King Adelwald (616–620);
and from the time of King Grimoald († 671) became the pre-
vailing system among them. Still, however, they remained
at variance with the popes; and Upper Italy asserted its
ecclesiastical independence. Theological learning continued to
be in a low state in Italy.

§ 132.

ECCLESIASTICAL STATE OF FRANCE AND SPAIN.

The superior dignity of the Romish Church was the more
readily admitted in the west on account of its being the only

---


16 Though always mixed with idolatry still. See vita S. Barbati (bishop of Benevent. † 682) in the Actis Sanct. Febr. iii. 139: Hic diebus quamvis sacri baptismatis unda Longobardi ablaeurentur, tamen priscum gentilitatis ritum tenentur, sive bestiali mente degebant, bestiae simulacra, quae vulgo Vipera nominatur, fleeteant colla, quae debite suo debeat fieri fecere creatores. Quin etiam non longe a Beneventi moenibus devotosissime sacrificium coelebant arborum, in qua suspenso corio, cuncti qui aderant terga vertentes arboris, celerius equitabant, calcaribus cruciantes equos, ut unus alterum posset praesero, atque in codem cursu retroversis manibus in corium jaculabantur, sique particula modi-
cam ex eo comedendam superstitione accepiebant. Et quia stulta ille persolvebant vota, ab actione nomen loco illi, sicut hactenus dicitur, Votum imposuerunt.


18 It is true that there is also found an indictionum (sacramenti) Episcopi de Longobardia in the Liber diurnus cap. iii. tit. 8, but such an oath was taken only by the bishops of the Roman patriarchal territory (the middle and south of Italy), who were now under the Lombard dominion.

19 This is clear, particularly from Agathonius Ep. ad Imp. in the Actis Syn. Constantinop. ann. 680, Act. iv. (ap. Mauz., xi. 235), where he repeatedly says of the legates whom he sends to the council: Non nobis corum scientia confidendum dedit, with the general re-
mark: Nam apud homines in medio gentium positos et de labore corporis quotidiamum victum cum summa haesitatione conquenteres, quomodo ad plenum poterit inveniri scripturarum scientia?
apostolic Church in that region, as well as the only medium of ecclesiastical connection with the east. But the greatest impression was made by the halo of holiness which surrounded that city in the eyes of the westerns; so that every thing proceeding from it was regarded as sacred.¹

The connection of the Frank Church with Rome was slight since the time of Gregory the Great. The chief authority lay continuously in the hand of the king; and thus all traces of metropolitan government had disappeared. Among the political disturbances of the French empire in the seventh century, the Church also fell into great disorder; the bishops took part in the feuds of the nobles; clergy and monasteries became ungovernable; and the better few, who wished to call attention to morality and discipline, were persecuted.² The robbing of Churches was not uncommon; and Charles Martel (major-domus from 717–741) even distributed ecclesiastical revenues and offices in usufruct to valiant soldiers (as beneficium, precatarium).³

¹ For example, Anastas. vit. xc. Gregor. II. after the account of the great victory gained by Duke Eudo at Aquitania over the Saracens at Toulouse (721): Eudo announced it to the pope, adicientes, quod anno præmissimo in benedictionem a praedicto viro eis directis tribus spongibus, quibus ad usum menaeae [perhaps the altar?] Pontificis apponuntur, in hora, qua bellum committebatur, idem Eudo Aquitanae princeps populo suo per modicas partes tribuenus ad summendum eis, nec unus vulneratus est, nec mortuus ex his, qui participati sunt.

² So Leodegar, bishop of Autun, who was put to death by the major-domus Ebrun, 678. Aigulf, abbot of a monastery at Lerins, wished merely to keep order among his monks, but was therefore abused, banished, and, in 675, murdered. See the lives of both in Mabillon Act. SS. Ord. Benedicti, saec. ii. p. 679, ss. 656, ss.

The Spanish Church appears to have gradually relaxed in humble subjection to the Roman see since catholicism had prevailed among the Goths likewise; although that subordination had been shown as long as the Church stood under the pressure of Arianism. Here also the king, as feudal lord of the bishops, was the head of the Church; but at the same time the bishops attained to a peculiarly great importance, both by their weighty voice in the election of the king, and by the necessity of supporting a tottering throne by means of spiritual authority.
Thus the connection with Rome ceased. The bishop of the royal metropolis, Toledo, was primate of the Spanish Church, and raised himself to a self-reliance, which exhibited itself very decidedly even in opposition to the Roman see. King Witiza (701–710) at length broke off all connection with it; but this

in conspectu Spiritus Sancti, et martyrum Christi, etc.—But further on also: To quoque praesentem regem, futurosque sequentiam aetatum principes humilitate qua debemus deperditi, moderati et mites erga subjectos existentes cum justitia et pieta populos a Deo volbis creditis regatis.—Ne quia quem vestrum solus in causa capitum aut rerum sententiam ferat, sed consensu publico, cum rectoribus, ex judicio manifesto delinquenterm culpa patet.—Sane de futuris regibus hanc sententiam promulgamus, ut si quis ex ipsis contra reverentiam legum, superba dominatione et fastu regio, in flagitiis et furor, sive cupiditate crudelissimam potestatem in populis exerceretur, anthemeis sententia a Christo domino condemneretur, et habeat a Deo separationem atque judicium, etc.

* Cenni, ii. 46, 62, 154.

7 From Gregorii M. lib. vii. Ep. 125, 126, it is plain that the same sent the pallium to Archbishop Leander of Seville. It may be that the latter was already dead († 599) when it came to him, so that for this reason no trace is found of his receiving it, as Cenni, ii. 225, supposes. That little value generally was attributed to the Roman pallium, is proved by the fact that the succeeding archbishops did not seek for it, and that, before the invasion of the Saracens, no other Roman pallium came to Spain, Cenni, ii. 222.—That self-reliance and independence are expressed particularly in the explanations of Archbishop Julian of Toledo, respecting the remarks made by Benedict II. against his confession of faith, in Conc. Toletan. xv. (688) ap. Mansi, xii. 9. They conclude with the words, p. 17: Jam vero si post haec et ab ipsis dogmatibus patrum, quibus haec prolatum sunt, in quocumque [Romani] dissentient, non jam cum illis est amplius contendendum, sed, majorum directo calle inhacrentes vestigiis, eni per divinum judicium amatoribus veritatis responsio nostra sublimis, etiamse ab ignorantibus aemulis censeatur indocilis.

8 Witiza is a remarkable example of the manner in which the clergy, treating of the historical persons of the middle ages, handled those who displeased them. The oldest writer of his history, Isidorus Pacensis (about 754. Chronicon in Spagna Sagrada por Henrique Florez, t. viii. p. 292, ss.), speaks in highly commendatory terms of his reign. He notices the ecclesiastical regulations made under his sanction in two places; first at the Agra, 736 (693, p. C.), when Witiza reigned along with his father Egica, p. 296: Per idem tempus Felix, urbis Regiae Toletanae Sedis Episcopus, gravitas et prudentia excellentissima nimirum polluit, et Concilia satis praecarae etiam adhuc eum amabimus Principibus agit. (To these councils also belongs Conc. Toletan. xviii. (701) at which, perhaps, the decrees above alluded to were enacted. Cf. Roderici Ximenii Hist. Hisp. iii. c. 15: Hic [Witiza] in ecclesia S. Petri, quae est extra Toletanum, cum episcopi et magnatibus super ordinaciones regni concilium celebravit, quod tamen in corpore canonum non habetur.) The second passage of Isidorus, p. 298: Per idem tempus (toward the end of Witiza’s reign) divinae memoriae Sinderdocus urbis Regiae Metropolitanae Episcopus sanctimonia studio claret: atque longevos et merito honorabiles viros, quos in suprafata sibi commissa Ecclesia repetit, non secundum scientiam zelo sanctitatis stimulat (probably he was zealous against unchastity) atque instincta jam dicti Witizae Principis eos sub ejus tempore convivxere non cessat. The first aspersions of Witiza appear in the Frankish Chron. Moissiacense (about 818) ad ann. 715, in Pertz Monumenta Germaniae Hist. i. 290: His temporibus in Spagna super Gottos regnabat Witicha.—Iste dedita in feminis, exemplo suo sacerdotibus ac populum luxurioso vivere docuit, irritans furorem Domini. Sarraecen tune in Spagna ingrediuntur. In Spagna these aspersions first appear in the Chron. Sebastiani Episc. Salmanticensis seu Alphonsi III. Regis (about 866 in España Sagrada, t. xiii.) They have been extended and exaggerated by Rodericus Ximenius, archbishop of Toledo, in the historia Hispanae (A.D. 1249) lib. iii. c. 15–17, and Lucas, Episc. Tudensi, in the continuation
step was attended with no important consequence, inasmuch as an incursion of the Saracens took place soon after.

§ 133.

ECCLESIASTICAL CONDITION OF THE BRITISH ISLANDS.

Among the Anglo-Saxons, Christianity had at first to struggle against heathenism with various fortune, but was afterward diffused by degrees in all the Anglo-Saxon states. Those who preached it were for the most part Roman missionaries; Northumberland alone being converted by the Scottish clergy, who introduced here the regulations of the ancient British Church. Old controversies between them and the Roman-English clergy were soon renewed; however, after a conference between both parties at the synod of Strenechal (now Whitby, not far from York, Synodus Pharensis 664), the king of Northumberland, Osuin, decided in favor of the Roman ordinances.¹ And since the well-ordered schools of the Irish monas-

of Isidore’s Chronicon (A.D. 1396). After relating many famous deeds of Witiza, it is stated by Rodericus, l. c. c. 16, in Andr. Schottii Hispania illustrata (Francof. 1603. 4 tomis, fol.) ii. 62: Verum quia ista sibi in facie resistebant [clericri], propert vexationem pontificis [Episc. Toletani] ad Romanum pontificem appellabant. Vitiza fachoratus timens, se suis criminibus obviarent, et populum ab eis obedientia revocarent, dedit licentiam, immo praeceptum, omnibus clericis, ut uxoros et concubinas unam et plures haberent juxta libitum voluptatis, et ne Romania constitutionibus, quae talia prohibebant, in aliquo obedientem, et sic per eos populos retineretur. Lucas Tadensis (ibid. iv. 69): Et ne adversus eum insurgeret s. ecclesia, episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus et caeteris ecclesiis Christi ministri canales uxoros lascivias Rex habere praecepit, et ne obiedirent Romano Pontifici sub mortis interminantia prohibuit. The state of the matter appears to have been this. Witiza, in conjunction with Siaderodus, archbishop of Toledo, opposed licentiousness in priests, and perceived that it could be eradicated only by allowing them to marry. The latter had been general among the Arians, and abolished when they joined the Catholic Church (cf. Conc. Tolet. iii. ann. 589, c. 5): Comportum est a sancto Concilio, Episcopos, Presbyteros et Diaconos venientes ex haeresi carnali adhibere desiderio uxoribus copulati: ne ego de cetero fiat, etc. Thus the judicial alteration, which had been introduced for one hundred years by the prohibition of the council, could be clearly noticed. Hence Witi-

zà allowed priests to marry, and declared the Roman decrees, forbidding it, to be of no binding force. Comp. a defense of King Witiza by Don Gregorio Mayans y Siscar, translated into German, from the Spanish, in Busching’s Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie, i. 379, ff. Aschbach’s Gesch. der Westgothen, S. 303, ff.

¹ Bedae Hist. eccl. gentis Anglorum, iii. 25. The remarkable conclusion of the dispute between the Scotch bishop, Colman, and the English presbyter, Wilfrid. The former appealed to Anastolius and Columba, the latter to Peter, and closed with the passage, Matth. xvi. 18: Tu es Petrus, etc. King Osuin then said: Verere, Colmane, haece illi Petro dicta sunt a Domino? Qui ait: vero, Rex. At ille: habetis, inquit, vos proferro aliquid
teries always attracted many young Anglo-Saxons to Ireland, and by this means might become dangerous to the Roman regulations, Rome sent forth into England, for the purpose of giving a check to this influence, the learned Theodore, born at Tarsus, as archbishop of Canterbury (668–690), and the abbot Hadrian, who every where strengthened the Roman ordinances, and, by the erection of schools, rendered those journeys to Ireland superfluous. No less active in favor of the Romish Church was also Wilfrid, a noble Anglo-Saxon, who, even when a young priest, had turned the scale at the synod of Whitby, had been afterward for a time bishop of York; and, driven thence, had preached, not without fruit, to the Frieslanders; and, lastly, had converted Sussex (about 680; † 709), where heathenism remained longest among the Anglo-Saxons.


3 Beda, iv. 2. (Theodorus) peragrata insula tota, quaquaversal Anglorum gentes morabantur,—rectum vivendi ordinem, ritum celebrandi pascha canonicalum, per omnia comitante et coeperante Adrianus disseminabat. Itaque primum erat archiepiscopus, cui omnis Anglorum ecclesia manus dare consentiret. Et quia litteræ sacris simul et secue.

3 Beda, lii. 27. (Theodorus) peragrata insula tota, quaquaversal Anglorum gentes morabantur,—rectum vivendi ordinem, ritum celebrandi pascha canonicalum, per omnia comitante et coeperante Adrianus disseminabat. Itaque primum erat archiepiscopus, cui omnis Anglorum ecclesia manus dare consentiret. Et quia litteræ sacris simul et secu.

It is true that the original missionary dependence of the Anglo-Saxon Church on Rome gradually ceased; here also the kings put themselves in possession of the same ecclesiastical privileges, which kings asserted in the other German kingdoms; the Latin language, connecting with Rome, was obliged to allow along with itself, even in the Liturgy, the Anglo-Saxon tongue; but notwithstanding such considerations, Rome continued to maintain an authority in the Anglo-Saxon Church which it did not now exercise in any other German Church.

Emulation with the Irish institutions for educational purposes also introduced into the Anglo-Saxon schools a very great activity. Not only did they distinguish themselves by the study of the Greek language, which Theodore had established in the whole of the west, but its stimulus unquestionably contributed to the development of the Anglo-Saxon dialect, already even as a written language. At the end of this period, England possessed the most learned man of the west, the Venerable Bede, a monk in the monastery of Peter and Paul at Yarrow († 735). The

---

6 Theodore was still in Rome when nominated Archbishop of Canterbury, after Wighard, who had been sent thither to be ordained, had died (Beda, iii. 59, iv. 1). But the decision of Rome in favor of Wilfrid, who had been expelled from the see of York (Eddius in vita Wilfridi, ap. Gale, i. 67), was not regarded; Wilfrid, on the contrary, was put in captivity (l. c. p. 60). The bishops were for the most part appointed by the kings (Lappenbergen's Gesch. v. England, i. 183), who had also the power of confirming the decrees of synods, and the highest judicial power over the clergy (Lappenbergen, i. 194).

7 Lappenbergen, i. 196.

8 Caedmon, a monk in the monastery of Streaneshalh (760) (Beda, iv. 24, non ab homini- bus, sed divinum adjutus gratis canendi donum accepit), author of poetical paraphrases of biblical books, especially of Genesis. See Caedmon's metrical paraphrase of parts of the Holy Scriptures, in Anglo-Saxon, by Benj. Thorpe. London. 1832. 8.—Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury, afterward bishop of Sherborne († 709), translated the Psalms (King Alfred said of him, according to Wilhelm. Malmesb. ap. Gale, i. 339: Nulla unquam spectar par ei fuit quia quos sanctos Anglicam posse facere, tantum componere, eadem asepinus vel canere vel dicere). As early as the year 680, there existed a version of the four gospels by Aldred. (Selden Praef, ad Scriptt. Hist. Angl. ed. Twysdon, p. 25): also Eckbert, bishop of Lindisfame, translated the gospels; Bede, the gospel of John.—Boewulf, a heroic poem, received its present form at this time from the hands of Christians (ed. G. F. Thorkelín, Copenhagen. 1817. 4, translated into German by L. Eittmüller. Zurich. 1840. 8). In like manner, about the year 700, there existed a poem (by Aldhelm?) descriptive of the conversion of the Myrmidonians by the apostle Andrew, and another on the finding of the cross by the emperor Helena, composed by one Cynowulf. See Andrew and Eileen, published by J. Grimm. Cassel. 1840. 8vo.

9 As a proof of his wide-spread fame is adduced Sergii P. L. Ep. ad Ccclfridum (abbot of the cloister there, A.D. 700, quoted in Guillelm. Malmesburiensis († 1143) de Rob. gestis Regum Angli, i. 3.: Hortamur Deo dilectam bonitatem tuam religiositatem, ut, quis exortis quibusdam ecclesiasticarum causarum capitulis (without doubt the cloister in question), non sine examinatione longius immetosendis, opus nobis sumt ad conferendam artia literarum imbuti, —abique aliquia inmoratione religiosum famulorum Dei (Bedam) venerabilis
new branch of ecclesiastical literature founded by John the Faster, in his penitential law-book, had been first adopted in the west by the British Church,\footnote{Stevenson, however, in his Introduction prefixed to Bedae Opp. Hist. tom. 1, p. x., shows that the word Bedam is wanting in an old MS. of this epistle, and was inserted by William of Malmesbury, but that Bede could not have been called at that time. —Bede's writings embrace Natural Philosophy, Chronology, Philosophy, Grammar, Astronomy, Arithmetic, etc., and give a view of all the learning of the time. In particular, Historia ecclesiast. gentis Anglorum libb. v., from Julius Caesar till 731 (ed. Fr. Chiffletius. Paris. 1691. 4. Joh. Smith. Cantabrig. 1732. fol.). De sex notatibus mundi liber. Lives of English monks. (Opera historica ad fidem Cod. MSS. rec. Jos. Stevenson, t. ii. Lond. 1838–41. 8.) Numerous commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, homilies, letters, etc. Opp. ed. Basile. 1563. t. viii. fol. Colon. 1688. t. iv. fol. ed. J. A. Giles, 5 vols. Lond. 1843. 8. H. Gehle Disp. de Bedae Var. vita et scriptis. Lugd. Bat. 1838. 8.} and, after its example, was also used among the Anglo-Saxons by \textit{Theodore, Bede, and Egbert of York († 767)}.\footnote{These \textit{libelli poenitentiales} do not seem to have as yet obtained currency any where out of England.} On the other hand, these \textit{libelli poenitentiales} do not seem to have as yet obtained currency any where out of England.

Endeavors were always proceeding from the Anglo-Saxon states to reconcile the Britons and Irish with the Roman Church as the common mother-church,\footnote{Theodori Liber poenitentialia, printed in its oldest existing form in the ancient laws and institutes of England, London. 1849. fol. and taken from this in Dr. F. Kuntsmann's latein. \textit{Poenitentialbuch der Angelsachsen. Mainz. 1844. S. 43. Theodori capitaula de redemptione peccatorum (ap. Kuntsmann, P. 106), give the oldest instructions how to purchase penitential masses by singing, prayer, and by money. —Beda de remediis peccatorum (ap. Kuntsmann, S. 142), elaborated, perhaps, by Egbert; and therefore Bede's canons are also occasionally attributed to the latter, and the Bullerin de Ant. collectionibus canonum p. iv. c. 6, have assigned the whole to him. Egbert's \textit{Poenitential}, Latin and Anglo-Saxon, is given in Wilkin's Conc. M. Brit. i. A fourth book was published by Mone, l. c. i. 501. Comp. Bullerin, l. c. Wasserschleben's \textit{Beiträge zur Gesch. u. Kenntniss der Beichtbücher in dess. Beitr. zur Gesch. d. vorchristianischen Kirchenrechtsquellen. Leipzig. 1839. S. 78.} Hence the fable which first appears in Boda, l. 4, that the British king, Lucius, in the second century, applied to Pope Eleutherus, obsercanus, ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficieretur, and that the British church was thus founded. Cf. D. Thiele de Ecclesiæ britann. primoculis part. 2 (Haleæ. 1839. 8.) i. 10, ii. 14.} and to unite them with the Church of the Anglo-Saxons. But although the abbot Adam-
nan, at the beginning of the eighth century, had labored to effect this object, not without success among the Britons and in the south of Ireland, and the monk Ecbert had gained over the northern Picts the side of Rome, yet the breach was not removed by this means. It was not till the decline of the Irish Church amid the continued civil wars, that, toward the end of the eleventh century, Dublin first came to attach itself to the archbishop of Canterbury; afterward the archbishop of Armagh, Malachy († 1148), was active in favor of Rome; till at last Ireland and Wales were conquered by Henry II, and

13 Beda, v. 16.
14 Beda, v. 23.
15 Beda, v. 24, says, when he speaks of the condition of his times (732): Britones maxima ex parte domestici sibi odio gentem Anglorum et totius catholicæ Ecclesiae statum pascha minus recto moribusque improbæ impugnauit. About the same time Gregory III. (731-741) warns the German bishops of the British errors. See an epistle among those of Boniface Ep. 139: Gentilitatis ritum et doctrinam, vel venientium Britonum abjicatis.
16 Bernardus Claraevall. de vita S. Malachiaæ, c. 10 (Opp. ed. Montfaucon, i. 673): Mos pessimus inoleverat quorundam diabolicæ ambitione procerum, sedem sanctæm (Armaewan) obtuentm iri haereditaria successione. Nee enim patibantur episcopati, nisi qui essent de tribu et familia san.—Et eo usque firmaverat sibi jus pravum—generatio mala,—ut etiam interdum defecissent clerici de sanguine illo, sed Episcopi nunquam. Denique jam octo existenter ante Celsum viri uxorati, et ab his Ordinibus, literati tamen. Inde tota illa per universam Hiberniam—dissolutu ecclesiasticae disciplinae, censuræ enervato, religionis evacuato.—Nam—sine ordino, sine ratione mutabantur et multica-bantur Episcopi pro libitum Metropolitani, ita ut unus Episcopus uno non esset contentus, sed singulæ paene Ecclesiae singulos haberent Episcopos. Hinc alioquæ, perhaps, may be explained the statement of Ekkhelardus († 1070, a monk in St. Gallen, to which place many Irish came at that time) in his Liber benedictionem: In Hibernia Episcopi et Presbyteri unum sunt (ex MS. in Arch Gesch. v. St. Gallen, i. 597).
17 Lantfrac, A.D. 1074, consecrated Patricius, who was chosen bishop of Dublin, and obtained from him the promise of canonical obedience. All subsequent bishops of Dublin were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. See J. Usseri Veterum epistolarum hiberniarum syllgo, Dublinii. 1632. 4. p. 68, 118, 136, but for this very reason luted by the other Irish bishops. After this Gillebertus Ep. Lunicensis (of Limerick) endeavored as well as Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, to induce the other Irish also to come to the same conclusion, l. c. p. 77, 88. The church of Waterford also attached itself to England 1066. p. 92.
18 He stood in close connection with St. Bernard, and died in a journey to Rome in Clairvaux. Bernard wrote on this lib. de vita et rebus gestis S. Malachiae (Opp. ed. Montf. i. 663). Malachy was legatus sedis Apost. per totam Hiberniam, but did not desire the pallium. In Clairvaux he educated young Irishmen, and then founded by their instrumentality, Cistercian monasteries in Ireland (vita Mal. c. 16. Usserii Vett. epist. hibern. p. 102). Immediately after him came the first pallia to Ireland. See Chronica de Mailros (ed. Edinburgi. 1823. 4) p. 74: Anno MCL I Papa Eugenius quattuor pallia per legatum suum Johannem Papirum transmisit in Hiberniam, quo nunquam ante pallium delatum fierat.
thus the complete connection of the British and Irish Church with Rome was effected.

§ 134.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN GERMANY.


The attempts to convert the Germans, whether made by Franks, or by Irish and Anglo-Saxons, were as yet but partially successful.

The Irish Kilian lost his life in the cause at Würzburg (689); as also Emmeram at Ratisbon (654). In Bavaria, however, better success attended Rupert, bishop of Worms, who baptized Duke Theodore II. († 696), and founded the Church of Salzburg († 718); as also Corbinian, who gathered a church in Freisingen († 730).

On the other hand, Anglo-Saxon monks endeavored to spread Christianity among the kindred north-German races. Witfrid was the first who preached among the Frieslanders († 677). 5

Afterward Willebrord, first bishop of Wiltaburg (Utrecht) from 696–739 labored, along with his associates, with much success, under the protection of the Franks, among the West Frieslanders and the surrounding territories; but the East Frieslanders remained steadfast to paganism. The Saxons even murdered the two Ewalds who visited them; and Suidbert, who had at first been received among the Boructiarii, was afterward obliged to retreat, when they were subdued by the Saxons; and obtained from Pipin an island in the Rhine to establish a convent on it (Kaiserswerth) 713.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES AND NOTES,

BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

§ 1. The Idea of the Church.—Prof. Leo, of Halle, in his Ferienschriften, Halle, 1847, contends for the Celtic origin of the word kirche, church. In the Celtic, cyrch or cylich designates the central point, around which something is gathered, the place of assemblage. Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 1, § 1, remarks, "that the introduction of the word among the Anglo-Saxons, and through English missionaries among the Germans," is the most probable hypothesis. For the idea of the church, cf. Dr. A. Petersen, Die Idee d. Kirche, 3 Thle. 1843-45.—Rev. Arthur Litten, Church of Christ in its Idea, etc. Lond. 1851.—W. Palmer, on the Church, 2. 1841.—The Princeton Repertory, 1846, 1853, 1854.—Field, B. of the Church (1638), new ed. by R. Eden, 4. 8. 1853.—Munchmeyer, d. Dogma von der sichtbaren und der unsichtbaren Kirche. 1854.—J. Müller, d. unsichtbare Kirche, Deutsche Zeitschrift. 1851.—Scherer, l'Eglise. 1844.

§ 2. On the general subject of this section, the most important recent work is, Bauer's Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung, Tubingen, 1852, written to sustain the views of the Tubingen school.—Hagenbach, Neander's Services as a Church Historian, transl. in Bib. Sacra, vol. viii. 1851.—Nieder, Zeichnung des Umfanges für d. Inhalt d. Gesch. d. christl. Religion: in Studien u. Kritiken. 1853.


The State in its Relations with the Church. By W. E. Gladstone, Esq. 4th ed. 2. 8. 1841.—Dr. Pusey on the Royal Supremacy. 1849.


History of Theology.—Dr. W. Gase has begun an important work on the "History of the Protestant Theology," vol. 1. 1854.—Schweizer, d. Protestantischen Centraldogen in ihrer Entwickelung, Bd. 1. 1854. Earlier works are, Heinrich, Gesch. d. Dogmatik. 1790; Schickes. 1827; W. Herrmann. 1842.

Neander's "Memorials of Christian Life" have been translated in part, and published in Bohn's Library. 1853.


Works on the General History of the Christian Church.—Neander's history has been admirably translated by Prof. Joseph Torrey, of the University of Vermont, in 5 vols. 8vo, comprising the whole of the original, including Schneider's edition of the last volume. Boston, 1849-54.—The seventh edition of Dr. Hase's History, translated by C. E. Bumhvel and C. P. Wing, 8. New York, 1855.—Markeinecke, Universal Kirchenhist. Bd. 1. 1806.—Fleury, Eccles. Hist., with Tillemon's Chronology, transl. to A. D. 870, 5. 4. 1727-32.


Of Bohringer's "die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen," a church history in biographies, the third division of the second volume, for the Middle Ages, has been published. 1855.

Of the later more popular manuals of church history in German, Joda's appeared in 1838; Thiele, 2d ed., 1852; Jacobi, Bd. 1, 1850; Schmidt, Lehrb. 1851; Wilcke, 1850; Trautmann, 1892-54; Huber, Universalgesch. 1850.

The "Ecclesiastical History of Meletius," metropolitan of Athens in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, previously issued in inferior modern Greek, though written in the ancient, is issued at Constantinople, edited by Prof. Constantine Euthymioues, first vol. 1853.

Stolberg's Geschichte is continued by Brischar, 1853, Bd. 49, being the 4th vol. of the continuation.—Dollinger's Church History to the Reformation, translated by Ed. Cox, Lond. 4. 8. 1849; "History of the Reformation" in German, in 1846.—Rohrbacher, histoire universelle de l'église, 29 tom. Par. 1842-49. A new edition is in the course of publica-
COLLATERAL HISTORICAL WORKS.


The Annals of Barovius are to be continued by Aug. Theiner from A.D. 1573, where they were left by Laderchi; his History of Clement XIV. is a part of this work, which he undertook by request of Gregory XVI.—Palma, Praelationes historico-eclesiasticæ. Romæ. 3 voll. 1839–42.—N. J. Cherrier (Pesth), Epitome Hist. Eccl. Nov. Foederis, 2. 8. Vienna, 1854.


History of Literature.—Grasse, Lchrb. einer allgemeinen Literar-geschichte aller bekannten Völker, i.–iii., 3. 2 (to the first half of the nineteenth century). 1857–54.—H. Hallam’s View of the State of Europe in the Middle Ages, 3. 8. tenth ed. 1853; Literature of 15th to 17th centuries, 2. 8. 1853.—Sismondi’s, of the South of Europe.—Quérard’s, la France littéraire.—Tiecknur’s Spanish Literature.—Germain, Gesch. d. Deutschen Literatur.

Upon the History of Art, in relation to Christianity, the work of Dr. Gieseler contains no references. Prof. Dr. F. Piper, Mythologie u. Symbolik der christlichen Kunst, Bd. 1. 1851.—Dr. F. Kugler, Hand-book of the Hist. of Art, new ed. transl. Lond. 1854.—Lord Lindsay’s Sketches of the History of Christian Art, 3. 8. 1847.—Didron’s Christian Iconography, 1, transl. in Bohn’s Library. 1852.—Symbols and Emblems of Early and Me-
Sources of Ecclesiastical History.


The volume of the “Acta Sanctorum,” for Oct. 10 and 11, was reprinted at Brussels in 1852; the vol. for Oct. 17-20, the second of the Brussels continuation, was published in 1853; the first of this continuation in 1845.—*Alban Butler’s Lives of the Saints*, 12. 8. New York, 1849.

WORKS ON THE COUNCILS AND SYMBOLS.


J. G. Wach, Bibliotheca Patristica. 1770.—Augusti, Christomathia Patristica. 1812.


The first volume of Hefele, Geschichte d. Concilien, 1855, reaches to the fourth century.
—German: Hartstheim, Conc. Germaniae. 1749, 10 fol.

Beveridge, Pandectae Canon. ss. et Conciliorum ab Ecclesia Graeca receptorum, etc., 2 fol. Oxon. 1672.


Bullarium Romanum, etc. Continuation by A. Spettia. 1835-44, 8 tom. fol. Another volume added in 1832.

P. Jafer, Regesta Pontif. Romanorum a condita Ecclesia ad annum post Christum 1199. Berol. 1851, 4. These Regesta, from 1198 to 1572, are in the Vatican, in 2016 folios. Among the Protestants, Pertz & Simon the only one who has been allowed to examine them, for his Monumenta Germaniae. The Regesta to 1198 are for the most part
WORKS UPON THE PRIMITIVE HISTORY.

lost. Jafé, in the above work, has collected the fragments (cf. Kuritz, Handbuch, 1. § 4).


on the Preparation of Man for Christianity. Lond. 1840.—Moore's Commentaries, vol. i. p. 9-49.—Trench, Unconscious Prophecies of Heathenism (Hulsean Lect.). Am. ed. 1853.—Maurice, Religions of the World, etc. Am. ed. 1854.—State of Man before Pro- 
mulication of Christianity, in "Small Books," etc. 1848.—Schaaf, p. 143-164.


—J. C. Harless, de Supernaturalism Gentilismo (Progr.). 1834.—J. F. Sepp, d. Heiden- 
thum, u. seine Bedeutung. 3. 8. 1853.—A. Wutke, Gesch. ds. Heidenthums, 2 Bde. 1854.

§ 15-19. Condition of the Jewish People, etc.—The works of Josephus, transl. into Eng- 
lish by W. Whiston, in frequent editions; a new transl. by R. Trail, with notes by J. 
Taylor, 2. 8. 1847.—Dr. F. Cruzer on Josephus: Stud. u. Krit. 1830, 1833.—Preparation 
for the Gospel, as exhibited in the History of the Israelites. By Geo. Carey (Hulsean 
Lect.). 1851.—W. H. Johnstone, Israel in the World; or, the Mission of the Hebrews to 
the great military Monarchies, 12. London, 1854.—Id., Israel after the Flesh, etc., 8. 
London, 1852.—Kurts, Sacred History. Transl. by Dr. Schaffer. Philad. 1855.—Id., Ge- 
schichte des alten Bundes, 1. 2 (1854).—Lengerke, Kenaan, 1. 1841.—Dr. Murdoch, trans- 
8. 1851-54.—Leo, Vorlesungen. 1829.—Bensinger, Hist. d. Juifs, 15 tom. 12.—M. De Bon- 

Hall, Contemplations on Old and New Test. (1634) in Works. 1808.—Samuel Shuck- 
ford, Connection Sacred and Profane History, 3. 8.—Russell's Connection, 2. 1827.— 
of Bible. Edited by Geo. Bardin, 3. 8. Lond. 1805.—Sharon Turner's Sacred Hist. of 
1626; abridged by Bernard, 1849.—Saurin, Discours Hist. Theol. Moraux, etc. 1720, eq. 
Test., 1843.—Valette, Rel. d. Alt. Test., 1. 1835.—Knobel, d. Prophetismus. 1837.— 
J. C. K. Hoffmann, Weissagung u. Erfullung im A. u. N. Test., 2. 8. 1841.—Spirit of 
Old Test., Dr. J. Lewis's Bibl. Repos. 1850.—Palfrey, Academical Lectures on Jewish 
Script. and Antiq., 4. 8. 1850-52.

Samaritans.—J. Grimm, d. Samariter, u. ihre Stellung in d. Weltgeschichte. München, 
1853.—Christ. Exam., 28. 29 (J. Walker).—M. Stuart, in Bibl. Repos., vol. 5, and North 
Am., vol. 22.

The Essenes.—Kite's Journal. Oct. 1852; April, 1853; Oct. 1853.—W. Hall, Bibl. Re- 
pos., 3d series, 3.

1849.—Dr. Rubinson, in Christ. Rev. Jan. 1853.—First Engl. transl. by C. D. Yonge, 
Bohn's Lib. 3 vols. published 1855.—John Jones, Eccles. Researches on Philo and Jose- 

§ 20, page 59.—The Life of Jesus.—Dr. J. N. Sepp, d. Leben Jesu, 4. 8. München, 
1843, sq. (French transl. 1843).—Ebrard, Wiss. Kritik d. Evangel. Geschichte. 1842.— 
Krabbe, Leben Jesu. 1838.—Weisse, Evangel. Gesch., 2. 1838, 9.—Geyer, d. Urchrist- 
thum, 1. Ostiander, Apologie. 1837.—J. P. Lange, d. Leben Jesu, 3. 1844.—Hoff.
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mann, d. Leben Jesu nach d. apocryphen Evangelien. 1853.—Ewald, Geschichte Christi und seiner Zeit. 1855.


§ 30. Constitution of the Church.—Rothe, Die Anfänge d. christl. Kirche. 1837.—Baur,
§ 35. The Apostolic Fathers.—The third edition of Hefele, Patrum Apostol., etc. 1849.
Archbishop Wake’s Genuine Epistles of Apostol. Fathers (1692). New York, 1817.—
Draille, Right Use of the Fathers. Transl. by S. W. Harnam. Lond. 1838 (Phil. ed.).
Collinson’s Bampton Lecture, Key, etc. 1813.—C. W. Woodhouse, Use and Value of the Fathers (Hulsean Essay). Lond. 1842.—Bickersteth, The Fathers. Lond. 1845.
Papias, Fragments, in Lardner’s Credibility, vol. 2.
A. H. L. Fuldner, Comm. de Ophelis. 1834.
APOLOGIES AND APOCRYPHAL WORKS.


§ 54. New Platonism.—Ochs, Kingsley, Four Lectures on Alexandria and her Schools. Lond. 1854.—Proechs, transl. by T. Taylor, 2. 4. 1816.—Plotinus, by Taylor, 8. 1834.
ORIGEN AND HIPPOLYTUS.


§ 65. Hippolytus, p. 225. — Gieseler's modified View, in Stud. u. Krit., 1853. A large addition has been made to the literature by the discovery and publication of the "Philosophumena, sive omnium Haeresorum Refutatia," edited by J. Muller, and issued at Oxford in 1851, as a work of Origen. — Bunsen's Hippolytus and his Age, 4, 8; second edition, 8, under the title of Christianity and Mankind. — Jacob's, Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1851; Meth. Qu. Review, 1851; Theolog. Critic, 1892; Edinb. Review, 1852 and 1853; Christ. Remembr, 1853; Dublin Review, 1853, 1854; British Quarterly (two articles), 1853; Westminster, 1853; North British, 1853; Christ. Review, 1853; North American, 1854. — Ritschl, Veldehorn and Bauer, in the Theol. Jahrb., 1853, '4. — Journal of Class. and Sacred Philol., 1854.

— New Brunswick Review, 1854.

Besides these articles, a number of independent works have been published. — Chr. Wordsworth, The Church of Rome in the third Century, with Reference to Hippolytus. 1853. — W. Elpe Taylor, Analysis of Hippolytus. 1854. — Lenormant, Controversie sur les Philosoph. d'Origine. Par. 1853. — Dollinger, Hippolytus u. Kallistus. 1854. — Cruice, Etudes
WORKS ON THE SECOND PERIOD.


§ 70. Divine Service, p. 244.—Bunsen's Hippolytus, Analecta Ante-Nicaea, 3. 8; Re- ligious Liturgiae.


J. B. Heard, The Extinction of Christianity in the Roman Empire, in Relation to the Evidences of Christianity (Hulsean). 1851.—Attilla, par Amédée Thierry, Rev. des deux Mondes. 1852.

WORKS ON THE FATHERS.


Whitaker's Origin of Arianism.


Baur and Dömer, in their works on the Trinity and Incarnation.—Petrinius, in his "Theol. Dogm.," 3 fol. tom. 2.—Frohschammer, d. Vorsitz auf d. Synode zu N. (Beiträge zur Kirchengesch. 1850.)

Bishop Bull, Defensio Fid. Nicaen. in his Works, 8. 8.—Id., Disc. on Doctrine of Catholic Church. Sherlock, Doctrine of Trinity. 1690.—Waterland, Vindication of Christ's Divinity: Works. 1843.—Hampden, in Bamboo Lects. 3d ed. 1848.


CHRYSOSTOM AND AUGUSTINE.


Gregory of Nyssa.—Doctrina de hominis natura illustravit et cum Origeniana compara- ravit, by E. G. Moeller. Halle, 1852.

Hilary.—In the Spicilegium Solesmense, ed. by Pitra, 1853, fragments of a commentary on Paul are vindicated for Hilary; cf. Christ. Remembr., July, 1853. Against this, and for Theodorus, Jacobi, in the "Deutsche Zeitschrift," 1854.


Theodor of Mopsuestia.—Comm. in N. T., ed. Frischke. 1847.—Doctrina de imagine Dei, Dorner, 1844; cf. Dorner's Person. Christi.—Commentar. in Spicileg. Solem. (see under Hilary, above).


Synesius.—Quae exstant Opera omnia, ed. by J. G. Krabinger, tom. 1. 1850.—Homilies; trad. pour la prem. fois, par B. Kolbe. Berl. 1850.


Shickesdale d. Augustinischen Anthropologie von d. Verdammung ds. Semipelagianismus
HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.


Julius Müller, Der Pelagianismus, ein Vortrag. Deutsche Zeitschrift. 1855.


Storia dei Papi, Bianchi-Giustiniani (8 vols. published in Switzerland).


Edict of Valentinian III. on Papal Supremacy, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1855.

Routh, Tres breves Tractatus (the third, S. Irenaei illustratas pagis, in qua Ecclesia Romana commemoratur), Oxon. 1854; cf. Pusey, Notes to Sermon on the Rule of Faith. 1854.


Doxam, Essai Hist. sur la puissance Temporelle des Papes (written at the instance of Napoleon); see Quar. Rev., Oct. 1853.


Christ. Remembr., 1855, on the papal and royal Supremacy.

Synod of Saricta, p. 379, in Shepherd's Church of Rome, 1852; its Acts discussed.—Barrow on the Papal Supremacy (also a recently discovered treatise of Barrow).—Scotch Eccl. Journal, April and May, 1852.

Leo, p. 392.—St. Cheron, vie de Leo, 8. Paris (to be translated).

CHRISTIANITY IN GERMANY.


§ 112, p. 382. Æthiopia.—Geddes, History of Church of Æthiopia. Lond. 1696.—Id., Hist. of the Church of Malabar. Lond. 1694.


§ 114, p. 389. Diomnysius the Areopagite.—Opera omnia quae extant, ed. B. Coderei. Leips. 1854.

Boethius, De Consolatione. Transl. into English by Chaucer; also by Lord Preston, with Notes, 1851.—2d ed. 1712, by Ridpath. Lond. 1785.—G. Baur, de Boethio. Darmst. 1841.


Ozanam (A. F.), Etudes Germaniques, 2. 8; La Germanie avant le Christianisme, 1847.


EARLY HISTORY OF BRITAIN.


Ælfric, Remains of, ed. by L. J. Le, 1623; with a reprint of the "Testimoniae Antiquitie," sanctioned by Archbishop Parker. 1567.
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