GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH:

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIRST, REVISED AND ALTERED THROUGHOUT ACCORDING TO THE SECOND EDITION.

1871

BY JOSEPH TORREY,

PROFESSOR OF MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

"Let both grow together until the harvest." *Words of our Lord.*

"Les uns Christianisant le civil et le politique, les autres civilisant le Christianisme, il se forma de ce mélange un monstre. *St. Martin.*

VOLUME SECOND:

COMPRISING THE SECOND GREAT DIVISION OF THE HISTORY.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CROCKER & BREWSTER.
LONDON: WILEY & PUTNAM.
1848.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1847,

By CROCKER & BREWSTER,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

STEREOTYPED BY
SAMUEL N. DICKINSON,
BOSTON.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

HAVING, through the kindness of the respected friend by whom I was first induced to engage in the present translation, the Rev. Dr. ROBINSON, of NEW YORK, obtained an early copy of the second edition of this volume, I have been enabled to incorporate a great part of the new matter which it contains with the text of my translation. The rest has been added in the form of notes at the end of the volume.

The only places in which this translation does not exactly accord with the last edition of the original work, are the introductions to a few of the sections, and the section generally which relates to the emperor Julian. In the latter case, the difference lies chiefly in the arrangement of the matter: in the former, I have purposely adhered to the old edition, where the thoughts are substantially the same, but more briefly and simply expressed.

With the volume now published, my labors on this great work end for the present. Should they meet with

any such reception as to justify the undertaking, I shall be ready, with the Divine permission, to resume my task at some future time.

I must once more express the great obligations which I feel myself laid under by the Rev. Mr. TRACY of Boston, without whose invaluable assistance, it would have been next to impossible for me, situated as I am, to carry this work, with the necessary degree of correctness, through the press. After all the care bestowed by him and by myself, I still observe occasional slight errors in the first volume. The same thing may occur again also in the present volume, for which I must ask the reader's indulgence. As a general thing, I hope it will be found that the notes and references, upon which I have bestowed peculiar attention, may be relied upon as sufficiently accurate.

J. TORREY.

BURLINGTON, OCTOBER 1, 1847.

DEDICATED

TO MY EARLY AND FAITHFUL FRIEND,

DR. KARL SIEVEKING,

SYNDIC OF THE FREE TOWN OF HAMBURG,

OUR COMMON AND BELOVED NATIVE CITY:

IN REMEMBRANCE OF OUR EARLY FRIENDSHIP, WHICH, HAVING GROWN OUT OF WHAT IS ETERNAL, CANNOT PERISH.

Berlin, September 30th, 1829.

WITH heartfelt joy, and thankfulness to Him in whose hands our life is, I now renew this dedication, April 30th, 1846, to serve as an abiding memorial of that union of souls which was formed in the enthusiasm of youth for the whole of life, and which, with God's help, shall endure, under all diversities of outward condition, down to the grave and beyond it.

A. NEANDER.

DEDICATION OF PART II.

TO THE VERY REVEREND ABBOT

DR. G. J. PLANCK,

ON THE DAY OF THE SEMI-CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF HIS INDUCTION INTO THE SACRED OFFICE.

Beloved and highly respected Instructer,

WILL you, on this day, when so many doubtless will unite in showing you the testimonies of their love, esteem, and gratitude, also receive, with your usual condescension, this expression of his hearty, inextinguishable thanks, from an old pupil, who presents you a gift, which, insignificant as it may be to you, is yet, from his own position, the best he has to offer. Though with many things in this book you may not be satisfied, still you will not fail to recognize, in his earnest endeavors to be charitably just, the pupil who, from the great master himself to whom he is under so many obligations, first learned to strive after the *suum cuique* in his construction of historical facts. And with your own candid justice, which, ennobled by the spirit of charity, has been tried through half a century, you will know how to place the right estimate on each of your pupils who with earnest intentions labors on at his own position. Therefore it is, that I confidently rely on your indulgence in offering you this token of grateful love and respect.

Praise be to God, who gave us you to be our instructer, and who has preserved you to us so long: and long may he still preserve you, honored teacher, to shine as a light before us by your precepts and your example.

This, on this day, is the warmest wish of your affectionate and grateful pupil.

A. NEANDER.

PREFACES TO THE FIRST EDITION.

PREFACE TO PART I.

I HERE present to the public the first part of the second volume of my Church History, containing the first two sections, as the second part will contain the next two following ones. I still hold to what I expressed in the prefaces to the several parts of the first volume.

As it regards the notion of the *invisible church*, which seems in my history to have given offence to many Catholic theologians, and to others, it will without doubt still continue to be the fundamental principle in this history of the church; as indeed it must, in my opinion, give the direction to every right treatment of church history generally. It will constantly be my endeavor to trace, and wherever I can find it, to seize and exhibit, with a charitable zeal, the manifestations of this truly catholic, invisible church, both among the orthodox and among heretics, and honestly to distinguish it from every thing that does not proceed out of the essence of this invisible church.

Critical remarks, carefully written, on those particular portions of my work to which I have devoted myself with a peculiar affection, and hence with a proportional degree of fulness and originality, would be thankfully received by me, nor should I fail to avail myself of all they might afford me in improving this work, which hereafter it will be my endeavor to perfect as I have opportunity; and I take this opportunity to express my grateful acknowledgments to Dr. Gieseler for a critique of this sort on my account of Manichæism.

BERLIN, JUNE 27, 1828.

PREFACE TO PART II.

IN presenting to the public the second section of the second volume of my Church History, I think it necessary only to add the following remarks to what I have already said in the earlier prefaces.

I have supposed it would contribute to the reader's convenience as well as to my own, to separate here also the rich materials into two different sections. The plan, perhaps, will be found to be justified by the execution.

In the first volume, I placed the history of Christian Anthropology after the history of the doctrine of the Trinity. But as the controversies on the doctrine of the Trinity are, in the present period, so closely connected with the controversies concerning the two natures in Christ, I have thought it best to abandon that arrangement here, and to place the history of the doctrine concerning the person of Christ immediately after the history of the doctrine of the Trinity. Furthermore, I doubtless might have concluded this section with the history of the doctrine of the Trinity; and this arrangement was recommended by various considerations; — but as the commencement of the history of the doctrine concerning Christ's person is, in this period, so closely connected with many views that had

been developed in the history of the doctrine of the Trinity, and they mutually serve to explain and to integrate each other, I preferred rather to include the latter also in this section.

The judgment of all unprejudiced friends of the truth, whether favorable or otherwise to my own views, and whether relating to my general scope and design, or to any particular points I have touched, will ever be welcomed by me. As to the criticisms of those who are leaders or slaves to schools and parties, I despise them. Popery of all sorts is my abhorrence, — whether it be a state-church, a doctrinal, a pietistic, or a philosophic, an orthodox, or a heterodox popery. May the Lord preserve in his church the liberty he has achieved for it; and may none who are his disciples, suffer themselves to be the slaves of any man or of any human mind.

Of those who undertake to criticise this work as a whole, I must of course beg, that they would reserve their judgment respecting the arrangement of the several parts of this section, until the whole is completed.

BERLIN, SEPT. 30, 1829.

PREFACE TO PART III.

WITH thanks to Him who has enabled me to proceed thus far with my work, I here present to the public the completion of its second great division.

I have prosecuted my design thus far from the point of view which I set forth in the preface to the first volume; and from the same point of view, which has been the result of my life and studies, I shall go on to complete the work, so far as I may be enabled to do so by the Divine goodness. This point of view is with me firmly established, whatever may be objected to it by those who are wont to regard all history as merely the sport of human caprice, and to explain the greatest effects from the most trivial causes, or who think themselves able to measure the development of the divine life in humanity, and to reach the depths of man's soul and spirit, by certain pitiful dogmas of the understanding, to which every thing else must be forced to bend. That any irreconcilable opposition exists between an *edifying* and an *instructive* church history, is what I shall never be disposed to admit. Edification can proceed only from the clear exposition of truth. Whatever, by the investigation of science, is shown to be a delusion, ceases from that very moment to be a source of edification. Ill would it fare with the practical business of edification, if it were incompatible with the free and enlightened views of the spirit. The truth, which is a witness to the power of the Godlike, cannot, if rightly apprehended, be otherwise than edifying; nay, the less vitiated it is, the more edifying must it become. Nor is it necessary that the bad should be passed over in silence or concealed out of view: for, without the knowledge of that too, as it is, God's judgments in the history of the world and the progressive triumphs of His kingdom in its conflicts with evil cannot be understood. The progress of Christianity cannot be learned without separating from it whatever has proceeded from foreign influences. In a word, there can be no true and genuine history of the kingdom of God, which is not accompanied side by side with the history of the kingdom of evil. But to be sure, the truth alone, which is its own witness, should here, as it instructs, also edify; which it certainly will do with the more purity and efficiency in proportion as the subjective character of the historian, faithfully open to the self-revealing spirit of Christianity, serves as the organ of it. This is the *objectivity* which I aim at; and in those cases where my own subjective views and feelings have intruded, as no doubt they have often done, I shall always be ready to acknowledge the fault, and seek to correct it. Thus much in reference to the κυρίαις δόξαις belonging to the various tendencies of the spirit of the age: and now, according to the measure of knowledge which God has bestowed, or may bestow on me, I shall quietly pursue my way, unconcerned as to what may be said on this side or on that.

I have, in this volume, interwoven the history of the more eminent church-teachers into the history of the doctrinal controversies, both for the sake of clearness and vivacity, and also to save room — hence there is no particular section devoted to the teachers of the church.

In that section particularly which treats of Chrysostom, I have confined myself within narrower limits, because a new edition, improved and enlarged, of the first volume of my Chrysostom is shortly to appear.

In my exposition of the system of Theodore of Mopsuestia, which is so interesting a subject, I would very gladly have availed myself of his Commentary on the Minor prophets — a work of great importance in its bearing on the history of the peculiar tendencies of the theological spirit, and one which has been long due to the public. May my friend Von Wegnern of Königsberg, instead of disappointing our hopes like Majus, soon give us the pleasure of seeing an edition of this important work.

JUNE 4, 1831.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

MY duty to the public and to this work, which I undertook in obedience to an inward call, demands of me, that before issuing the volume which carries the history of the church down to the times of the Reformation, I should prepare a new edition of the second great division, — the first having long since been disposed of. In doing this, I am bound thankfully to avail myself of all the new light which has been thrown on the history of the dissemination of Christianity by our own great master, C. Ritter, by Professor Neumann of Munich, and by Professor Waitz of Kiel. A considerable part of the matter in the section which treats of the emperor Julian, and of the relation of the later New-Platonism to Christianity, will need to be remodeled; as also in the section which treats of Jovinian. Also, in other parts of the work, I must endeavor to introduce improvements in the matter, but more especially in the form of many scattered passages. Critical remarks, with the scientific grounds on which they are based, I shall ever estimate at their just value. The revilings of party passion I know how to despise, and vulgarity I shall leave to punish itself.

A. NEANDER.

BERLIN, APRIL 20, 1846.

[The rest of this preface is a beautiful and affectionate tribute to the memory of Hermann Rossel, the young friend of Neander, whom he notices in one of the prefaces to the first volume, and who died the same year (1846) in which this new edition passed through the press. *Translator.*]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME SECOND.

SECOND PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.
FROM THE END OF THE DIOCLESIAN PERSECUTION TO THE TIME OF GREGORY THE GREAT, BISHOP OF ROME; OR FROM THE YEAR 312 TO THE YEAR 590.

SECTION FIRST.

RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE WORLD. ITS EXTENSION AND LIMITS, p. 1—129.

Within the Roman Empire, 1—103.

Relation of the Roman Emperors to the Christian Church, 1—84.

PAGE

Import of the edict of Galerius ..... 1—2

Maximin. His measures in relation to the Christians. Favor shown to Paganism. Means adopted for its restoration, (Acta Pilati.) Last effusion of blood in consequence of the Dioclesian persecution ..... 2—5

Constantine. His early history and education. Resides while a youth at the courts of Diocletian and of Galerius. Becomes Augustus, A.D. 306. Offers in the temple of Apollo, at Augustodunum, A.D. 308. Makes his public declaration in favor of Christianity, after the victory over Maxentius, A.D. 312. Legend respecting the vision of the cross. (Examination of the evidence in support of it, and of the various theories in explanation of it. Result.) ..... 5—12

First religious edict of Constantine and Licinius. Restrictive clause in it. Second edict, (313,) introducing a general and unconditional liberty of conscience. Influence of this law of the two emperors on Maximin. Edict of the latter. A later and still milder rescript ..... 12—16

Constantine and Licinius sole rulers. Death of Constantia. Growing hostility of Licinius to the Christians. War betwixt the two emperors, (323.) Preparations of Licinius. Constantine's reliance on the sign of the cross. Constantine victorious, and sole ruler ..... 16—19

Constantine's directions respecting the Pagan cultus. His tolerance of the Pagans. His law of the year 321. Indications of his relapse into Pagan superstition. His proclamation to the provinces of the East. Letter to Eusebius of Cæsarea. Explanation of his conduct. His self-deception. Flattery bestowed on him by the bishops at his court ..... 19—23

Constantine's wish to unite together all his subjects in the worship of one God. His tolerance. Causes heathen temples to be destroyed in Phœnicia and Cilicia. Grounds of this proceeding. Its effects on different classes of Pagans ..... 23—26

New prohibitions by Constantine. Law forbidding idols and idolatrous sacrifices. Rules for the army — (for the soldiers, Christian and Pagan.) Constantine resorts to every *outward means*, except force, to promote the extension of Christianity. His words to the Council of Nice. Hypocrisy encouraged ..... 26—28

PAGE

Constantine still a catechumen in the sixty-fourth year of his age. Receives baptism from Eusebius of Nicomedia, a short time before his death, (373.) Reasons for deferring baptism. Story among the Pagans respecting the cause of his conversion. Reasons for suspecting its truth. General truth in it ..... 28—30

His successors: Constans, Constantius, Constantine. Law passed by the two latter, A.D. 346, for the extirpation of Paganism. Laws against nightly sacrifices, (353.) Persecutions of Paganism. (Yet, for the purpose of preserving the national antiquities, the emperors forbid the destruction of the temples.) Several of the Christian clergy opposed to the employment of forcible measures. Others in favor of it. The flatterer Maternus ..... 30—35

Way opened for the reaction of Paganism. Attempts to revive Paganism. *Julian.* Early training and formation of his character. His destination for the spiritual order. Residence at Constantinople. His instructor Ecebolius. Continuation of his studies in Nicomedia. His connection with the Pagan party. Influence exerted upon him by the philosopher Maximus. Julian conceals his opinions. His studies in Asia. His companions in Gaul: Oribasius — Sallust ..... 35—41

Julian emperor. Assumes the office of Pontifex Maximus. Attempts to restore the worship of images. Julian's defence of images. His ideas of the priesthood, and of the business and occupation of priests. Borrows many things from Christianity. His laws for the priests. Restoration of the Pagan sanctuaries. Injustice in this transaction. Intercession of Libanius in behalf of Christians. Attempts to gain proselytes to Paganism by means of money and posts of honor. Julian's views concerning Judaism. His attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. 41—51

Julian's behavior towards the Christians. His tolerance. Reasons of it. Covert attacks by the emperor. Julian's edict, granting equal freedom to all the church parties. His motives in this. Edict recalling the bishops. Julian's behavior towards Athanasius. The emperor resorts to unworthy tricks. Forbids Christians to teach ancient literature. Sophistical defence of this prohibition. Permission given for Christian youth to attend the Pagan schools. Præresius and Fabius Marius Victorinus resign their posts as rhetorical teachers. Labors of the learned Syrians: Apollinaris, father and son. Julian prejudiced against bishops educated in the Grecian schools: *e. g.* Basil, Gregory, etc. His behavior towards Titus, bishop of Bostra, in Arabia. His mildness towards inimical Christian bishops. Outbreak of Pagan fury against the Christians in Alexandria. Julian's mild treatment of the insurgents. Persecutions of Mark of Arethusa ..... 51—61

Julian in Antioch. His zeal in the Pagan worship. Julian hated among the Antiochians, — especially on account of his restoration of the temple of Apollo. The bones of Babylas, the martyr, exhumed. Julian celebrates the festival of Apollo Daphnicus. Burning of the temple of Apollo leads Julian to adopt harsh measures. Repeated intercessions of Libanius in behalf of the Christians. Julian's journey to Syria, in his campaign against the Persians. His death, A.D. 363. 61—66

Advice of Gregory Nazianzen to the Christians. Jovian grants universal religious liberty. Speech of Themistius to the emperor ..... 67—69

Valentinian. His tolerance conduces to the spread of Christianity. (Heathenism=Paganismus.) ..... 69—70

Valens. Address of Themistius to him 70

Gratian declines taking the office of Pontifex Maximus. Refuses to grant an audience to the Pagan delegates ..... 70—71

Valentinian II. Grants an audience to the Pagan party, represented by the præfect Symmachus. Symmachus opposed by Ambrose, bishop of Milan ..... 71—73

Theodosius. In his reign, Chrysostom composes his book on the martyr Babylas. Laws of the emperor against Paganism. Wild bands of

PAGE

monks go about destroying the temples. Inconsistency of the emperor. Suppression of the Pagan worship by the præfect Cynegius. Contest betwixt the Christians and the Pagans at Alexandria. Theophilus exposes the sacred things of the Pagans to the sport of the people. Insurrection of the Pagans. Edict of Theodosius, in consequence of these disturbances. Destruction of the temple of Serapis. Destructive fury manifested by Marcellus, bishop of Apamea. Laws of the year 391, and of the following year ..... 73—78

Arcadius. Gradual increase of severity against the Pagans of the East. Porphyry of Gaza. Eudoxia. New law of the year 423. Paganism cherished in secret. The Pagan philosopher Proclus ..... 78—83

Justinian. Persecution of the Pagan philosophers. They fly to Persia 83—84

Polemical writings of the Pagans against Christianity — general charges which they brought against it — manner in which these charges were met by the teachers of the Christian church. 84—93.

Polemical writings of the Pagans. Julian. Finds contradictions in the New Testament ..... 84—89

The dialogue *Philopatris.* Ridicules the Christian doctrine of the Trinity ..... 89—90

Particular objections of the Pagans to Christianity and the Christians. Charges laid against the conduct of the Christians and against Christian princes. Reply of Augustin. Pagan objections to Christian doctrines. Work of Orosius, in reply to the objections of Eunapius and Zosimus ..... 90—93

Various obstacles which hindered the progress of Christianity among the heathen — means and methods by which it was promoted — different kinds of conversion. 93—103.

Hindrances to the spread of Christianity. Pagan superstition, Pagan self-sufficiency. Some seek repose in New Platonism. Outward means of expiation. Longinian. Different classes of Pagans. The partially educated. Against these, Augustin and Theodoret. Pagan views concerning the necessity of different religions. (Simplicius — Proclus — Themistius — Symmachus.) Relation of Christianity to this way of thinking ..... 93—97

Different ways in which Pagans were converted. Numbers of formal and nominal Christians. Gross worldly motives, the source of hypocritical conversions. More or less of intentional deception. An uneasy state of conscience conducting to Christianity. Insincerity of Christian ecclesiastics. Sophistical defence of superficial conversions. Combatted by Augustin. New Platonism leads to Christianity. (Augustin — Synesius.) ..... 97—103

Extension of Christianity beyond the limits of the Roman empire. 103—129.

Its spread in Asia.

Persia. Constantine recommends the Christians to the protection of Sapor, in Persia. Persecution of the Christians in Persia. Principal persecution in 343. Occasion of it. Objections of Persian magistrates to Christianity. Proclamation of *Mihr-Nerseh.* First order of the Persian emperor. Simeon, bishop of Seleucia — his letter to the emperor. Second imperial decree. Simeon declines paying homage to the sun. Martyrs: Guhsciatazades, Simeon, Phusik. Continuation of the persecution till 344. Activity of Maruthas, bishop of Tagrit — favorable to the Christians. Imprudent conduct of Abdas, bishop of Suza, in destroying a fire-temple. New persecution beginning A.D. 418. The martyrs, Jacobus, Hormisdas, and others. Theodoret's letter to the bishop Eusebius, in Armenia.

PAGE

Flight of the Christians into the Roman empire leads to a war. Acacius of Amida. Schism betwixt the churches of the Persian and of the Roman empire (in the fifth century) ..... 103—113

Armenia. Gregory, the illuminator. Miesrob's labors to promote the spread and secure the establishment of Christianity. Persecution of the Armenian Christians by the Persians ..... 113—114

Conversion of the Iberians (spread of Christianity in Georgia, by means of a captive Christian female) — of the Lazians and Abasgians. Justinian favors the latter ..... 114—116

Indians. Theophilus, the Indian. Accounts preserved in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes. Christians in Taprobane, Male, Kalliana 116—117

Arabia. Theophilus, imperial embassador to the king of the Hamyares. Churches founded in Arabia. Labors of the monks among the Arab tribes. Simeon, the Stylite. The Saracenian Scheikh, Aspebethos, (by baptism, Peter,) first Saracenian camp-bishop in Palestine ..... 117—119

Spread of Christianity in Africa.

Abyssinia. Meropius, with Ædesius and Frumentius, comes to that country. Frumentius ordained bishop of Auxuma by Athanasius. Theophilus visits that city. Constantius persecutes Frumentius, as being a disciple of Athanasius. The Abyssinian king, Elesbaan, takes part with the Christians in Arabia. Christianity on the island of Socotora ..... 119—121

Spread of Christianity in Europe.

Ireland. Founding of the Christian church in that island by Patricius. Account of his life. Residence in Ireland, in Gaul. Return to his country. Whether Patrick was commissioned from Rome. Labors of Patrick among the country people and the chiefs. (Benignus.) He founds Irish monasteries. Provides for the education of the people ..... 121—125

Goths. Receive Christianity by occasion of their wars with the Roman empire. Theophilus, a Gothic bishop. *Ulphilas.* His efforts in behalf of the Goths. Time of his appearance in the reign of Constantine. Reports concerning Arianism among the Goths. Athanasius on their conversion. Martyrs among the Goths. Missionary institutions established by Chrysostom. Invites Goths to preach in Constantinople. The Gothic clergy cultivate biblical studies. West Goths. Alaric in Rome, A.D. 410 ..... 125—129

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION, CHURCH DISCIPLINE, SCHISMS OF THE CHURCH, 130—222.

I. *History of the Church Constitution,* 130—178.

1. *Relation of the Church to the State,* 130—146.

General Remarks.

New relation of the church to the state. Advantages and dangers accruing from it to the church. The church calls upon the state for assistance in the promotion of its objects. Causes of this great change: the conversion of the Roman emperor to Christianity. Emperor's views of the church constitution. *Constantine.* In what sense he styled himself an Ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Calling of general councils by the emperors. Publication of their decrees by imperial authority. Influence of the emperors on the councils.

PAGE

(Constantine at Nice. Theodosius II.) Isidore of Pelusium. Individuals opposed to the confounding together of things spiritual and things secular. (Hilary of Poictiers.) Of no avail against the spirit of the times. The emperors decide doctrinal disputes by command. Basiliscus, Zeno, Justinian. Independent development of the Western Church ..... 130—135

Relation of the church to the state in particular things. *The state takes some part in providing for the support of the churches.* Churches authorized to receive bequests. Numerous presents to the churches. Abuse of this permission. Jerome on this point. Other bishops renounce this right. Augustin ..... 135—136

Benevolent Institutions. Public charities for strangers, for the poor, the old, the sick, and for orphans. The Basilias. Alms-houses in the country. Care of Theodoret for his flock 137

Privileges bestowed by the State. Exemption of the clergy from all public burdens, (muneribus publicis.) Law of Constantine, A.D. 319. Evils resulting from it. Great flocking to the spiritual office. Limitations of the law, A.D. 320. This restriction evaded ..... 137—139

Judicial authority conferred on the bishops. Advantages of this arrangement. Complaints of the bishops. Self-denial of Augustin .. 139—140

Intercessions of the bishops. Decrees of the council of Elvira, (305,) of Arles, (314,) respecting the administration of civil offices. Ambrose and Studius. Intercessions of Basil of Cæsarea, of Flavian of Antioch, of Theodoret. Advantages of these intercessions in times of despotism. Evils and abuses ..... 140—144

Churches used as asylums. The ecclesiastical usage limited by Eutropius, A.D. 398. Chrysostom. Behavior of certain slaves who fled to a church under the reign of Theodosius II. Law in favor of asylums, A.D. 431 ..... 144—146

Internal Organization of the Church, 146—148.

Central point of the theocratic system of the church, the idea of a priestly caste. False view of opposition between things secular and spiritual. Celibacy. Laws of the council of Elvira, in 305; of Neo-Cæsarea, in 314, and of Ancyra, in 314, relating to this subject. Proceedings at Nice. Paphnutius. The old custom retained, that only ecclesiastics of the first three grades, after having been once ordained, should not remarry. The more liberal council of Gangra. Custom of married bishops to forsake the marriage relation. Exceptions, like that of Synesius, still to be met with in the fifth century. Ecclesiastical law by Siricius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 385. Jovinian and Vigilantius ..... 148—149

Education of the spiritual order. Reliance on the supposed magical effect of ordination. Want of institutions for theological education. Theological school at Antioch. Attendance on the schools for general education. The cloisters, as seminaries for the clergy. Education of the clergy under the care of individual bishops ..... 149—151

Intrusion of the unworthy into spiritual offices — against which decrees of councils avail nothing. (In the West, the case better.) Participation of the laity in elections. Form of election. Strife after bishoprics in the capital cities. Decrees of councils against the transfer of ecclesiastics of little avail; but are strictly carried out by Damasus of Rome. Orders forbidding the bishops to be absent from their communities, or to reside at court ..... 151—154

Progress of the episcopal power towards the monarchical form. Prerogatives of bishops: ordination, confirmation, etc. (Chrysostom and Jerome in favor of the originally equal dignity of bishops and presbyters.) Presbyters distinguished above *the deacons.* Office and number of the deacons. Influence of arch-deacons. Deaconesses. Their ordination — at a later period, considered offensive. Laws of

PAGE

the Western church against their appointment. In the East, they continued to exist for a longer time ..... 154—158

New church offices: Οἰκόνομοι, ἔκδικοι, notarii, parabolani, (numerous in Alexandria,) Κοπιάται ..... 158—159

Chor-bishops. Restriction of their power. Councils of Sardica and Laodicea abolish the office; the latter substitutes in their place the περιοδευταί. Traces of country-bishops in later times ..... 159—160

City churches. Head churches and filial churches. Their relation to each other at Constantinople and at Rome ..... 161—162

Metropolitan Constitution. Further development of it. Provincial synods coördinate to the Metropolitan 162

Patriarchal Constitution. Sixth canon of the council of Nice. Exarchs, next Patriarchs. In the beginning, at Rome, Alexandria, Antioch — next at Constantinople (on account of its political importance) and Jerusalem. Spirit of freedom in the North-African church, — their declaration at Hipporegius, A.D. 393. Patriarchal constitution prepares the way for the papacy ..... 162—165

Rome. Rufinus's explanation of the sixth canon of the Nicene council. Wealth and political importance of Rome. (Theodoret's letter to Leo the Great.) In addition to this, came the idea, assumed as a fundamental principle by the people of the West, that the unity of the church must necessarily have *an outward representation, which was supposed to be realized in the cathedra Petri, at Rome.* Progress of this idea, especially in the church of North Africa. Optatus of Mileve. Augustin. (His exposition of Matth. 16: 18. Two different points of view confounded together by him in considering this subject as well as others.) Yet the Africans are unwilling to concede all the consequences following from this position. The Roman bishops consider themselves the successors and representatives of Peter. Leo's letter to Anatolius. Innocent to the North-Africans, A.D. 417. Leo to the Illyrian bishops. More favorable situation of the Roman church compared with the church of the East. More independent of political influences. Rome, the sole Patriarchate of the West. Greater tranquillity of doctrinal development in the West. The Eastern parties appeal to Rome — this advantage improved by the Roman bishops. The three decrees of the council of Sardica. Confounding of these with the decrees of the Nicene council. Gratian's declaration in favor of Damasus. Hilary of Arles and Celidonius. Leo's arrogant claims. Recognition of them by Valentinian III., A.D. 445. Spirit of freedom continues to be maintained in the North-African church. Councils of Carthage in 407 and 418, against appealing to any jurisdiction beyond the sea ..... 165—175

General councils. Their object. Description of them by Gregory of Nazianz. Augustin's theory of councils. Christianity opposed to the requisition of a blind obedience to human authority. Facundus of Hermiane. Other objects of the councils. Decretals and canons of the councils collected by Dionysius Exiguus, (after the year 500,) 175—178

II. *History of Church Discipline*, 178—182.

Persons convicted of gross offences, excluded from the fellowship of the church. (In case of sincere repentance, none refused the communion in the hour of death.) Different classes of penitents. Conditions of readmission. Difficulties attending the application of the principles of church penance — partly in the case of schisms, partly in the case of persons of rank. (Chrysostom. Ambrose. The case of Theodosius.) Anathema of the church. (Synesius against Andronicus.) Nectarius rescinds the office of a presbyter to administer penance ..... 178—182

PAGE

III. *History of Church Schisms*, 182—222.

Donatist Schism, 182—217.

Important as representing the contest betwixt Catholicism and Separatism, and the reaction against the confusion of ecclesiastical matters with politics. Immediate, local occasion; a certain enthusiastic spirit in North Africa 182

The prudent bishop Mensurius of Carthage, and his arch-deacon Cæcilian. Charges laid against Mensurius by the fanatical party, favored by Secundus of Tigisis. Assembly of Numidian provincial bishops at Cirta, under the presidency of Secundus, A.D. 305. Mensurius dies. The superstitious widow, Lucilla, an enemy to Cæcilian. Donatus of Casæ Nigræ. Meetings in the house of Lucilla. Cæcilian ordained by Felix of Aptungis before the arrival of the Numidian bishops. Cæcilian accused. The reader Majorinus set up as anti-bishop. Constantine opposed to the party of Majorinus. Trial before Melchiades, bishop of Rome, and five bishops of Gaul, A.D. 313. (Donatus complainant against Cæcilian.) Council of Arles, A.D. 314, (against frivolous charges of denying the faith, and on the objective validity of sacramental acts.) Appeal to the emperor, who also decides in favor of Cæcilian. Donatus of Casæ Nigræ, and next Donatus Magnus, successors of Majorin, take the lead of the party. Pars Donati. Harsh proceedings of the Count Ursacius against the Donatists. Circumcelliones. Forbearance of Constantine towards the Donatists ..... 182—193

Constans seeks to gain the Donatists by pecuniary presents. Severe measures against them. Vehement discourses preached against the confounding together of church and state. Desperate bands of Circumcellions, under the command of Fasir and Axid. Reaction in the reign of Julian. Party of Maximinian ..... 193—197

Distracted state of the North-African church, occasioned by this schism. *Augustin as an opponent of the Donatists.* His confidence in the force of his arguments. Plan of Augustin and Fortunius. The Donatists fear the logical talents of Augustin. Council of Carthage, A.D. 403. Augustin's letter to the Donatist churches. Penal laws demanded against the Donatists (Augustin, at this time, still opposed to forcible measures) — enacted in part, A.D. 405. Religious conference held at Carthage, A.D. 411, under the presidency of Marcellin. (Proposals of the Catholic party. Augustin's sermons. Distrust on the part of the Donatists. Augustin and Petilian.) Severer laws against the Donatists. Gaudentius of Thamugade. Donatists continue to exist until the middle of the sixth century ..... 197—203

Theological controversy betwixt the Donatists and the Catholic party.

Fundamental error common to both parties, — the failure to distinguish between the visible and the invisible church. Augustin's course of religious development had led him to his outward conception of the church — hence the great importance of this conception in his own view. He admits (the Donatists appealed to miracles, etc.) of the external and objective evidence only of the divine word, (not so in his contest with the Manichæans.) The Donatists require severity of church discipline. Controversy respecting the biblical term, "World." The Donatists appeal (in this case inconsistently) to Old Testament examples. *The Catholics subordinate the predicates of purity and holiness to the notion of Catholicity; the Donatists do the reverse.* They protest against the arrogant claims of the Apostolical See. Midway between both parties, Tichonius, the grammarian: corpus Domini bipartitum. Petition against the Catholic church. Augustin in defence of it. Controversy on the employment of force in religious matters. Augustin defends the right of resorting to such measures. False comparison of the divine method of educating

PAGE

mankind with the laws of the state. Deductions of Augustin from these erroneous principles. Foundation of the theory expressed in the phrase: Compelle intrare in ecclesiam ..... 203—217

The Meletian Schism in Egypt, 217—221.

More rigid party (in respect to the *lapsed*) under Meletius of Lycopolis. The more mild and discreet pastoral letter of Peter of Alexandria. Meletius arbitrarily ordains and excommunicates persons within the diocese of Peter. Meletius excommunicated. [Critical examination of the sources of information respecting this schism.] Meletians. Orders of the Nicene council. Yet the schism continues down to the fifth century ..... 217—221

Schism between Damasus and Ursinus at Rome, 221—222.

Liberius of Rome deposed and banished by Constantine in 356. Felix made bishop. Liberius afterwards recalled. Separate party, under the presbyter Eusebius, in opposition to the court party. Contest betwixt Ursinus (belonging to the party of Liberius) and Damasus, (belonging to the party of Felix,) after the death of Liberius, A.D. 366. Damasus prevails. Gratian's law, in order to the suppression of this schism ..... 221—222

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

I. *Christian Life.*

Outward Christianity. False confidence in externals. Tendency to partial views of doctrine. The idea of the universal spiritual priesthood obscured. Amurca per publicum currit. Sincerity in religion exposed to obloquy. Pious wives and mothers, (Nonna, Anthusa, Monica, and others) ..... 223—227

Peculiar tendencies of Christian life. The ascetic tendency and monasticism, 227—265.

Its earlier opposition to Paganism — now to a mere outward Christianity. Transition from the earlier and freer form of the ascetic life to the more stable organization of monasticism. Relation of Christianity to monasticism ..... 227—228

Anthony, (born A.D., 251, of a Coptic family,) and not Paul of Thebes, the father of monastic orders. How he was led to adopt the monastic life. His wrong conception of self-denial, which he afterwards corrected. His strictly abstemious life. His influence. Did not wish to be regarded as a worker of miracles. Visits to Alexandria in 311 and 341. Apothegms of Anthony. (Letter to him from Constantine.) His gentleness to others. Opposed to the superstitious veneration of relics. Spread of Monasticism. Hilarion promotes it in Palestine. .. 228—236

Pachomius, founder of the cloister-life. The Cœnobium of Tabennæ, an island in the Nile in Upper Egypt. Abbots. Classes of monks. Their occupations. Noviciate. Pachomius also founds cloisters for nuns ..... 236—238

Fanatical tendencies which became united with monasticism. Suicide, (Stagirius.) Morbid state of mind. Ascetic pride. Sayings of Pachomius and Nilus. (Valens. Heron. Ptolemæus) ..... 238—240

The Euchites, (in Syria.) Different names. Their principles and doctrines to be traced to a practical error, (purely contemplative repose. The first begging friars.) An excessive leaning to externals in the monastic life leads to the opposite error of mysticism. Doctrine

PAGE

of inward prayer, with its mischievous consequences, (depreciation of the means of grace; Antinomianism; sensuous mysticism, and Pantheism.) Flavian of Antioch and Adelphius. Kindred sect of the Eustathians — opposed to these, the council of Gangra. Opposition to these fanatic tendencies serves to promote the Cœnobite life. Contest of the Cœnobites with those who clung to the older form of asceticism. (Sarabaites, Remoboth) ..... 240—248

Lights and Shades of Monachism.

Anchorites. Defended by Augustine and Chrysostom against the charge of being devoid of active charity. Their healthful influence. (Macedonius) ..... 248—250

Cœnobites. Christian society. Prayer and labor. Prominence given to the original equality of all men. The cloisters as institutions of education. (Rule of Basil.) Hospitality. Tendency to degenerate. Mischievous fanaticism. The seclusion of the monastic life might lead to deep self-knowledge, to a conviction of the vanity of righteousness by outward works, to childlike submission to God, (Chrysostom, Nilus, Marcus, Marcian;) but it oft times engendered the spirit of legal righteousness, spiritual pride, servility of disposition, (Eusebius in Syria and others) ..... 250—257

Simeon, the Stylite. His labors. (Theodoret's remarks concerning him.) Simeon's vision. Warning given to the Stylites by Nilus ..... 257—258

Monachism in the West. At first opposed. Encouraged by Athanasius, Jerome, and others. Augustin's views of the monastic life; he teaches that monks are bound to labor, (de opere monachorum.) His account of the corruption of monachism. Cassian introduces the monastic institutions of the East into southern France, (his institutiones cœnobiales and *Collations.*) Practical Christian spirit in these cloisters, which also became seminaries for the clergy ..... 258—261

Reformation of the monastic life by Benedict of Nursia. His education, (residence in Rome. Romanus. General respect in which he was held.) Foundation of the abbey of Monte Cassino. Rules of the Benedictines. Wise moderation shown in them. Benedict's disciples. 261—265

Different spiritual tendencies in religion, in their relation to Monachism and Ascetism, 265—277.

Secular opposition to monachism. Law of Valens, A.D., 365..... 265—267

More moderate views of the monastic life, (recognition of its value, opposition only to the extravagant overvaluation of it) expressed at the council of Gangra and by Chrysostom ..... 267—269

Jovinian. Evangelical opponent of the one-sided ascetic tendency. Contends against the distinction between *præcepta* and *consilia* evangelica. Gives prominence to common fellowship with Christ. Rejects fasting, the unmarried life, monachism, though not unconditionally, (he himself continues to remain a monk,) contends only against the tendency to depreciate the high worth of the marriage relation, and to overvalue fasting, (also martyrdom.) Jovinian opposed to the righteousness of works, and allows himself to be misled by this opposition to deny all different stages of the Christian life. His conception of the invisible church. Influence of Jovinian. Siricius of Rome, and Ambrose his opponent. Sarmatio and Barbatian. Augustin (de bono conjugali) in relation to Jovinian. Vigilantius (see above) also opposed to monachism ..... 269—278

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP, 278—343.

Relation of Christian Worship to the entire Christian life, 278—283.

Chrysostom and Augustin on the Christian worship of God, as not confined to any particular time nor place. General reading of the Bible

PAGE

(φροντιστήρια,) — strongly recommended by Chrysostom and Augustin — hindered by the want of knowing how to read and the excessively high price of manuscripts. Public reading of the sacred scriptures · 278—283

Relation of Worship to Art. Church buildings, their ornaments — images, 283—296.

Appropriation of art, corresponding to the altered relations of different periods. Zeal (often impure) manifested in the building of new churches. Remodeling of temples — oftentimes, however, the simpler places of meeting are still retained. Churches constructed after the pattern of the temple of Jerusalem, (the fore-court, temple proper, and holy of holies, where were to be found the altar and the bishop's chair.) Festive dedication of churches · · · 283—286

The sign of the cross · · · 286—287

Images. Begin to be opposed. Employment of images proceeded from the great mass of Christians. Asterius of Amasea. Opposition to pictures and images of Christ. (Letter of Eusebius to Constantia.) Decoration of churches with pictures, (Nilus, — conduct of Epiphanius.) Moderate tendency of Christians in the West. Προσκύνησις in the East. Leontius of Neapolis, on the use of images, in opposition to the Jews. Zenayas · · · 287—296

Times of assembling for divine worship, and festivals, 296—316.

Every day a festival: Jerome, Chrysostom. Socrates on this matter. Celebration of the dies stationum · · · 296—297

Festival of the Sabbath. Ordinance of the council of Laodicea. Different usage of the churches of the East and West in respect to fasting on the Sabbath, (Saturday.) Liberal views of Augustin and others on this subject. Decision by Innocent of Rome · · · 297—299

Festival of Sunday. Cessation of business. Laws of the years 321 and 386. Spectacles on Sunday and on the principal feast-days forbidden A.D., 425 · · · 299—301

Yearly Festivals.

Difference of views in respect to the *feast of the passover.* Decrees of the councils of Arles and of Nice, (Quartodecimani.) Mode of announcing the time of Easter by the bishop of Alexandria. Dionysius Exiguus · · · 301—302

Times of fasting. Their salutary influence. Hypocritical fasting. The great week. The great sabbath — white dress of the candidates for baptism worn till the *octava infantium.* The fifty days succeeding Easter · · · 303—306

Feast of Epiphany. The ancient principal festival in the East in celebration of the baptism of Christ, (at first not accompanied by the Christmas festival.) First indications of the spread of this festival in the West about 360. Altered views of it (as the revelation of Christ to the pagan world) in the West · · · 306—308

Festival of Christmas. Originated in the West, (about 350 generally recognized :)— in the East, a new festival in the times of Chrysostom. Arguments of Chrysostom in favor of the time fixed for this festival. Union of the two festivals of Epiphany and Christmas at Jerusalem and Alexandria. *The celebration of this festival on the 25th of December* founded doubtless upon some apocryphal account, which is to be traced, not to any disposition to fall in with the pagan ceremonies (Saturnalia, Sigillaria,) but to the mystical interpretation given to that season of the year. · · · 308—314

New Year's festival. Not the remodeling of the civil celebration into an ecclesiastical one: but opposition to the licentious pagan celebration led to an ecclesiastical celebration accompanied with fasting · · · 314—316

PAGE

Particular acts of Christian worship, 316—344.

Public reading of the sacred scriptures. Origin of the *pericopes.* Sermon. Applause by the clapping of hands. Short-hand writers. Church psalmody. Psalms and church hymns, (often heretical.) Pambo, Isidore of Jerusalem and Jerome opposed to theatrical church psalmody ..... 316—319

Administration of the Sacrament.

Infant baptism, not as yet universally recognized in the East. Causes and effects of it. *Catechumens.* At first composed of two, at present of three classes: audientes, genuflectentes, competentes. [Whether there was a class styled ἐξωθούμενοι.] Symbolical customs in administering baptism (veiling of the head; sufflation; distribution of the consecrated salt; double unction.) Confirmation. Clothing the candidates in white robes. Seasons of baptism. Missa catechumenorum and fidelium ..... 319—325

Lord's Supper. Agapæ. Eucharistical liturgy. More frequent or more rare celebration of the communion. (Augustin, Jerome, Chrysostom, on this subject.) Communion at home. Participation of it under one form. Idea of an offering. Intercessions for the departed. Augustin's spiritual, but still unscriptural idea of an offering ..... 325—332

Veneration of the saints. Genuine Christian interest connected with this. Festival of St. Stephen the martyr. Worship of relics. Customs bordering on Paganism. Augustin's views respecting the worship of the saints. Vigilantius combats the idolatrous worship of martyrs. Opposed by Jerome. *Worship of the Virgin Mary.* Collyridians. Helvidius (a layman at Rome, controversy with Jerome) and Bonosus. *Pilgrimages.* Chrysostom's views of them. Jerome and Gregory of Nyssa opposed to the over valuation of externals in this practice ..... 332—342

Aërius. His controversy with Eustathius of Sebaste: — aims at a total severing of Christianity from Judaism. He is persecuted ..... 342—343

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY APPREHENDED AND DEVELOPED AS A SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES, 344—718.

General introductory remarks, 344—360.

Influence of Origen and his school. Opposite ways of apprehending the doctrines of Christian theology appear more openly. Imperfect mode of distinguishing between actual life and speculative conception; between the fundamental essence of the gospel, and particular doctrines of Christianity. Lamentable interference of the civil power ..... 344—346

Opposite views in respect to single doctrines, more than in respect to general doctrinal tendencies 346

Difference of prevailing tendency in the doctrinal spirit of the Oriental, and of the Western church: the former busied with speculative distinctions on the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine concerning Christ; while the attention of the latter is directed to the central point of practical Christianity, the doctrine concerning man's nature, and concerning redemption ..... 346—348

Gregory of Nazianz, respecting the most important matters of doctrine 348

Later influences of the Origenistic spirit less discernible in the Alexandrian church, than in the particular cases of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the three great church-teachers from Cappadocia, and in bringing

PAGE

about a more spiritual mode of apprehending the Christian system of doctrines generally. . . . 348—349
Platonism constantly, except in the case of Eunomius, the scientific form for expressing the doctrines of faith. . . . 349—350
New combination of Platonic with Christian elements in the case of Synesius The mystico-theurgical system in the Pseudo-Dionysian writings which sprang out of a combination of this sort. . . . 350

Interpretation of Scripture and Inspiration, 350—353.

Great influence of Origen in bringing about a more scientific method of expounding the scriptures; of Jerome, also, on the church of the West. The Antiochian school. . . . 350—351
More accurate distinction of the divine and human elements in holy writ among the Antiochians. . . . 351
Chrysostom on the difference of the gospels . . . 352
Jerome, on Gal. 5 : 12 . . . 352
The difference in the prevailing method of interpretation among the Antiochians and the Alexandrians — owing to a radical difference between the two schools (the latter being more inclined to the mystical side — to give an undue prominence to the divine element; the former being more inclined to logical reflection, and striving to apprehend the divine and human elements in harmony with each other.) The Antiochian tendency tempered by Theodoret and the great homelist, Chrysostom. . . . 352—353

Augustin, the Church-father of the West, 358—360.

Compared with Origen, more systematic, but inferior in learning and historical discipline. Platonism, in his case, but an inferior stage of development. Faith and gnosis in him reconciled and united. Connection of his system of faith with the development of his Christian life . . . 353—354
His training and progressive development. Pious education. Given, when a young man, to the pleasures of the world. Awakened by a passage in the Hortensius of Cicero. Manichæan. His interview with Faustus. In danger of falling into utter scepticism. Led by means of the Christian associations of his youth to Platonism. From the impulse of a practical need, becomes a Christian. Studies the epistles of Paul. Gradually emerges from the Platonic *intellectualism.* Fides præcedit intellectum. Harmony of "faith" and "reason." His dependence on church tradition. . . . 354—360

Oppositions in the mode of apprehending and treating the single great doctrines of Christianity, 360—678.

Theology in the stricter sense of the word, or the Christian doctrine concerning God, 360—424.

Development of this doctrine in the preceding period: the *Western* system and its predominant interest in behalf of the *unity of essence* —the *Oriental* system of *emanation* and *subordination*. . . . 360—361
Dionysius of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria . . . 361

Doctrine of Arius. 361—366.

Arius educated at Antioch. His tendency to rest in the limitations of the understanding. Wanted the intuitive faculty. Is not conscious of teaching a new doctrine . . . 361—362
The Logos had a beginning of existence — was created from nothing — is called metonymically "Son of God," as being the most perfect creature: by whom the rest of creation was produced. Christ possesses by nature a mutable will (he makes the humanization of the Logos to

PAGE

consist merely in his being united with a human body,) yet calls him "God" — that is, by the communication of grace, not in essence — the essence of God incomprehensible even to the Son ..... 362—365
Character of his system 365

Beginning of the Arian controversy, 365—370.

Arius, a presbyter and pastor in Alexandria, venerated on account of his rigidly ascetic life, deposed in the year 321 by his bishop Alexander, who was devoted to the doctrine of Homoousion ..... 365—366
The work of Arius, entitled "Thalia" 366
Alexander's circular letter; and endeavors of Arius to interest in his favor the bishops of the Oriental church, who were for the most part inclined to the system of Origen ..... 366—367
Efforts to bring about a conciliation by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and by Eusebius of Cæsarea, who was opposed to controversy on divine things. [Essentially Origenistic system of the latter.] His incorrect judgment with respect to the importance of the matters in dispute. Arius favorably disposed. Alexander disinclined to his mediation ... 367—370
Constantine, indifferent to these matters, is vexed by this division, and publishes a letter of conciliation, which is without effect ..... 370—372

First ecumenical council of Nice, A.D. 325.

[Critical examination of the diverging reports of Eusebius and of Athanasius] 372
The three parties: *Arians*, Homoousians, and the more numerous party, who held the middle ground between the two others, — afterwards called *Semi-Arians* ..... 372—373
Eusebius of Cæsarea, as a pacifiator: his symbol of faith, made up for the most part of scriptural phrases ..... 373—374
The party of Alexander, and with it, at present, also Constantine, demand the Homoousion and antithetic clauses or articles against Arianism. *The Nicene creed* ..... 374—376
Eusebius, who at first refuses acquiescence, finally yields, for the sake of peace, explaining, like many of the others, the Homoousion in the sense of Homoiousion ..... 376—377
Creed subscribed, and Arius condemned ..... 377—378
Persecutions of Arius and his party 378
Reäction against this forced result. Constantine changes sides. Arius recalled, A.D. 328 or 329 — his confession of faith. Principle of the then existing theology of court, — to represent doctrinal difference as of no importance ..... 378—380

Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, 380, ff.

Already, while a presbyter, the soul of the contest against Arius — acute, consistent, firm and unwavering 380
The Homoousion, for him the central point of the Christian consciousness of God: Christ can introduce men to fellowship with God only by being God in essence. Attacks the Arian definition of the phrase, "Son of God," and "generation from God" ..... 380—381
His resolute and repeated refusal, in spite of the emperor's threats, to reädmit Arius to his standing. Personal appearance before the emperor ..... 381—382
Renewed charges against Athanasius, and hence the synod of Tyre in 335. Athanasius deposed, appeals to the emperor, who banishes him, however, A.D. 336, to Triers ..... 382—384
Purposed restoration of Arius. His second confession of faith. His sudden death and its consequences. Explicit condemnation of Arianism on the part of the head party in the East, merely for the purpose of asserting their opposition to the Homoousion ..... 384—386

PAGE

Constantine's death, A.D. 337. Constantius, an emperor who too much affected the theologian: won over to the side of Arianism: disputatious spirit at Constantinople ..... 386—388

Athanasius sent back to Alexandria by Constantine the younger, and received there with enthusiasm. New intrigues of his adversaries. Their ecclesiastical assembly at Antioch, A.D. 341. Deposition of Athanasius confirmed. Delegates from both parties sent to Julius of Rome. Protest of the Orientals against his supreme judicial authority 388—389

Gregory forced as bishop upon the people of Alexandria. Athanasius flees to Rome — there recognized, by a synod held in 342, as a regular bishop. Letter of Julius to the Orientals ..... 389—390

Meetings of the Orientals (who in the West were generally regarded as Arians) at Antioch, A.D. 341 and 345, with their five symbols of faith. Points of difference between them and the Nicene creed: — they condemn Arianism, but do not admit the unity of essence, nor a generation of the Logos grounded in the essential being of God ..... 390—391

Convocation of a general council at Sardica, A.D. 347, by Constantius and Constans — the Orientals present only in small numbers, — secede on account of Athanasius, repair to Philippopolis, and draw up a new creed. At Sardica, the Nicene creed retained ..... 391—392

Return of Athanasius brought about by Constans ..... 392—393

[Diversity of reports respecting the particular circumstances] ..... 392—393

Death of Constans. New complaints against Athanasius. Attack on Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus of Sirmium, aimed indirectly against Athanasius ..... 393—394

Marcellus, a warm advocate of the Homoousion and opponent of the Origenistic theology; — his approximation to Sabellianism — the *ἡσυχάζειν* of the Logos in the divine Being, and his *ἐνέργεια δραστική*. (See Exposit. of Col. I: 15) ..... 394—395

Deposed as early as 336; the two works of Eusebius of Cæsarea against him; at a later period returns to his bishopric. Photinus, his disciple, openly professes Sabellianism. Both deposed by the synod at Sirmium, in 351 395

Athanasius condemned at the church conventions in Arles and in Milan, A.D. 355, where a part of the Occidentals themselves are overreached by the court party ..... 395—396

Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Hilary of Poictiers zealous defenders of his innocence 396

Unsought agreement of the latter with the Nicene creed ..... 396—397

His own free-spirited, and Lucifer of Cagliari's passionate memorial to the emperor ..... 397—398

Banishment of Liberius of Rome, and Hosius of Cordova 398

Deceitful letter of the emperor to Athanasius. Storming of the church of Athanasius, and establishment of the passionate Georgius in his place by force of arms, in February, 356. Athanasius returns among the Egyptian monks ..... 398—399

Manifestation of differences among the Anti-Nicene party after their triumph over the Homoousians. Strict Arianism taught by Actius and his disciple Eunomius. Doctrine of the latter, with regard to the comprehensibleness of divine things, and his controversy on this point with Gregory of Nyssa. The essence of religion consists, according to him, in the theoretical knowledge of divine things; according to Gregory, in inward experience ..... 399—402

Eunomius does not wish to be considered an innovator. Doctrine concerning the Son of God as a creature ..... 402—403

Antioch, where Eudoxius was bishop, principal seat of the Eunomians. Violent opposition of the Semi-Arians, (Basil of Ancyra) 403

Artifices of the Arian court bishops, Ursacius and Valens, to conceal the difference between the Eunomian and Semi-Arian parties. The use of the unscriptural term *οὐσία* represented to the emperor as being the cause of all the disputes ..... 403—404

PAGE

This term excluded, in the symbol of faith drawn up at the council of Sirmium, A.D. 357, which Hosius and Liberius are compelled to subscribe ..... 404—405

Opposition of the Semi-Arians, headed by Basil of Ancyra and Georgius of Laodicea, at the council of Ancyra, A.D. 358 405

The emperor Constantius hence proposes the holding of a general council — but Ursacius and Valens, dreading a combination of the Semi-Arians and Homoousians, contrive that two separate councils should be held, one at Seleucia in Isaurea, the other at Arminium in Italy . 405—406

Their negociations with Basil and Georgius, at the imperial court, respecting the creed to be proposed to the councils: The Son is in all respects like the Father, as the scriptures teach; the term *οὐσία* must be discarded ..... 406—407

By various arts, they contrive to impose this creed on the Westerns, (first on their ten delegates at Nice,) then on the Orientals ..... 407—408

Confirmation of this creed by a council at Constantinople, A.D. 360. — Pains taken by Eudoxius, then bishop of Constantinople, and by Acacius of Cæsarea, who was averse to doctrinal controversies, in favor of this vapid court-creed. Impatience shown by Constantius at every departure from it. Aëtius and Eunomius are deposed ..... 408—409

Confusion resulting from this artificial union 409

New turn of affairs consequent on the death of Constantius in 361; particularly to the advantage of the Homoousians ..... 409—410

Spirit of Christian love shown at the council of Alexandria, held under the direction of Athanasius, A.D. 362. Owing, however, to the want of impartiality, a schism continued to exist at Antioch 410

Meletian Schism at Antioch, 410—412.

Eustathius of Antioch deposed by the Anti-Nicene party, about the year 330. Eustathians. Eudoxius is made bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 360, and the Arians choose, as his successor, the Nicene Meletius, not rightly interpreting the moderation of his character. The latter deposed again on account of his Anti-Arian inauguratory discourse. The Eustathians under the presbyter Paulinus, recognized by the Alexandrian synod alone. Lucifer at Antioch, ordains Paulinus as bishop. The Western and Alexandrian churches in favor of Paulinus, the Orientals in favor of Meletius ..... 410—412

Lucifer himself, the occasion of a separate schism. The Luciferites consider themselves as the only true church 412

Jovinian and Valentinian decline all interference in ecclesiastical affairs. Lamentable disorders in the Oriental church, occasioned by the despotic proceedings of the Arian emperor Valens; which eventually, however, led to a union of the Semi-Arian and Nicene parties, and to the triumph of the latter, which had the advantage of great talents on its side ..... 412—413

Basil of Cæsarea: Cappadocia preserved by his means from disorders. Respected by the people. His freedom towards the emperor, who does not venture to depose him. (Athanasius, also, is recalled by Valens, through fear of an insurrection) ..... 413—414

Zeal of Basil for the restoration of the peace of the church, especially of the churches of the East and West 414

Edict of the year 375, against the abuse of the emperor's name to promote religious persecutions. Triumph of the Homoousion under Theodosius the Great — his law of the year 380, in favor of the Nicene doctrine 414

Gregory of Nazianz. His inclination to the contemplative life — his activity as bishop of Sasima, and at Nazianzus, as the assistant of his father — retires again to a life of seclusion. Zeal for the faith, perhaps also vanity, brings him to Constantinople — his five temperate discourses in defence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity — hence

PAGE

surnamed the Theologian — his zeal for practical Christianity in opposition to the prevailing inclination to doctrinal discussions ..... 414—416
Entrance of Theodosius into Constantinople, who removes Demophilus and places Gregory in the principal church. Arian assemblies prohibited within the walls of the city 416
Second ecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 416
Gregory consecrated bishop of Constantinople by Meletius of Antioch . 416
Gregory labors ineffectually to do away the Eustathian schism, (afterwards disposed of by Alexander of Antioch) ..... 416—417
Resigns his post. Influence of Gregory of Nyssa on the further transactions of the council ..... 417—418
Voluntary adoption of the Nicene creed with the addition of a more precise article in relation to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit 418
Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Its development. The doctrine at first indistinctly expressed. (Lactantius, Hilary) ..... 418—419
According to Eunomius, the Holy Spirit is the first creature produced by the Son, invested with power to sanctify and teach, but without divine or creative power 419
Athanasius, in the consistent development of his own Christian consciousness, is led to apply the Homoousion also to the Holy Spirit: as certain as the Holy Spirit is the means of fellowship with God, so certainly he must be one with the divine essence ..... 419—420
His influence on the Oriental church, and thus on the council of Constantinople 420

Germ of the later difference between the Oriental and Western churches in respect of this doctrine, 420—423.

Oriental view: God the Father, the μία ἀρχή, works all things *through* the Son, *in* the Holy Spirit; in opposition to the doctrine, that "the Spirit is the creature of the Son," it is held, that as the Son is generated of the Father, so the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father .... 420—421
View of the Western church; particularly under the influence of Augustin: Everything communicated by the Father to the Son; the Spirit is one and the same Spirit of both, is the communion of both; that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, regarded as a remnant of the Arian system of subordination ..... 421—422
Language of Theodore and Theodoret, opposed to the creation of the Spirit, and in favor of the procession of the Spirit from the Father .. 422—423
Establishment of the doctrine "a patre filioque," by the third ecclesiastical council of Toledo, A.D. 589, in opposition to Arianism 423
Few opposed to the Nicene creed in the West. Auxentius of Milan, a Semi-Arian. His successor in 374, the former proconsular Ambrose. His decided conduct towards the Arian princess Justina 423
Arianism among the rude German tribes. Persecution of the advocates of the Nicene creed by the Vandals in Africa ..... 423—424
Consequences of this new modification of the Nicene creed, which finally obtains the supremacy over the older subordination-system 424

Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 424—557.

Connection of this doctrine with that concerning the Trinity: the divine and human nature in Christ more accurately distinguished by Homoousians. The Arians, with whom neither the divine nor human nature meets with its just rights, accuse the Homoousians of denying the true personal unity of the God-man ..... 424—425
Doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra, and Photinus ..... 425—426
Further development of the doctrine of the church in opposition to the Arian and Samosatenian systems ..... 427—428
The personal unity and the complete human nature taken into union with the Logos, held fast — notwithstanding the difference of views on other points 427

PAGE

Influence of the two Gregorys, who carried still further the system of Origen ..... 427—428

Gregory of Nyssa's doctrine concerning the transformation of the human nature after the analogy of the divine, meeting the Eunomian objection to the church doctrine as establishing a duality of existence — hence the *ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων*; his doctrine concerning an intermingling (*ἀνακρᾶσις*) of the sensuous element with the essence of the divine nature — hence his theory respecting the omnipresence of Christ's glorified humanity 428

Doctrine of the younger Apollinaris, 428—435.

In opposition to the Origenistic theory 428

His interest in behalf of Christian faith combined with the interest of scientific speculation 428

His opposition to the theory of a rational human soul in Christ — its place supplied by the Logos ..... 428—429

His idea of the God-man 430

In Christ, there was no human development. Union of the Logos with the complete human nature first takes place in the case of believers . 430—431

His predilection for the interchange of attributes — accuses his opponents of holding to a transformation of Christ's body, and denies the omnipresence of Christ's glorified body ..... 431—432

Does not suppose that he teaches a new doctrine — agrees with others in opposing the Arian doctrine concerning Christ's human nature — supposes himself to have first established the true doctrine of the God-man ..... 432—433

In opposition to Apollinaris, Athanasius (also Gregory of Nazianz) affirms, that Christ, being our pattern, and the redeemer of man's entire nature, must have appropriated the whole of it — the position of Apollinaris, that Christ could not have assumed human nature without sin, leads to the doctrine of the natural necessity of sin 433

The scheme of Apollinaris condemned by Western councils, subsequent to the year 375; also by the second ecumenical council, which established, however, no new articles on this point 434

Opposition to the Samosatenian and the Apollinarian doctrines, in the schools of Antioch and of Alexandria. Distinctive character of these schools ..... 435—436

Doctrine of the Antiochian school, 436—444.

Conformably to their historico-grammatical tendency, the disciples of this school form their conception of Christ from the gospel history — hence their representation of the purely human nature of Christ without curtailment. Close connection of this view, in the case of Theodore, with his whole doctrinal system 436

Doctrine of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 436—444.

Connection of it with his doctrine of human nature: — the rational nature divided by him into two sections; the *mutable*, which is capable of being advanced to an *immutable* nature — man, who is the image of God for all creation, constitutes the medium of this transition — hence it was necessary for Christ to enter into the mutable nature of man, which is subject to temptation — according to the measure of the triumph of his own will in this conflict, was revealed by him the divine power of the Logos constantly united with him, and elevating him from one higher stage to another, as the reward of his merit. Hence Christ possessed more than human knowledge, but not omniscience. Hence he could not send the Holy Spirit, until after his glorification . 436—439

Maintains, on scriptural grounds, the doctrine of a progressive development of Christ by conflict and exercise, particularly in opposition to Apollinarianism ..... 440—442

PAGE

Maintains the union of two natures in Christ, in opposition to the interchange of attributes .... 442—443
Two natures united, without confusion and without separation, in opposition also to Appollinaris .... 443—444

Doctrine of the Alexandrian church, 444—446.

Gives prominence to the incomprehensible side of the doctrine. Inclined to the interchange of attributes (ἡ θεοτόκος) — yet without confounding the divine and the human 444
The two tendencies compared. Their fundamental difference .... 444—446

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES.

Nestorian disputes, and their consequences down to the time of the Chalcedonian council, 446—524.

Beginning of the Nestorian controversy.

Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, subsequent to the year 428 — educated in the cloister — wanting in prudence — his zeal against heretics. Sets forth in his sermons the doctrines of the Antiochian school. Imprudent zeal of his presbyter Anastasius (also of another ecclesiastic) against the term "mother of God," (θεοτόκος.) .... 446—449
Disputes concerning the propriety of this term. Nestorius takes the part of his friend 449
Participation of the laity in this dispute 450
Nestorius, attacked in a sermon by Proclus, defends himself with moderation. Does not reject the term θεοτόκος directly .... 450—452
Nestorius attacked in various ways by others .... 452—453
Interference of Cyrill of Alexandria 453
His ambitious and persecuting spirit, coupled with a narrow doctrinal zeal .... 453—454
His "paschal letter" and "warning," addressed to the Egyptian monks, aimed against Nestorius, though without any mention of his name .... 454—455
Defends himself against the charge of a contentious spirit and uncharitableness .... 455—456
His hypocritical letter addressed to the excited Nestorius .... 456—457
Nestorius' dignified reply, and Cyrill's answer to this letter 457
The Alexandrian presbyter Campon, undertakes the part of a mediator; conciliatory letter of Nestorius to Cyrill 458
Cyrill's connections with the party opposed to Nestorius at Constantinople. Cyrill accused by certain of his own clergy before Nestorius .... 458—460
His two works against Nestorius, addressed to the emperor and to the Augusta Pulcheria 460
His adulatory report of the dispute to Cœlestin of Rome .... 460—461
Letter of Nestorius to Cœlestin; in which also he makes inquiries concerning four deposed Pelagian bishops .... 461—462
Cœlestin, under the influence of hierarchical pride, decides in favor of Cyrill .... 462—463
A new schism threatens to take place between the East and the West. The Syrian bishops, and especially John, patriarch of Antioch, advise Nestorius to yield. His compliant answer, and confidence in a general council .... 463—464
Cyrill, supported by Rome, grants an arrogant pardon to Nestorius, and pronounces twelve anathemas against the Antiochian system of doctrine .... 464—465
Theodoret's writings in answer to Cyrill. He censures the confounding together of the language suitable for homilies with the technical language of doctrinal theology — contends especially against the notion of a physical unity in respect to substance (ἕνωσις φυσική, καθ' ὑπόστασιν)

PAGE

as God is thereby subjected to a law of natural necessity. Cyrill's vindication of his anathemas ..... 465—466
Anti-anathemas of Nestorius 466
Orders for a general council to meet at Ephesus, in 431. Letter of Theodosius II. to Cyrill 467
Third ecumenical council at Ephesus, A.D. 431 468
Candidian, imperial agent appointed with full powers to preserve order in the proceedings of the council. The bishops forbidden to visit the court during the session of the assembly. Nestorius attends, accompanied by his friend Irenæus. Cyrill, with a large number of Egyptian bishops. His friend Memnon of Ephesus. Nestorius petitions for a guard ..... 468—469
Detention of the Roman delegates, and of John, patriarch of Antioch. The council opened in an illegal manner on the 21st of June, 431, by Cyrill, supported by Memnon, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem, in spite of a letter from John of Antioch ..... 469—470
The council, now the blind tool of Cyrill, send a summons to Nestorius. His protest. The fanatical speeches of Euoptius of Ptolemais and Rheginus of Constantia. Sentence of deposition passed on Nestorius, which is publicly announced, and reported to the emperor ..... 470—472
Letter of Nestorius and ten other bishops to the emperor, describing Cyrill's arbitrary proceedings, and demanding an assembly legally conducted 473
Candidian suspected by the Cyrillian party 473
Arrival of John. Meeting of a separate council — by which Cyrill and Memnon are deposed, and Cyrill's anathemas condemned. The other bishops invited to a common council ..... 473—474
Arrival of the Roman legates, who unite with the party of Cyrill. John summoned by this party-council. He and his associates suspended .. 474—475
Impartial letter of the emperor to the synod; answer of the Cyrillian party ..... 475—476
Dalmatius the Archimandrite, gained over and excited by Cyrill, heads a large procession of monks and of the people to the emperor's palace. In consequence of this, three Cyrillian bishops allowed to visit Constantinople ..... 476—477
Letter of Nestorius to his former friend and patron, the chamberlain Scholasticus 477
Irenæus gives an account to the emperor of the arbitrary conduct of Cyrill; yet John, the Syncel of Cyrill, produces a partial impression in his favor 478
The Comes John, appointed the emperor's commissioner to the council. Nestorius, and also Cyrill and Memnon are to be deposed. Indignation of the Cyrillian party. The Comes invites the emperor to call before him eight bishops from each of the parties ..... 478—480
Nestorius retires to a cloister 480
The eight delegates from each party appear before the well-meaning, but weak emperor ..... 480—482
Cyrill's briberies at the court. The emperor prejudiced against Nestorius by the influence of Pulcheria. The Orientals petition for a dismission of the council. Nestorius remains deposed. Cyrill and Memnon return to their bishoprics. The emperor still hopes for the restoration of peace between the two parties ..... 482—483

Compact between Cyrill and the Orientals, A.D. 432; and its consequences, 482—488.

Cyrill subscribes the creed proposed by John of Antioch. John consents to the condemnation of Nestorius. Maximian appointed patriarch of Alexandria ..... 483—484
New divisions. Cyrill accused by the zealots of his own party. Compact disapproved on the part of the Antiochians. The more mode-

PAGE

rate, such as Theodoret, dissatisfied with the removal of Nestorius and the condemnation of his doctrines. The zealots, such as Alexander of Hierapolis, and Meletius of Mopsuestia, demand the condemnation of Cyrill's anathemas, and regard him as an excommunicated person. Excited by the violent conduct of John of Antioch, they form an opposition party in the East, the synod of Cicilia secunda ..... 484—488

Proclus appointed patriarch on the death of Maximian, in 433, although the people demand Nestorius. His connection with Cyrill and John. The latter endeavors to put down the opposition of the Asiatics by resorting to the civil power ..... 468—489

Theodoret's negotiations with John. He endeavors to bring over the more rigid Antiochians, but fails. Alexander of Hierapolis and Meletius of Mopsuestia, banished ..... 489—492

Sequel of the fate of Nestorius.

Remains four years in a cloister near Antioch. A.D. 435, banished to the Egyptian Oasis. His letter to the præfect of Thebais, and the unmerciful treatment he received. His tragedy written by himself, (and that of his friend Irenæus.) Circumstances of his death unknown 492—495

Severer laws passed against Nestorianism, A.D. 435. Theodoret, continuing steadfast, is accused of being a Nestorian by Cyrill ..... 495—496

Cyrill's plan to procure the condemnation of Diodorus and Theodore. His death, 496—498.

The attempts of Rabulas of Edessa, and of the abbot Maximus, violently opposed in the Syrian church ..... 496—497

Cyrill's labors with the emperor frustrated by the superior prudence of Proclus. The latter's Tomus ad Armenos. His delegates transcend their powers. Letter of the Antiochian synod in behalf of Theodore, addressed to the emperor. Letter of Proclus to John, and ordinance of the emperor to the synod. Cyrill evades the storm ..... 497—498

Cyrill's work aimed against Theodoret: "that there is but one Christ." Theodoret's defence of Theodore 498

New plots of Cyrill. His death 498

Dioscurus, Cyrill's successor, of the same mind with his predecessor, but still more violent — his zeal to establish the authority of the Alexandrian church. Treats every distinction of natures in the concrete subject as a Nestorian heresy. Theodoret the main object of his attack. His connection with Syrian monks and ecclesiastics under Barsumas, and the illiterate monks of Constantinople under Eutyches 499—501

The *Eranist* of Theodoret, a work temperately composed against the Eutychian and Egyptian type of doctrine, in 447 ..... 502—503

Theodoret arraigned by Dioscurus before Domnus of Antioch. Mild letter of Theodoret to Dioscurus. Theodoret accused by Dioscurus before the emperor, of Nestorianism. Theodoret and Domnus defend themselves. Theodoret forbidden to leave his diocese ..... 503—504

Eutyches and the synod at Constantinople, in 448, 504—515.

Complaint entered before this synod against Eutyches by Eusebius of Doryleum. Flavian, president of the synod, attempts to reconcile the parties, but fails. Eutyches appears before the synod, after being thrice summoned. Emperor's letter to the synod, apparently in favor of Eutyches. Flaventius, the emperor's *commissioner of faith* ..... 504—506

Eutyches deposed and excommunicated 507

Influential connections of Eutyches. His petition to the emperor. Sentence revised — but confirmed ..... 507—508

Eutyches appeals to a general council, and confers for this purpose with Leo the Great of Rome. Flavian seeks to hinder this, and writes also to Leo ..... 508—509

PAGE

Robber's synod at Ephesus, A.D. 449.

Party ordinance of the emperor. Dioscurus president of the synod. Orders respecting Theodoret and Barsumas. Commissioners of the emperor ..... 509—510
Dioscurus rules supreme, by means of his voice, the monks, the soldiers, and the cowardice of many bishops. The Niceno-Ephesian creed established as alone valid. Flavian, Eusebius, Domnus, and the firm Theodoret, deposed ..... 510—513
Course taken by Leo the Great, with regard to the Robber's synod ..... 514—515
Acquiesces in the condemnation of Eutyches. *His letter to Flavian.* Slight attention paid to his delegates at the Ephesian council. Flavian and Theodoret appeal to an Italian council 515
Leo's letter, at first to no purpose, against the *latrocinium.* Negotiations with him, to procure his recognition of Anatolius ..... 515—516
Change of political relations. Pulcheria and Marcian in power, after 450. Leo's influence increases ..... 516—518
Order for a general council to meet at Nice. Leo's delegates. Council removed to Chalcedon ..... 518—519

Fourth ecumenical council, held at Chalcedon, A.D. 451, 519—524.

Excitement of the parties. Theodoret's reception. Many bishops veer round with the new breeze at court 519
Aversion to the forming of a new creed. The creed of Anatolius, which is approved by the Egyptian party, (Christ, out of two natures.) A part of the Orientals and the Roman delegates not satisfied. Threat of a Western council. A creed finally agreed upon, by adopting several articles from the letter of Leo ..... 520—522
Dioscurus deposed 522
Unworthy treatment of Theodoret, who at last directly condemns Nestorius ..... 522—523
Case of the ten Egyptian bishops ..... 523—524
The union at Chalcedon also, merely in appearance 524

Monophysite controversy, 524—550.

Original germ of it 524
The monk Theodosius, after the expulsion of Juvenal, made patriarch of Jerusalem ..... 524—525
Proterius, the successor of Dioscurus at Alexandria, and the Monophysite party under Timothy Ailuros. Made bishop by this party in 457 ..... 525—526
Assassination of Proterius. The emperor desires an agreement of the two parties. Leo the Great applied to, and shows no disposition to yield anything. Imperial request addressed to all the Metropolitans. Wise judgment of the bishops of Pamphylia. Banishment of Ailurus, A.D. 460. The mild Salophaciolus made patriarch ..... 525—526
Basiliscus dethrones Zeno, A.D. 476. In the beginning, favorable to Monophysitism. His circular letter condemns the Chalcedonian creed and Leo's epistle. Ailurus once more patriarch. Acacius of Constantinople resists the emperor. Anti-circular of Basiliscus ..... 526—527
Zeno again emperor. Favorable to the Chalcedonian party. Choice of Peter Mongus by the Monophysites, after the death of Ailurus. Obliged to flee. Salophaciolus again patriarch. Peter Mongus and John Talaya chosen ..... 527—528
John Talaya, with Gennadius, at Constantinople. His connection with Illus. Irritates Acacius. The cunning Peter Mongus. *Zeno's Henoticon,* A.D. 482. New divisions. Four parties, (the Acephali among the Monophys.) Schism betwixt the Eastern and the Western church ..... 528—530
Anastasius emperor, in 491. Endeavors to maintain the Henoticon.

PAGE

Is suspicious of Monophysitism. The patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius of Constantinople. Philoxenus of Hierapolis and Severus, the two heads of the hitherto headless party, (the Acephali.) Tumult in Constantinople, in consequence of the addition to the *Trisagion*. The emperor removes Macedonius, but is afterwards obliged to make concessions to the Chalcedonian party ..... 530—532

Justin emperor, from the year 518. Enthusiasm for the Chalcedonian council. Vitalian and Justinian. Negotiations with Rome. Anathema on the leaders of the Monophysites. Acacius himself sacrificed. Severus flees to Alexandria ..... 532—533

Justinian emperor from the year 527.

Would fain be champion of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy, and lawgiver to the church, as well as to the state. In so doing, acts as the tool of others, particularly of his monophysite wife Theodora. Anthimus her favorite, whom, deceiving her husband, she makes patriarch, A.D. 535. Anthimus excommunicated by Agapetus of Rome. Deposed by the undeceived emperor. Mennas is made patriarch ..... 533—534

The council under Mennas, A.D. 536, fully condemns Monophysitism. Justinian's despotic law confirming this decision ..... 534—535

Intrigues of Theodora, with the aid of Vigilius, a deacon, and after the banishment of Silverius, in 538, bishop of Rome. Vigilius declines to declare openly in favor of Monophysitism ..... 535—536

The Origenistic court-party, led by Domitian and Theodore Ascidas. Peter of Jerusalem, Pelagius the Roman Apocrisarius, and Mennas, (the two last being jealous of the influence of Theodore Ascidas,) propose to the emperor, the condemnation of the heresies of Origen. Emperor's letter to Mennas, and a synod condemn Origen; yet, Theodore Ascidas and Domitian sacrifice the truth to party interests, and subscribe ..... 536—538

The Origenist's exert themselves to make the anathema pronounced on Origen recoil on Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, for the purpose of drawing off the emperor, annoying Mennas, and forming a combination with the Monophysites and Theodora. They persuade the emperor to condemn those three church teachers by his edict *de tribus capitulis*, A.D. 544; which the four Oriental patriarchs, and the majority of the bishops, after some resistance at first, subscribe ... 538—541

The controversy on the three chapters, 541—550.

Protest of the more free-spirited Africans, particularly of Pontian, as also of the bishops of Dalmatia and Illyria, against the imperial edict. At the request of Vigilius, bishop of Rome, whom the emperor endeavors to gain, Fulgentius Ferrandus writes his judgment. (1. Authority of general councils. 2. Persons deceased are removed from the jurisdiction of a human tribunal. 3. The writing of an individual, though subscribed by many, does not approach to the authority of holy writ.) Vigilius, inclined to follow this judgment at first, is gained over by the court-party — then seeks himself to gain over the African bishops. Seventy subscribe his *judicatum*, but two of his own deacons, and others of the clergy, oppose it ..... 541—544

Thorough and free-spirited defence of the three articles by Facundus of Hermiane ..... 544—545

Vigilius, excommunicated by a Western synodal decision, urges the call of a general council. Retracts his *judicatum*. His shameful oath. Council of Constance, A.D. 551. A part of the African bishops appear. Persecution of the resisting bishops. (Reparatus of Carthage banished) ..... 545—546

New edict of the emperor drawn out in detail. Vigilius declines subscribing it ..... 546—547

PAGE

Fifth ecumenical council at Constantinople, A.D. 553. Vigilius' Constitutum ad imperatorem. Vigilius excommunicated by the emperor. Theodore of Mopsuestia, and several of the works of Theodoret and of Ibas, condemned. Many bishops deposed. Vigilius, still inconstant, confirms the decrees of the council ..... 547—549

Union of the Monophysites with the ruling church not yet effected. Secession of the churches of Istria and Aquilia from Rome 549

Aphthartodocetism, (Christ subjected himself to the affections and defects of a sensuous nature only *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*) proceeding from a mistaken effort to glorify Christ. The emperor, who had already, in 533, confirmed the formulas of the Theopaschites, makes it a law. Deposes Eutychius. Justinian's death, A.D. 565, delivers the church from the utter confusion which threatened it ..... 549—550

APPENDIX.

Formation of isolated church parties, which grew out of these disputes, beyond the limits of the Roman empire ..... 550—551

Nestorians in Persia.

Edessa in Mesopotamia, a seminary for Persian church-teachers. Rabulas of Edessa becomes a follower of Cyrill. Zealous against Nestorianism. Expels the presbyter Ibas and others, who go to Persia. Letter of Ibas to Maris, and his translations of the writings of Theodore and Diodorus into the Syrian tongue. A.D. 536, becomes bishop of Edessa ..... 551—552

Activity of Barsumas (one of those who had been driven away by Rabulas) as bishop of Nisibis, from 435 to 489, in establishing the Nestorian church; the organization of which is completed by a synod under Babias, patriarch of Seleucia, from the year 496. (Permits the clergy to marry) 552

The school of Edessa, destroyed in 489 by Zeno, transplanted to Nisibis 552

Monophysites.

In Egypt, (seceded in the time of Justinian,) and in Ethiopia ..... 552—553

In Armenia, more liberal. The synod of Thiven, under the Catholicos Nierses, in 536, condemns the Chalcedonian council 553

In Syria, the restless activity of Jacob, the Metropolitan, in behalf of the oppressed church, till 578. Jacobites 553

Divisions among the Monophysites. The party of Severus. Niobites. Severus favors Phthartodocetism. Themistius inclined to Agnoëtism .. 553—554

Studies, for the most part barren and unprofitable dialectics. Aristotle. Two men of larger views. John Philoponus, (distinguished the twofold Aristotelian sense of the term *φύσις* — accused of tritheism) and Stephen Gobarus, (collates the opposite decisions of the older church-teachers) ..... 554—555

Mystical tendency of Bar Sudaili, an abbot of Edessa: taught that all fallen beings would eventually be raised to union with God. His Chiliasm. His mystical interpretations of scripture ..... 555—557

Doctrine concerning Man, 557—661.

Introductory remarks. Practical spirit of the Western church. The West (Tertullian) gives more prominence to sin and grace. The Oriental church, (Origen) to that which is akin to God and to the free-will; — answering to the two main directions of human culture .. 557—559

PAGE

The West.

Development of the doctrine concerning man, previous to the time of Augustin 559

The still undeveloped system of Hilary of Poictiers.

The sinful propensity cleaving to all men from Adam. Hilary seems to refer moral evil to the sensuous nature. All men need the forgiveness of sin. Among men, all goodness relative. Holds to a certain painful righteousness of the law. The mild yoke of Christ. Presupposes, too, the communication of a new principle of life by Christ. Gives prominence to the free-will ..... 559—562

Ambrose, the predecessor of Augustin 562

Distinctly sets forth the fact of universal sinfulness, (by men's own fault,) and the doctrine of grace as the efficient cause of all conversion, which, however, is conditioned on human recipiency ..... 562—563

The two passages treating of grace as effecting the whole work ..... 563—564

Anthropology of Augustin and Pelagius, 564—592.

Augustin.

Connection of his scheme of doctrine with the history of his life. Study of St. Paul, at the time of his conversion. The two great divisions of his life. The question, "whence is evil in man's nature, which is attracted towards goodness," led him to Manichæism; but became also, the centre afterwards of his consistent scheme of thought ..... 564—566

The first period, reaching to about 394. Certain Platonic ideas. His doctrine of moral corruption not derived from Manichæism. Moral evil the μὴ ὄν. Holds fast to free-will. His exposition of Rom. 9, of the year 394, (Quod credimus, nostrum est.) The occultissima animarum merita ..... 566—568

With more profound views of the nature of faith, he comes to give a more partial prominence to the divine agency. A predestination conditioned on foreknowledge does not satisfy his discriminating mind ..... 568—570

Second period. The letter to Simplician, A.D. 397, also, on Rom. 9. The incomprehensible, yet at all times just, councils of God ..... 570—572

Augustin's scheme of doctrine distinctly struck out previous to the Pelagian controversy; before the system of Pelagius (which grew out of several views already prevailing in the church) had been formed out in opposition to Augustin 572

Pelagius.

Monk of Britain. Connection with the East. His sequestered life in study and ascetism. Sense of moral power. His letter to Demetrias. Præcepta et concilia — against Jovinian. Takes the sermon on the mount in the literal sense ..... 572—576

His practical interest in opposing the worldly Christianity of the times. Outward participation in the sacraments and faith (understood by him as an outward thing) are not enough. Opposed to purgatory; in favor of the eternity of future punishment. His opposition to moral inaction ..... 576—578

His doctrine concerning man. Virtues of the pagans. Denies inherited depravity. The possibility of moral evil, a necessary condition of goodness. Free-will overcomes the enticements of sense, or yields to them 578

His doctrine concerning the Saviour, that of the church, modified, however, by his doctrine of man. Works must be *added* to faith. Opposition to the Augustinian maxim: Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis ..... 578—579

His commentary on Paul's epistles, composed at Rome, (re-written by Cassiodore) 579

PAGE

External history of the Pelagian disputes, 579—592.

Cœlestius, formerly an advocate, openly appears as a defender of the principles of Pelagius ..... 579—580
Cœlestius visits Carthage (with Pelagius) in 411. Endeavors to obtain there the place of a presbyter. Complained of by Paulinus before a synod of that country, A.D. 412, (for maintaining that Adam's sin injured no one but himself.) Cœlestius of the opinion that the subject in hand was a *speculative* question *de traduce peccati;* but is excommunicated ..... 580—581
Pelagius at Palestine, A.D. 415. Jerome and Paul Orosius, his antagonists. Jerome's letter to Ctesiphon, and his dialogues. Yet the Oriental church, on the whole, more favorably inclined to Pelagius than to Augustin ..... 581—582
Orosius arraigns Pelagius before a synod under John of Jerusalem, A.D. 415. The prudent John will not allow himself to be moved by the authority of Augustin. Pelagius vindicates himself before the Orientals on the charge that "he taught man might easily fulfil the divine commands." The complainants allege that the matter belonged to the West — and for this reason, John reports it to Innocent of Rome ..... 582—583
Heros of Arles, and Lazarus of Aix, enter a complaint against Pelagius, before a synod held at Diospolis, under Eulogius of Cæsarea. Pelagius defends himself against the charge that he taught "there was such a thing as perfect purity and exemption from sin." Also condemns certain positions of Cœlestius, and is recognized as a member of the Catholic church ..... 583—585
Alleged violences at Bethlehem. Jerome and Augustin (de gestis Pelagii) concerning the synod of Diospolis 585
The three letters of the North-African bishops, A.D. 416. Letter of Pelagius — and his vague confession of faith, all addressed to Innocent. Innocent, though not wholly given to the views of Augustin, joins in the condemnation of the Pelagian doctrines, but dies in the same year, 416 ..... 586—587
Zosimus his successor, more favorable to the Pelagian doctrines. Cœlestius at Rome. His confession of faith, likewise vague and indefinite, satisfies Zosimus. Two letters of the latter to the Africans, asserting the orthodoxy of Cœlestius and Pelagius ..... 587—589
The decided protest of a synod at Carthage produces an impression on Zosimus. He suspends his decision. Nine canons of the Africans against Pelagius ..... 590—591
Africans secure on their side the civil power. Imperial edicts against Pelagianism. Zosimus thereby brought round. Cites Cœlestius, who does not appear. Condemns by his "tractoria" Pelagius and Cœlestius. Accused by the Pelagians of denying his own convictions ..... 591—592
Bishops deposed for refusing to subscribe the *tractoria* of Zosimus 592

Julian of Eclanum, 592—596.

More systematic, at the same time more passionate, than Pelagius and Cœlestius. Free-spirited, well educated, moral, and devout. His remarks against the timid bishops. Against the interference of the civil power. Constantly makes his appeal to reason, (ratio) ..... 592—595
The Pelagian anthropology, rigidly carried out, must needs introduce a change also, in the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. Leporius, condemned as a Pelagian, A.D. 426. His recantation at Carthage, in which, however, there is no trace of his earlier Pelagian views, but only of his Antiochian notions respecting the person of Christ .. 595—597
Annianus, deacon at Celeba, a zealous and constant Pelagian. Translator of Chrysostom's homilies ..... 597—598

PAGE

Leo the Great opposed to Pelagianism. The Pelagian Seneca, about the year 500 — letter of Gelasius of Rome against him 598

Final result of the controversy. Pelagianism suppressed by outward force — but as the victorious doctrine (not, however, the whole doctrine of Augustin) had in its favor the voice of the Christian consciousness at large, no reäctions, like those in the Oriental church, ensued ..... 598—599

Inner relation to each other, of the conflicting modes of thinking, and shape of the dispute, 599—606.

Importance of the questions in dispute, depreciated by Pelagius and Cœlestius — strongly asserted by Julian and Augustin ..... 599—600

Fundamental difference. According to the professions of the parties: *the different views of man's moral condition in relation to the first sin* ..... 600—601

A good deal that cannot be traced back to this point. The different way of apprehending the doctrine of man's free-will. Finding nowhere substantial freedom, Augustin is led to the supposition of *a corruption of man's nature*, and of a preceding *original moral state*. Pelagius, with his formal conception of freedom, conceives the possibility of goodness, as well as of moral evil — and his theory of an original moral state and of a first sin, stands disconnected from his system. The *possibilitas utriusque* of Pelagius. The antithesis of "nature" and "grace" of Augustin, the dependence of all rational beings on grace for attaining to their destination ..... 601—605

Accordingly, the fundamental difference is in the different mode of apprehending *the relation of the natural to the supernatural* — or reduced back still further — of *the creation to the Creator* ..... 605—606

Individual points of dispute.

The first sin and its consequences. The Pelagians represent the first sin as the disobedience of a heedless child, yielding to the seductions of sense. Augustin makes the exceeding guilt of the first sin to consist in man's transgressing the law of God with a free-will; "concupiscence" the root of selfishness. Augustin's *propagatio reatus et pœnæ*, Rom. 5 : 12. The Pelagians taught that Adam injured his posterity only by his example. Augustin's well-weighed expressions respecting the *propagatio fidei per traducem*, which Pelagius called nonsensical. The Pelagians affirmed a progressive deterioration of humanity — yet that there were examples of perfect holiness ..... 606—612

The wavering notion of "grace," among the Pelagians, and their three stages of righteousness ..... 612—613

Julian, against the charge of the self-sufficiency of human reason — yet holds there is no contradiction betwixt reason and revelation ..... 613—614

Grace and free-will. The Pelagians: all operations of grace conditioned on the bent of the will. According to Augustin, grace excludes all merit. To the Pelagians, grace consisted of outward revelations — to Augustin, of inward communications ..... 614—616

Doctrine concerning Christ as Redeemer. The Pelagians, limiting the negative significance of the redemption, make it to consist especially in the ennobling of the imperfect human nature: Christ, the divine teacher, the highest pattern of the divine righteousness, imparted to man many new motives to moral effort ..... 616—617

The Pelagians, recognizing the objective significance of justification, place the *inner union with Christ* in the back-ground ..... 617—618

Progressive development of the divine life according to Augustin, 618—623.

In opposition to the three stages of righteousness according to Pelagius,

PAGE

Augustin teaches there is but one only spring of true holiness — the specific principle of the Christian life. Augustin's narrow judgment of the pagan times, (Rom. 14 : 23.) On the other side, Julian's illogical distinction of the *fructuose and steriliter bona* ..... 618—622

Augustin's *prevenient*, *efficacious*, and *coöperating grace*, and his "gift of perseverance" ..... 622—623

Doctrine of absolute predestination, 623—627.

Necessarily connected with Augustin's doctrine concerning grace. His more profound apprehension of freedom as a state, leads him to deny it as a faculty. Contents himself with an apparent freedom. Real freedom only in the case of Adam ..... 623—625

Augustin's prudent, logically skilful statement of this doctrine. Mischievous consequences derived from it already in 426, by the monks at Adrumetum. Against these, Augustin writes his works de gratia et libero arbitro, and de correptione et gratia ..... 625—627

Semi-Pelagianism and Augustinianism, 627—651.

Intermediate tendencies.

John Cassian, 627—630.

A monk from the East. His predominant practical bent. A disciple of Chrysostom 627

Recognizes a universal corruption — also Augustin's views of "grace" and "justification," but in connection with a love of God extending to all, and with the exclusion of all constraining influence on the free-will. His thirteenth *collation*, on the relation of grace and free-will .. 627—630

The Semi-Pelagians in Gaul, not satisfied with Augustin's book *de correptione et gratia*. Some of the clergy there, however, enthusiastically attached to Augustin —for example, Prosper of Aquitania. His and Hilary's letter to Augustin, on the agitated state of men's minds ..... 630—631

Augustin's works, written with Christian moderation, against the Semi-Pelagians. De prædestinatione sanctorum and de dono perseverantiæ . 631—632

Prosper's hearty and fervent carmen de ingratis — in which, however, he omits to notice, in his opponents, the interest for a morality that would be *free* ..... 632—633

Augustin's last years. His *retractationes*. The opus imperfectum. His letter to Boniface. Dies A.D. 429 ..... 633—634

Prosper and Hilary have recourse to Cœlestin of Rome. Cœlestin's indefinite letter to the Gallic bishops. The Commonitorium of Vincentius — partly in opposition to the too great authority ascribed to Augustin ..... 634—636

Hilary and Prosper in Rome. Prosper's unsuccessful efforts also with Sixtus ..... 636—637

Writings of Prosper. Able exposition of the doctrine of predestination. (God not arbitrary, but his judgments unsearchable. Germ of the distinction between the revealed and the secret will of God ..... 637—638

The book De vocatione omnium gentium — [its author] — aims at a comparison resulting in favor of the Augustinian system of doctrine. His dialectic method ..... 638—639

The three positions of man: Voluntas sensualis, animalis, spiritalis; and the two kinds of grace, general and special. Our knowledge is but in part ..... 639—641

The Predestinatians. The "second book of the Predestinatus," (stern form of the doctrine of predestination, examples of Judas and Paul. Through Christ, a restoration of corrupt nature only in hope) ..... 641—643

The author of the "Predestinatus," a Semi-Pelagian. By prevenient grace, he understands only the work which Christ accomplished here on the earth. Refutation of the above mentioned examples ..... 643—644

Genuineness of the second book of the Prædestinatus ..... 644—645

PAGE

The Semi-Pelagian Faustus of Rhegium. His practical Christian spirit. His controversy with the Predestinatian Lucidus. Council of Arles, A.D. 475. His book De gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio. Free-will not lost, but weakened. Distinguishes also a universal and a special grace; but this sometimes precedes human efforts. His well-conceived collation of the doctrines concerning man and concerning Christ. Mentions Augustin with respect. Gennadius on Augustin ..... 645—648

Cæsarius of Arles, a man distinguished for practical activity, and Fulgentius of Ruspe, (both driven out of Africa by the Vandals,) and others of a similar stamp, bring about the triumph of the Augustinian system of doctrine ..... 648—649

Controversies occasioned by the work of Faustus. The Scythian monks of Constantinople, zealous for the orthodox faith. Question proposed by the African bishop Possessor to Hormisdas of Rome, and his free-spirited, moderate reply. Those monks, dissatisfied with the answer, are the occasion of Fulgentius of Ruspe writing several works against Semi-Pelagianism ..... 649—650

The council of Orange, A.D. 529, under Cæsarius, and that of Valence, testify to the victory of the Augustinian scheme of doctrine ..... 650—651

The Oriental Church, 651—661.

Slight participation of the East in the controversies of the West, relating to the doctrine concerning man 651

Theodore of Mopsuestia. His work against the system of Augustin. Whether at a later period he joined in the condemnation of Julian? 651—652

His Anthropology: man the image of God for the whole creation, the bond of union to the entire universe. The necessary appearance of sin in the state of mutability. His views respecting the law, and respecting death. Exposition of Rom. 8 : 19 ..... 652—656

His point of contact with Pelagianism. Weakness of man's nature, doctrine of freedom; difference. In Theodore's system, the doctrine of redemption occupies an essential place ..... 656—659

Chrysostom. His practical spirit. His quiet development. His rich inward experience. His sphere of activity. His exposition of Rom. 5 : 19. Grace operates within, in proportion to the free determination of the will 659

Nestorius agrees essentially with Chrysostom. The occurrence with the four Pelagian bishops, and his letter to Cœlestin. Memorial of Marius Mercator. Nestorius' letter of condolence to Cœlestius. Pelagianism condemned by the Cyrillian council of Ephesus, out of complaisance to Rome ..... 659—660

Isidore of Pelusium. Seeds of goodness left even after the fall. Grace needful for all — is ordinarily not prevenient — is not constraining .. 661

Doctrine of the Sacraments, 661—665.

The notion of sacrament, a very indefinite one. The ambiguous term *sacramentum*. Propensity to multiply holy symbols, especially in the Greek church ..... 661—662

Greater doctrinal strictness of Augustin. The *virtus sacramenti* and the *sacramentum*. Outward symbols necessary for every religious society, but the determinate form God might alter in the New Testament. Necessity of a recipient state of mind. God's grace not absolutely connected with the symbol. He sets distinctly forth, in opposition to the Donatists, the objective significance of the sacraments. In the New Testament, the religion of the spirit, signs few and simple ..... 662—664

Number of the sacraments still undetermined. The four sacraments of Augustin ..... 664—665

PAGE

Doctrine of Baptism, 665—670.

Connection of baptism and regeneration. In connection with their different views of man, the Occidentals gave more prominence to the negative, the Orientals to the positive effect of baptism ..... 665—666
Theodore of Mopsuestia. For adults, the forgiveness of sin and union with Christ; in the case of infant baptism, properly no forgiveness of sin, but communication of the higher life of exemption from sin, (anamartesia.) His nicer distinction of vehicle and efficient principle 666—667
In like manner, the Pelagians, though without reference to their principles, following the church tradition, affirmed the necessity of baptism for persons of every age. Their *intermediate state* of unbaptized children ..... 667—669
This intermediate state, a doctrine also of Gregory Nazianzen. Augustin at first, Ambrose, Pelagius himself, undecided. Augustin opposed to it. Doctrine condemned by a council at Carthage, A.D. 418. In the case of the baptism of infants, the faith of the church, according to Augustin, represents that of the subject ..... 669—670

Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 670—675.

The idea predominant of a spiritual and bodily union with Christ; most strongly, in Cyrill of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, Nilus 670—671
Not directly a transubstantiation. Theodoret on the relation of the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ ..... 671—672
Gregory of Nyssa approaches the theory of transubstantiation; expresses clearly the wide-spread idea of a repetition of the incarnation of the Logos 672
More spiritual views of Athanasius. Augustin. Gregory of Nyssa .... 672—673
Eusebius of Cæsarea seems, like Origen, to distinguish the sensible and the spiritual ordinance ..... 674—675

Doctrine concerning the Last Things, 675—678.

The doctrine of purgatory, (ignis purgatorius.) Its abuse. Pelagius against it. Augustin seeks to guard it against misconstruction ..... 675—676
The doctrine of everlasting punishment. Often impugned from frivolous motives. Against which Chrysostom. Combatted on deeper grounds of Christian interest by the Origenistic and Antiochian schools ..... 676—678

Opposite spiritual tendencies in theology, which grew out of the after working of the Origenistic disputes, 678—704.

Enthusiastic admirers of Origen, and blind zealots opposed to him in the East. Marcellus of Ancyra, an opponent of Origen, held that he was the father of Arianism. Commixture of Platonic ideas with Christianity. Didymus an Origenist. Chrestomathy from the works of Origen, by Basil and Gregory of Nazianz. Great influence of Origen on Gregory of Nyssa ..... 678—680
The monks, especially in Egypt, in part for, and in part against Origen 680
Epiphanius of Palestine. Educated among the Egyptian monks. A.D. 367, bishop of Constantia. Well-read, but uncritical. His upright, but narrow doctrinal spirit. Zealous opponent of Origen ..... 680—681
Jerome. His merits as a promoter of biblical studies. His zeal for the gospel, coupled with great defects. Born at Stridon, about 430. Disciple of the grammarian Donatus, and of Apollinaris. Baptized at Rome when a young man. Retires to the desert of Chalcis in Syria. Study of the ancient authors. His dream and his oath. Learns the Hebrew. Becomes a presbyter. Goes, about the year 380, to Constantinople, to Gregory of Nazianz. Studies and translates Origen. In 382 at Rome. Secretary of Damasus. Has many friends and enemies. Exerts himself to promote the ascetic life. Goes to

PAGE

Bethlehem. Spiritual education of young men. Improvement of the Latin version of the Bible, and new translation of the Old Testament after the original ..... 681—685
Rufinus and John of Jerusalem, united with Jerome also in the study of Origen. Relations of the latter with Origen 685
Zeal of Western pilgrims against Origen, leads Jerome, who was anxious to maintain his reputation for orthodoxy, to exercise more prudence in expressing his views of Origen ..... 685—686
Epiphanius, A.D. 394, at Jerusalem, where he requires of John the condemnation of Origen — and at Bethlehem, ordains Paullinianus. Controversy between Epiphanius and John. Jerome takes the side of Epiphanius. A.D. 396, Jerome and Rufinus are reconciled ..... 686—687
Rufinus in 397 repairs to Rome. His translation, with modifications, of the work Περὶ ἀρχῶν. Pammachius and Oceanus. Jerome incensed with Rufinus. Rufinus justified by Siricius. Anastasius against Origen and Rufinus ..... 687—689
Theophilus of Alexandria. Connected with Origenistic monks. His presbyter Isidore — a man of no character ..... 689—690
His Epiphany-programm, A.D. 399, against the Anthropomorphites. Exasperation of the Scetic monks. Theophilus pacifies them by dissimulation ..... 690—691
The Origenistic monks of mount Nitria. Evagrius. The four tall brothers. Out of revenge to these and to Isidore, Theophilus unites with the Anthropomorphites. Jerome and Epiphanius, at various synods after 399, stigmatize Origen as a heretic, and persecute those monks, who take refuge with Chrysostom at Constantinople ..... 691—693
John Chrysostom. Born 347, at Antioch. His mother Anthusa. His early education. Study of the ancients. From 386, presbyter at Antioch, under Flavian. Eloquence. A.D. 397, bishop of Constantinople. Freedom of Spirit, sequestration, austerity. Eutropius. His inconstant relations to Eudoxia ..... 693—694
Arrival of the monks. Letter of Chrysostom to Theophilus. Latter's accusation of the monks. Petition of the monks to the empress. Theophilus cited to Constantinople ..... 694—695
Theophilus, full of vengeance against Chrysostom, unites with his enemies and with Epiphanius. Council held under Epiphanius, A.D. 401, for the condemnation of Origen. Epiphanius comes, in 402, to Constantinople. Is perplexed as to the course he ought to pursue ... 695—697
Theophilus enters into an understanding with Eudoxia against Chrysostom. Arrives at Constantinople in 403. Synod at the Oak. Chrysostom deposed and accused of high treason, and sent into exile, but is soon recalled. His sermon on John the Baptist, and second exile, to Cucusus. His lofty confidence of faith, and restless activity in spreading the gospel in his exile. Innocent of Rome intercedes for him. New exasperation of his enemies. Is conveyed to Pityus in Pontus. Dies on the journey, at Comanum, A.D. 407 ..... 697—701
Schism of the Johannites, disposed of by Atticus and Proclus, (438) 701
Synesius, despite his views (in part Origenistic) differing from those of the ruling church, is ordained by Theophilus bishop of Ptolemais ... 701—702
Individual ecclesiastics inclined to the views of Origen ..... 702—703
Origenistic controversies in the time of Justinian. Justinian's edict, and council under Mennas, A.D. 541, against the Origenistic doctrines. Question, whether the fifth ecumenical council (533) condemned Origen? ..... 703—704

Appendix to History of Doctrines.

Sects, 704—718.

Significance of the sects ..... 704—705
Audians. Audius in Mesopotamia. His opposition to the unspiritual clergy. Anthropomorphism. Excommunicated. Bishop of his sect.

PAGE

Time of the Easter festival. When old, banished to Scythia. Promotion of the ascetic life ..... 705—706
One-sided ethical tendencies. Rhetorius and the knowledge-haters (Gnosimachi) ..... 706—707

Manichæans, 707—710.

Persecution in Persia, A.D. 525. Law of Diocletian against them. At first tolerated under Constantine, afterwards persecuted. Intercession of Libanius in their behalf. Laws against them after 372. Leo the Great inquires them out. Laws of Valentinian III. and of Justinian, (punishing them with death.) Persecuted in Africa by Huneric (477) 707—708
Secret spread of the sect. Agapius. Faustus of Mileve. His writings against the church doctrines ..... 708—710
New commixtures of Christianity with Oriental theosophy. The θεοσοφία of Aristocritus 710

Priscilianists, 710—718.

External history of the sect.

In Spain. Marcus of Memphis. Priscillian: rich, respectable, eloquent, a rigid ascetic. The bishops Instantius and Salvianus, his adherents. Hyginus of Cordova, and Idacius of Emerita, opposed to him. Synod at Saragossa, A.D. 380. Ithacius of Sossuba. Idacius and Ithacius resort to the secular arm. The Priscillianists have recourse in vain to Damasus of Rome and Ambrose. Bribe Macedonius ..... 710—711
The worldly-minded Ithacius gains over Maximus the usurper, against the Priscillianists. Synod at Bourdeaux, A.D. 384. Instantius deposed. Priscillian appeals to the emperor. Martin of Tours intercedes with the emperor, whom Magnus and Rufus once more bring round. Trial by Euodius. Priscillian executed. The Priscillianists persecuted. Theognist, Martin of Tours, Ambrose, opposed to these unspiritual proceedings. Enthusiasm of the oppressed ..... 711—715

Doctrines of Priscillian, 715—717.

Dualism and emanation system. The souls of men, divine essences sent forth to contend with the empire of darkness. The souls confined in bodies by the powers of darkness; but in order to their own subjugation. The twelve sidereal and the twelve celestial powers. Man the microcosm. Man still subjected to the influence of the stars until the appearance of the Redeemer. Monarchian and Docetic notions of Christ. Regeneration. Use of the Old Testament and of several apocryphical writings ..... 715—717
Morality of the Pricillianists. Rigidly ascetic. Pious fraud: "libra" of the later catholic bishop Dictinnius. The opponents of the Priscillianists employ their own arts against them; against which, Augustin's work, De mendacio ad consentium ..... 717—718
Propagation of the sect clandestinely. Council of Braga, A.D. 563. Important influence of the sects on the succeeding centuries 718

Additional notes and remarks from the second edition 719
Index of subjects and names 762

CHURCH HISTORY.

SECOND PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. FROM THE END OF THE DIOCLESIAN PERSECUTION TO THE TIME OF GREGORY THE GREAT, BISHOP OF ROME; OR FROM THE YEAR 312 TO THE YEAR 590.

SECTION FIRST.

RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE WORLD. ITS EXTENSION AND LIMITATION.

I. Within the Roman Empire.

A. *Relation of the Roman Emperors to the Christian Church.*

The Christian church had come forth victorious out of its last bloody conflict in the Dioclesian persecution. The very author of the persecution, the Emperor Galerius himself, had been forced to acknowledge, that the power of conviction was not to be overcome by fire and sword. But in truth no experience can subdue the obstinacy of fanaticism and of despotism; and had not everything assumed another shape, under the influence of a great political change in the Roman empire, deeply affecting the history of the world, the attempt would, perhaps, even after that last edict of toleration, have been renewed in many districts, to suppress Christianity by force; as indeed it had often been the case before, that the persecution, after a momentary pause, broke forth again with increased violence.

One of the regents of that period was Caius Galerius Valerius Maximinus, who ruled at first over Egypt and Syria; then, after the death of his uncle Galerius in the year 311, made himself master of all the Asiatic provinces; — the bitterest enemy of Christianity and of the Christians. Sprung from the lowest condition, — having been originally a shepherd, — he was blindly devoted to all the popular superstitions of Paganism, inclined by his own disposition to serve as a tool to the priests, and possessed withal of a rough, violent, despotic temper. He had no wish now, it is true, to be the only one among the regents of the Roman empire to oppose the edict which had been issued by the

oldest Augustus; but still he could not be satisfied to publish it in the same open manner in which it had been published in the other parts of the empire. He had only directed, under the hand of his first officer of state, Sabinus, the prætorian prefect, that it should be announced to all the provincial magistrates, as the emperor's will, that the Christians should no longer be molested. The prefect issued a mandate which agreed in substance with the edict of Valerius: "That it had long been with the emperors an object of their most anxious desire, to bring back the souls of all men to the right ways of a pious life; so that those who followed any usage foreign from that of the Romans, might be induced to pay to the immortal gods the homage which is due to them: but such had been the obstinacy of many people, that they would neither be drawn away from their purpose by a reasonable obedience to the imperial command, nor awed by the punishments with which they were threatened. Inasmuch, then, as their imperial majesties[1] had graciously considered, that it would be contrary to their mild intentions to involve so many in danger, they had resolved that, for the the future, no Christian should be punished or disturbed on account of his religion; since it had been made evident by the experience of so long a period, that they could in no way be persuaded to desist from their own wilful determination."[2]

The more violent the persecution had been, especially in the countries subject to the government of Maximinus, the greater was the joy of the Christians in those countries, when this command of the emperor was everywhere put in execution. From their different places of exile, from the prisons, from the mines in which they had been condemned to labor, crowds of thankful Christians returned to their homes; and the public wayfares resounded with their songs of praise. The churches began to be rebuilt, and to be filled once more with worshipping assemblies. Scarcely for half a year did their joy and tranquillity remain undisturbed. As was to be expected, the restoration of the Christian churches, and the great number of those who now freely and publicly joined in the religious services, excited afresh the fanatic rage of the Heathens, which could once more readily find an organ for its expression in that Maximinus, who, at heart, had never ceased to cherish his blind zeal for the old idolatry, and his hatred of Christianity.

At first, they could not bear to see the enthusiasm which the memory of the martyrs enkindled in the Christians who assembled at their graves. It was very easy, too, in pretending fear lest some disturbance might happen to the public peace, to find a reason for prohibiting the Christians from assembling at their places of burial — the cemeteries. The religious views of the emperor being well known, the heathen priests, conjurors and magistrates, in various cities both of his old and of his new province, where from the earliest times the pagan worship stood in high repute, and certain forms of it in particular were exhib-

[1] The Numen dominorum nostrorum, ἡ θειότης τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν, — as the debasing, idolatrous flattery which had become already the diplomatic language, then expressed itself.

[2] Euseb. hist. eccles. l. IX. c. 1. De mort. persecutor. c. 36.

ited with much antique display, (as at Antioch, Tyre, and Nicomedia in Bithynia,) instigated their fellow-citizens to beg it as a favor of the emperor, that no enemy to the gods of their fathers might be permitted to dwell or practise his own rites of worship within their walls. In part it was fanatical intolerance, and in part a spirit of servile flattery, more anxious to obtain the favor of the prince than to promote the honor of the gods, which dictated these petitions. Christian authors, it is true, affirm, that the emperor himself secretly encouraged these persons to present such petitions, that he might have a fair pretext for persecuting the Christians.[1] But it is plain that they do not here report a fact which was known to themselves; but only represent as a fact, the inference which they thought themselves warranted to draw, from the manner in which Maximinus received such petitions, and from his known disposition. The reception which these petitions met with from the emperor was, at all events, without any further action on his part, a sufficient encouragement to repeat them. True, when he first took possession of the Asiatic provinces, which had belonged to the empire of Galerius; and when, on his arrival at Nicomedia, many of the citizens appeared before him with the images of their gods, and presented him, in the name of the city, a petition of this sort, he was still just enough — unless we may suppose he was restrained for the present by reasons of policy — to refuse granting their petition immediately. He caused himself, in the first place, to be informed of the true state of things; and on finding that there were many Christians in the city, he told the deputies, that he would have been pleased to grant their request; but he understood that it was not the wish of all the citizens, and he desired to leave every man at liberty to follow his own convictions.[2] When, however, similar petitions came to him from other cities, testifying great zeal for the worship of the gods; when, moreover, pious frauds, so called, were employed to operate on the mind of the superstitious and credulous prince, — as at Antioch, where it was said a voice had issued from a wonder-working statue of Jupiter Philios, lately set up, and the god required that his enemies should be driven from the city and its territory,[3] — Maximin could no longer maintain that tone of impartiality which was so foreign from his nature. He thought it due to the honor of the gods, as he expressed it in the later edict, those gods to whom the state owed its preservation, that he should not reject a request which aimed at nothing but the promotion of that honor. He not only granted such petitions, but expressed to those who presented them, his particular approbation of their pious disposition. At Tyre, he caused to be publicly fixed up, in answer to a proposal of this sort, and as an encouraging token of his satisfaction

[1] Thus De mortib. persecut. c. 36: Subornatis legationibus civitatum, quæ peterent, ne intra civitates suas Christianis conventicula extruere liceret, ut quasi coactus et impulsus facere videratur, quod erat sponte facturus; and Euseb. IX. 2: Αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ καθ' ἡμῶν πρεσβεύεται.

[2] This is stated by Maximin himself, in the edict which he subsequently published in favor of the Christians, and which Eusebius, after his usual manner, has translated in very obscure language from the Latin original; or else it was composed in a very barbarous diplomatic style.

[3] Euseb. IX. 3.

with its pious spirit, a laudatory writing, composed in the pompous, declamatory style of the rhetorical schools of that period, by some master or pupil of the same. Among other things it was here said: "That highest and greatest Jupiter, who presides over your famous city, who saved the gods of your fathers, your wives, children, hearths and homes from every pestilent infection, he it was who inspired your souls with this wholesome purpose, revealing to you how noble and salutary it is, to approach the worship of the immortal gods with becoming reverence." Next is set forth in swollen expressions, how, by the renewed worship of the gods, men had been delivered from the distresses of famine and of war, from contagious pestilence, and other public calamities, which formerly had been brought on by the guilt of the Christians: — "For these things happened in consequence of the pernicious error of those reckless men, when it had taken possession of their souls, and covered almost the whole world with disgrace." It is then said of the Christians: "If they persist in their accursed folly, let them be banished, as you demand, far from your city and its territory." And that they themselves might know with what good will the emperor received their proposition, they were invited to ask for some special favor, which should be granted them at once, as a memorial to their children and childrens' children of their piety towards the immortal gods.[1]

In every way, Maximin sought to restore the splendor of Paganism, and, by giving new power and new consequence to its zealous votaries, to supplant the Christians, without publishing any new edict against them. The appointment to sacerdotal offices in the provinces had hitherto been lodged with the senatorial colleges, (the collegio decurionum, curialium,) who chose to such posts, those of their own number who had been already tried in various municipal employments. But Maximin now reserved the appointment to such places in his own hands, that he might be sure to have promoted to them the most distinguished men of the senate, and those from whom he could expect the most zealous and influential exertions to reanimate Paganism. To the highest posts of the sacerdotal colleges he chose, in fact, men who had already filled the higher civil offices; and, to procure for them greater respect, he gave them the mantle of glistening white, inwrought with gold, which before was the distinguishing badge of the court offices.[2]

Trials before Pilate (acta Pilati) were now forged, full of blasphemies against Christ.[3] These fabricated documents were distributed through the city and country schools, in order that hatred to Christian-

[1] The edict, in a Greek translation, is in Eusebius, IX. 7.

[2] Euseb. IX. 4. De mortib. p. c. 36.

[3] Euseb. IX. 5. Still earlier than this, there may have been various recensions of the acta Pilati by Christians and Pagans; and so this new device of malice may have sprung out of some older root. Perhaps, also, it is inexact, when it is said, that those *acta* were then forged for the first time; perhaps the fanatical hate of the Pagans had already devised some contrivance of this sort in the earlier times of the Diocle-sian persecution; and special pains were now taken to put it in circulation. This we are obliged to suppose, if these *acta* are altogether the same with those to which a pagan priest, in some earlier year of the Diocletian persecution, appealed before a tribunal as testimony against the divinity of Christ. Acta Tarachi, Probi, et Andronici, c. 9. His words to the Christians are: Μῶρε, τοῦτο οὐκ οἰδας, ὁτι, ὃν ἐπικαλῇ, ἄνθρωπόν τινα γεγενημένον κακοῦργον, ὑπὸ ἐξουσίᾳ δὲ Πιλάτου τινὸς ἡγεμόνος ἀνηρτῆσθαι σταυρῷ, ὃν καὶ ὑπομνήματα κατακεῖνται;

ity might be seasonably instilled into the minds of the children, — a well-chosen means, no doubt, for giving currency to convictions such as men wished to have them.

The declamatory notice above cited, that public calamities were warded off by the worship of the gods, was soon refuted by experience. There was a failure of harvest, and a famine; pestilential disorders raged. Meanwhile the Christians chose the best way to manifest the spirit of their faith, and to show the Heathens the groundlessness of their accusations.[1] They collected the whole multitude of the starving population in the city (probably Nicomedia) into one place, and distributed bread to them. Thus it might be that more was accomplished by this work of faith, than could have been effected by any demonstration of words; that, as Eusebius says,[2] the Heathens praised the Christians' God, and pronounced the Christians themselves to be the only truly pious and God-fearing men. But there is always a fanaticism which the strongest facts can neither confute nor embarrass.

Although no new edicts of a sanguinary character were issued, yet it could not fail to be the case, under the impulse of freshly excited passions, the outbreaks of which were rather favored than checked by the supreme power of the state, that in various scattered spots the blood of the martyrs would flow copiously. Individuals who, by their zeal for the spread of the faith, and by the authority in which they stood among their fellow-believers, had drawn particularly upon themselves the hatred of the governors or of the emperor, suffered martyrdom. Instances of this kind occurred at Emesa in Phœnicia, at Alexandria, and at Antioch.[3] This was the last martyr's blood which flowed in consequence of the Dioclesian persecution. From the West began a train of events, which placed the whole Christian church in a different relation to the civil power in the Roman state; and the influence of these events soon extended, at least indirectly, to the Eastern portion of the empire.

Constantine, the son of Constantius Chlorus, was the individual by whom this change was brought about. The manner in which it took place had an important influence on the entire shaping of the church within the bounds of the Roman empire, during the period commencing with this epoch. In order to a correct understanding of the whole matter, it is certainly much to be desired, that we possessed better means of information respecting the early religious education of the person from whom all this proceeded. But, as often happens, the facts which have reached us concerning the mental development of the author of a great outward change in the history of the world, are scanty and meagre; and it only remains for us to gather our conclusions from a few scattered hints.

His father, Constantius Chlorus, was, as we have already remarked in another place, friendly to the Christians, and probably a follower of that species of religious eclecticism which united Christ along with the gods of Rome. His mother, Helena, the first wife of Constantius, be-

[1] Compare the similar example in the first volume.

[2] L. 9, c. 8.

[3] Euseb. IX. c. 6.

comes known, at a somewhat later period, as a zealous Christian according to the measure of her religious knowledge, — devoted and punctilious in the performance of all the external duties of religion. There are no existing grounds for supposing that she came to this conviction suddenly, or that she was led to embrace it, in her later years, by the example of her son. Nothing forbids us to suppose that she was, in the earlier period of her life, if not a Christian, at least inclined to Christianity.[1] Possibly it was through her influence that this direction had been given to the mind of her husband; since it not unfrequently happened, that the husband came to the knowledge of Christianity through means of the wife. Slight as must have been the immediate influence of his parents on the education of Constantine, who was so early removed from their side; yet it may well be supposed, that the religious principles of the parents would not fail to make some impression on the mind of their son. The Christians being at that time so numerous and so widely dispersed, Constantine would, without doubt, frequently come in contact with them; and, as we may readily suppose, they would neglect no opportunity which offered, of making the prince favorably disposed towards their religion and their party. While a youth, he resided at the court of Dioclesian; and afterwards at that of Galerius. He witnessed at Nicomedia the out-burst of the persecution against the Christians.[2] This example of blood-thirsty fanaticism could have no other effect, than to revolt his youthful, and in respect to such proceedings, unprejudiced mind. When he compared the religious tolerance of his father with the spirit which he here saw displayed, it was no difficult task for him to decide, which way of thinking would best contribute to promote the tranquillity and well-being of the state. He witnessed here, too, such proofs of the power of Christian faith, as might well make an impression on him. He saw there was something in Christianity, which was not to be subdued by fire and sword.

In the next following years, after Constantine, as his father's successor, had been proclaimed Augustus, in 306, by the legions in Britain, he appears to have been still attached to the pagan forms of worship. When, in the year 308, after the successful termination of the war with

[1] Nothing certain is known with regard to the relations between Helena and her son as to this matter. Theodoret, it is true, says expressly, (H. E. l. I. c 18,) that Constantine received his first impressions of Christianity from her; but we cannot be sure that his authority for this statement is deserving of confidence. Eusebius might have been more correctly informed; and he says, (de vita Constant. l. III. c. 47,) it was by means of Constantine that his mother first became a Christian, — *θεοσεβῆ καταστησάντα, οὐκ οὖσαν πρότερον.* But we should remark, that Eusebius was strongly inclined to turn everything to the advantage of his hero; and that it is in nowise inconsistent with this statement, to suppose that Helena, while professing to be on the side of Heathenism, still cherished a certain veneration for Christ, as a divine being, and was disposed to favor Christianity.

[2] See the religious discourse which the Christian emperor is said to have pronounced before a Christian assembly — Oratio ad sanctorum cœtum, appended to the life of this emperor by Eusebius, c. 25. Though it assuredly cannot be supposed that the discourse was delivered by the emperor precisely as it stands here, yet the substance of it is nevertheless not wholly unlike what we might naturally expect from him. Compare also what Constantine says concerning the persecution of Dioclesian, in his proclamation issued in the East, after the victory over Licinius. Euseb. de vita Constantin. l. II. c. 49.

that Maximianus Herculius who had a second time set himself up as emperor, he received the unexpected intelligence, that the Franks, against whom he was just commencing a campaign, had ceased from their hostile demonstrations, he gave public thanks in a celebrated temple of Apollo, probably at Autun, (Augustodunum,) and presented a magnificent offering to the god.[1] From this circumstance we may gather, not only that Constantine still professed an attachment to the old heathen ceremonies, but also that he did not belong to the class of warriors and princes who make no account of the religious interest, and who, strangers to all emotions and impulses of that nature, have an eye only to the human means of prosecuting their undertakings. He believed himself to be indebted for his good fortune to the protection of a god.

It was not until after his victory over the tyrant Maxentius,[2] that Constantine publicly declared in favor of the Christians. The question here presents itself, whether, as we must suppose according to one of the traditions, it was this victory itself, in connection with the extraordinary circumstances preceding it, which gave this new and decided direction, not to the public conduct only, but also to the religious opinions, of this emperor.

According to Eusebius,[3] the way in which this important change was brought about, was as follows: — Maxentius, in making his preparations for the war, had scrupulously observed all the customary ceremonies of Paganism, and was relying for success on the agency of supernatural powers. Hence Constantine was the more strongly persuaded, that he ought not to place his whole confidence in an arm of flesh. He revolved in his mind, to what god it would be suitable for him to apply for aid. The misfortunes of the last emperors, who had been so zealously devoted to the cause of Paganism, and the example of his father, who had trusted in the one true and almighty God alone, admonished him that he also should place confidence in no other. To this God, therefore, he applied, praying that he would reveal himself to him, and lend him the protection of his arm in the approaching contest. While thus praying, a short time after noon,[4] he beheld, spread on the face of the heavens, a glittering cross, and above it the inscription: "By this conquer.[5]" The emperor and his whole army, now just about to commence their march towards Italy, were seized with awe. While Constantine was still pondering the import of this sign, night came on; and in a dream Christ appeared to him, with the same symbol which he had seen in the heavens, and directed him to cause a banner

[1] Eumenii Panegyricus Constantini, c. 21.

[2] Maxentius, son of Maximianus Herculius, had seized upon the sovereignty in Italy and in North Africa; and by his abandoned and voluptuous life, his oppressions, and his despotic acts in every way, had rendered himself alike odious to Heathens and to Christians; though at Rome he had in the outset showed himself favorable to the Christians, with a view to secure on his side the interest of their party. Euseb. H. E. l. VIII. c. 14.

[3] De vita Constant. c. I. 27.

[4] The obscure language of Eusebius: *ἀμφὶ μεσημβρινὰς ὥρας, ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας ἀποκτινούσης*, is, I think, most naturally interpreted by supposing the last clause to contain a limitation of the first.

[5] *Τούτῳ νίκα*, undoubtedly, in the native language of the emperor and of the Roman soldiers: Hoc vince.

to be prepared after the same pattern, and to use it as his protection against the power of the enemy. The emperor obeyed: he caused to be made, after the pattern he had seen, the resplendent banner of the cross, (called the Labarum,) on the shaft of which was affixed, with the symbol of the cross, the monogram (☧) of the name of Christ. He then sent for Christian teachers, of whom he inquired concerning the God that had appeared to him, and the import of the symbol. This gave them an opportunity of instructing him in the knowledge of Christianity.

Taking the account of Eusebius as literally true, we should have to recognize in this occurrence a real miracle. We should be the less tempted to separate the fact at bottom from the subjective conception and representation of it by the narrator, and thus to reduce it from the form of a supernatural to that of a natural phenomenon, because the pagan army, which Constantine was leading from Gaul, and which, according to the pagan rhetorician Libanius, conquered, praying to the gods,[1] is said also to have beheld the words inscribed in the heavens. But the supposition of a miracle here, is one which has in itself nothing to recommend it, especially when we consider, that the *conversion, as it is called, of the Roman emperor*, such as it really was, could in nowise possess the same significance in the sight of God, who respecteth not the person, but looks upon the heart alone as an acceptable sacrifice, as it had in the eyes of men dazzled and deceived by outward show. In this particular way, it is scarcely possible to conceive that a change of heart, which is the only change that deserves to be called a conversion, could have been wrought. Much rather might we presume that, in this way, the emperor would be misled to combine pagan superstition with a mere coloring of Christianity. And were we to judge of the end which this miracle was designed to subserve, by the general consequences of the emperor's conversion on the Christian church within the Roman empire, it might be questioned whether these consequences were really so benign in their influence on the progress of the kingdom of God, as they were imagined to be, by those persons who, dazzled by outward show, saw in the external power and splendor of the Christian church a triumph of Christianity.

But, aside from all this, in order to suppose a real miracle, we need better testimony to the truth of the facts, as they are stated by Eusebius. The only witness is Constantine himself, who, many years after the event, had related the circumstances to this writer.[2] But, in the case of Constantine himself, it might easily happen, that what was in itself a natural phenomenon, would, by his own subjective apprehension

[1] Liban. *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν*, ed. Reiske, vol. II. p. 160, *καθαιρεῖ μὲν τὸν περιυβρισάντα τὴν ῥώμην ὁ γαλατῶν ἐπ' αυτὸν ἀγαγὼν στρατόπεδον, ὃι θεοῖς ἐπῆλθον πρότερον εὐξάμενοι.*

[2] As Eusebius does not mention this in his Church History, and yet we can hardly suppose that, when he composed this history, he did not know *something* about it through the popular tradition of the Christians, we must explain the circumstance by supposing that what he *then* knew about it, seemed to him either not well authenticated, or else not important enough for his purpose; for it was then his opinion that Constantine, following the example of his father, was already a Christian, and marched against Maxentius, calling on God and Christ to assist him.

of it, by the power of fancy, the length of the intervening time, the wish to be regarded by the bishops as a person peculiarly favored of God, gradually assume to itself the shape of a miracle. Add to this, that Eusebius himself, in the character of a rhetorical panegyrist, might indulge in some exaggeration.

His story is not wholly consistent with itself; but contains, besides the miraculous part of it, much that seems altogether improbable. Constantine must have received some knowledge of the God of the Christians from his father; yet he inquires who he is. It seems that he needed to be informed what was meant by the symbol of the cross; but the import of this sign, which appeared in the daily life of every Christian, and concerning the supernatural influence of which so much was said, could at that time hardly remain unknown to any one who was in the habit of associating with Christians. The very style of the narration, then, as drawn up by Eusebius, would lead us of itself to be cautious how we take everything it contains as literally true; and to conjecture that a natural phenomenon was the basis of what he has represented as a supernatural event. Now we do actually find other accounts, which may, perhaps, be traced back to a still older and purer source, — to an account given by Constantine, or by Christians who were with him, soon after the event, — and which point more directly to a natural incident. According to Rufinus, he sees, in a dream, towards the East, the flaming sign of a cross; and, waking in a fright, beholds at his side an angel, who exclaims: "By this conquer."[1] The work, "*De mortibus persecutorum*," reports, that he was directed in a vision to cause the sign of the Christian's God to be placed on the shields of his soldiers.[2] These statements point to a psychological explanation. Yet we must admit, that what then transpired in the mind of Constantine would have an important influence on his way of thinking and on his conduct in regard to matters of religion.

But it may be doubted, whether we have sufficient warrant for adopting this hypothesis. It is possible that the whole story may have sprung up after the event. In the eyes of both Pagans and Christians, the victory over Maxentius was an event of the utmost importance. Pagans and Christians were at that time inclined, each party in their own way, to introduce, under such circumstances, the aid of higher powers; and the rhetorical panegyrists especially contributed to the propagation of such legends. Pagans saw, in this case, the gods of the eternal city, engaged to deliver them from the disgraceful yoke. Among them, accordingly, was circulated the legend of a heavenly army, seen in the air, and sent by the gods to the succor of Constantine.[3] Among the Christians, on the other hand, the story was propagated of an appear-

[1] Rufin. hist. eccles. l. IX. c. 9.

[2] De m. p. c. 44. Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus ut cœleste signum Dei (the monogram of Christ) notaret in scutis atque ita prœlium committeret.

[3] Nazarii Panegyricus in Constantin, c. 14. In ore denique est omnium Galliarum, exercitus visos, qui se divinitus missos præ se ferebant. The words are even put into their mouth: Constantinum petimus, Constantino imus auxilio. And the pitiable flattery adds to this: Habent profecto et divina jactantiam, et cœlestia quoque tangit ambitio. Illi, divinitus *missi*, *gloriabantur* quod *tibi* militabant.

ance of the cross. Constantine having been observed, in the later years of his life, to show a peculiar veneration for the cross, men would fain trace this habit to the fact, that it was by the aid of the cross he had obtained his victory; and by an anachronistic combination of events which is of no unfrequent occurrence, they referred many things, which belonged to a later period of the reign of Constantine, as for instance, the erection of the banner of the cross, back to the present time. In the latter part of his life, Constantine may have acknowledged this account of the popular tradition, to give himself importance in the eyes of the Christians; perhaps, by degrees, persuading himself that the event had actually so happened. This, we must admit, is possible. But, in this case, we should have to trace those regulations of Constantine in favor of the Christian church, which immediately ensued, to some other cause. It is altogether inadmissible, however, to explain these regulations as resulting from the policy of Constantine. In gaining over the Christian party to his side, he lost ground with the Heathen; and yet the Heathen party, if not the most numerous, was for the most part still in possession of the power. Many things, moreover, are to be observed in the proceedings of Constantine, after this time, which assuredly do not admit of being explained from any plan of policy, but only on the ground of a peculiar religious interest. From what has been said above, however, respecting the early education of Constantine, we might very easily account for the fact, even without resorting to the vision of the cross, that, like Alexander Severus and Philip the Arabian, he had become convinced that the God of the Christians was a powerful Divine Being, who was to be worshipped along with the ancient gods of the nation; and that he was led, after the defeat of Maxentius, when his power was increased, and he had obtained the sovereignty over those lands where Christianity had become more widely diffused, to express, in his public and civil acts, a conviction which he had already long entertained.

But although the origin of this legend might be thus explained, and although we are not driven to a fact of this sort in order to account for the conduct of Constantine towards the Christian church, yet we ought not, without weighty reasons, to reject the legend altogether; nor should we, without weighty reasons, charge Constantine with a partly intentional fraud; especially as he himself here furnishes us with a key to explain his way of thinking and acting in matters of religion, which is in every respect exceedingly well suited to that end, and which in many ways is proved to be the right one. We have already observed that Constantine, in his wars, was in the habit of looking to the gods for assistance.[1] Christian and Pagan historians are agreed, that Maxentius, whose superstition, as it frequently happens, was equal to his crimes, offered many sacrifices to secure the victory on his side; and that he relied more upon supernatural powers than upon the might of his arms.[2] Even in the later period of Constantine's life, we meet

[1] Comp. with the above remark, the coins of Constantine with the inscription: *Soli invicto comiti.* Eckhel, doctrina nummorum veterum, vol. 8, p. 75.

[2] Vid. Zosim, l. II. c. 16.

with many things which show that he dreaded the effects of the pagan rites. Supposing this to be the case, we may readily conceive that he, too, would wish to have some superior power on his own side; and that with this feeling, in accordance with the pagan mode of thinking, which, for the most part, still clung to him, his attention would be directed to watch for signs in the heavens, from which he could gather an omen.[1] In his intercourse with the Christians, he had heard of the miraculous power of the cross; he already believed in the God of the Christians as a powerful being. Now it is very possible that, either of himself, or at the suggestion of Christians about his person, he imagined he perceived, in the shape of the clouds, or in some other object, a sign of the cross, — the Christians being disposed to trace their favorite symbol in almost every object of nature. The vision in his sleep, which perhaps immediately followed, admits itself also, in this case, of an easy explanation. Thus, then, Constantine was led to conceive the hope that, by the power of the God of the Christians and the sacred symbol of the cross, he should conquer.[2] He obtained the victory, and now felt that he was indebted for it to the God of the Christians. The sign of the cross became his amulet, of which fact we find many and various indications in the ensuing life of Constantine. After the victory, he caused to be erected in the Forum at Rome his own statue, holding in the right hand a standard, in the shape of a cross, with the following inscription beneath it: "By this salutary sign, the true symbol of valor, I freed your city from the yoke of the tyrant."[3] He was afterwards in the frequent habit of making this sign, (to which he ascribed a supernatural power of protection) on the most ordinary occasions, and was often observed to draw the cross upon his forehead.[4]

This hypothesis is rendered probable, by similar examples belonging to the same period, where superstition became the way to faith, and men who imagined they perceived supernatural effects to proceed from

[1] We may compare the *θεοσημία* in Eusebius vita Const. I. 28, with a *διοσημεῖον*.

[2] Although the remark is certainly just in itself, that the Christian historians were very ready to imagine they saw the sign of the cross where there was nothing of the kind, yet there are no existing grounds for applying this remark, with Eckhel and Manso, to all the monuments belonging to the time of Constantine, and for regarding the Labarum as no more than an ordinary Roman banner; still less is there any good reason for seeking in the Attic antiquities an explanation of the monogram of Christ, the meaning of which is so obvious.

[3] Euseb. hist. eccles. IX. 9, de v. C. II. 40. *Τούτῳ τῷ σωτηριώδει σημείῳ, τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἐλέγχῳ τῆς ἀνδρίας, τὴν πόλιν ὑμων ἀπὸ ζυγου τοῦ τυράννου διασωθεῖσαν ἐλευθερώσα.* Rufinus has it, hoc singulari signo: he seems, however, not to have had before him the original Latin words; but, in his usual way, to give an arbitrary translation of the Greek words in Eusebius. As Eusebius lays a peculiar stress on the word *σωτηριώδης*, we may conclude that in the Latin there was something exactly corresponding to it, as "salutari." Now unquestionably it may be said, that the emperor had perhaps caused himself to be represented simply with a Roman hasta, (*δόρυ σταυροῦ σχήματι*, says Eusebius,) and that it was only the word "salutare," and some accidental peculiarity in the shape of the spear, coupled with what was known respecting Constantine in his later life, which led to the explanation of that symbol as the cross; but the truth is, we have not the least warrant for accusing Eusebius of any such misapprehension, especially when we consider that in his Church History, where this circumstance is already related, nothing as yet occurs respecting the supernatural appearance of the cross. The language certainly applies more naturally to the symbol of the cross than to an ordinary spear; yet we should remember that, in the language of Constantine, Roman and Christian notions flow together.

[4] Euseb. III. 2. *Τὸ πρόσωπον τῷ σωτῆρῳ κατασφραγιζόμενος σημείῳ.*

the sign of the cross in the common occurrences of life, were thereby first led to repose faith in the God of the Christians.[1] Examples of this sort occur also at other periods, as, for instance, in the conversion of warlike princes, such as Clovis and Olof Trygwæson.

In this way we may best explain how in Constantine's mind there was at first only a mixture of Heathen with Christian views, — how at first he could worship the God of the Christians along with the gods of Paganism, until, gradually led on by the conviction that this his patron God had procured him the victory over all his enemies, and made him master of the whole Roman empire, in order that His own worship might by his means become universally diffused, he came at length to believe that this God was the Almighty Being who alone deserved to be worshipped, and that the gods of the Heathen were malignant spirits, opposed to the only true God — spirits whose kingdom was, through his instrumentality, to be destroyed. In the first instance, *his religious convictions* moved him, in conformity with his eclecticism, simply to grant equal toleration and freedom to all the religions existing in the Roman empire; and this, certainly, was the course best suited, under the existing circumstances, to secure tranquillity to the state. His peculiar veneration for the God of the Christians moved him to give special distinction to the Christian worship, without prejudice to the old Roman religion. The Paganism of Greece and Rome was, in fact, as the religion of the state, already in possession of the privileges; the Christian worship, hitherto oppressed, had yet to be elevated to the same rank with the other.

The first law relating to matters of religion, which Constantine enacted in common with Licinius, has not come down to us. The nature of its contents, therefore, can be gathered only from the character of the second law, published in the following year, in which the first is said to be amended. But this latter rescript has also come down to us in a form which renders the attempt to do this both difficult and unsafe.[2] It is most probable that, in the first rescript, all the religious parties then existing in the Roman empire — including the Christian party, with its various sects — were mentioned by name, and then the free exercise of their religion accorded to all the members of these

[1] In the poem of Severus, belonging to the fifth century, which may be taken as a picture drawn from real life, the pagan shepherd is led to embrace the faith, from observing, as he supposes, that the fold of the Christian shepherd is preserved by the sign of the cross from the contagious murrain which fell on the other folds. He concludes:

> Nam cur addubitem, quin homini quoque
> Signum prosit idem perpeti sæculo,
> Quo vis morbida vincitur?

In the same manner, a warrior, from observing, as he supposes, the power of the sign of the cross in battle, becomes more inclined to the faith.

[2] We have this rescript in an abbreviated form, in the book de mort. persecut. chap. 48. Conditions are here spoken of, by which the free exercise of the Christian worship seemed to have been limited in the first rescript: the nature of these conditions, however, is not mentioned. In the next place, we have the same, after a Greek translation, in the Church History of Eusebius, (X. 5,) but somewhat obscurely expressed, as such translations from the Latin in Eusebius usually are, (and perhaps distorted from the true sense by various misapprehensions of the Latin original.) Yet we may infer, even from a comparison of Eusebius with the passage in the book de mortibus, that the translation was made from a somewhat different form of the rescript, than that which is found in the book de mortibus.

different religious parties. This, however, was so expressed, that it might at least be interpreted to mean, that each individual was allowed indeed to follow, with unlimited freedom, the principles of that religious party with which he happened to be connected when this rescript appeared; but could not be permitted to leave the religious party with which he then happened to be connected, in order to unite himself with another.[1] This addition must have been felt to be a great constraint, especially by the Christians; for it may be conceived that under a new government, so favorable to the Christians, many who had heretofore been held back by fear, would wish to go over to the Christian church. The attention of the emperor having been directed to the injurious consequences of the first law, he published at Milan, in the year 313, in common with Licinius, a second edict, in which it was declared, without mentioning by name any of the different religious parties, that, in general, every one might be permitted to adopt the principles of the religious party which he held to be right; and, in particular, every one without exception to profess Christianity. This rescript contained, in fact, far more than the first edict of toleration published by the emperor Gallienus; since, by the latter, Christianity was merely received into the class of the *religiones licitæ* of the Roman empire; while this new law implied the introduction of a universal and unconditional religious

[1] In the book de mortibus, it says in the second rescript: *amotis omnibus omnino conditionibus*, quæ (in) prius scriptis ad officium tuum datis super Christianorum nomine videbantur. If we chose to take the word *αἵρεσις* in the expression of Eusebius, *ἀφαιρεθείσων παντελῶς τῶν αἱρέσεων*, as synonymous with conditio, then Eusebius would agree word for word with the book de mortibus; but to take the word *αἵρεσις* as meaning simply the same thing with conditio, is what neither the general usage of the Greek language, nor the way in which Eusebius uniformly employs this word in the rescript, will permit. It always retains in Eusebius the significations, choice, choice arising from free conviction, the religious sect which one embraces from conviction, hence sect in general. If the word *αἵρεσις* in this rescript occurred nowhere else in Eusebius, it might be said, that the translator had misunderstood the Latin word conditiones; as in fact it seems quite evident that in one passage of the rescript an error of translation has arisen out of a misunderstanding of the Latin, where the question relates to the indemnity which those were to receive, who gave up to the churches the landed estates they had been deprived of, and where in the book de mortibus the rescript runs thus: Si putaverint, de nostra benevolentia aliquid vicarium postulent (if they think good to do so, they may ask of our benevolence some indemnity.) and where the translator in Eusebius understands the word vicarium as a masculine noun, designating the name of an office; hence reads the passage as if it stood thus: aliquid Vicarium postulent, (may demand something from the Vicarius of the province,) and translates, *προσέλθωσι τῷ ἐπὶ τόπων Ἐπάρχῳ δικαζόντι*. But since the same word occurs several times in a similar connection in Eusebius, and since, moreover, as we have remarked, the form of the original document as known to Eusebius, and the form of the rescript in the book de mortibus, seem not to have been in all respects the same, we are not warranted to suppose here a misconstruction of words, but must rather endeavor to gather the nature of the *conditions*, which are not clearly stated in the book de mortibus, from the rescript in its more detailed form, as it appears in Eusebius. The connection in Eusebius is as follows: as in the first rescript many sects of different kinds seem to have been expressly added, the case was perhaps, that many belonging to the above-named sects, soon after the appearance of this rescript, abandoned their previous religion, (*ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαυτῆς παραφυλάξεως ἀνεκρούοντο.*) These now seemed by that rescript, which extended religious freedom expressly to the then members of the respective sects, to be hindered from passing over to any other religious party;—hence in the second edict it was determined, *ὁπῶς μηδένι παντελῶς ἐξουσία ἀρνητέα ἢ τοῦ ἀκολουθεῖν καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν χριστιανῶν παραφυλάξιν ἢ θρησκείαν, ἑκάστῳ τὲ ἐξουσία δοθεῖη τοῦ διδόναι ἑαυτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ θρησκείᾳ ἣν αὐτός ἑαυτῷ ἁρμόζειν νομίζῃ.*

freedom and liberty of conscience ; a thing, in fact, wholly new, and in direct contradiction with the political and religious mode of thinking which had hitherto prevailed, grounded on the dominant *state* religion; —a principle which, without the indirect influence of Christianity, would hardly have been brought to light, although the ground on which this general toleration was established, in the present instance, is by no means the purely Christian position. The emperors expressly declared it to be their intention, that the interest of no religion whatever should seem to be injured by them:[1] and for this they assign political and religious motives; first, that it would be conducive to the tranquillity of the times; and, secondly, that it might conciliate the good will of whatever there was, possessed of a divine and heavenly nature, to the emperor and his subjects.[2]

While under the influence of this eclectic liberality, it was really of great importance to Constantine that he should be accurately informed respecting the different religious sects in the Roman empire, and especially respecting those which were little known and much decried, (as, for example, the Manichean sect,) in order to see whether he might not, consistently with the welfare of the state, extend the abovementioned toleration to these sects also. He made it the special duty of Strategius, a man well fitted for this business by his education and learning, to examine fully into the character of the different sects, particularly of the Manicheans, and to draw up for him a report on the whole matter.[3]

He at the same directed with regard to the Christians, that the places of assembly and other estates which belonged to the Christian church, but which had been publicly confiscated in the Dioclesian persecution, should be restored to the original proprietors. But he did this with a just provision for the indemnification of those private individuals who had purchased these estates, or received them as presents. In this case, too, he assigned as the reason of his conduct, "that the public tranquillity would thereby be promoted, since, by this method of proceeding, the care of the divine Providence, which we have already experienced in many things, will remain secure to us through all time."

This union of two Augustuses to promote the interests of the Christians would necessarily have a favorable influence upon their situation in the other provinces. As the two emperors transmitted their laws also to Maximinus, who then stood on good terms with them, the latter, from special considerations, would be unwilling alone to exasperate the Christians against himself. He wished to introduce a change in his

[1] Ὅπως μηδεμία τιμῇ μηδέ θρησκειᾷ τινι μεμειῶσθαι τὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν δοκοίη.

[2] Ὅπως ὅτι ποτε ἔστι θειότης καὶ οὐράνιου πραγματος, ἡμῖν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐξουσίαν διάγουσιν, εὐμένες εἶναι δυνήθῃ. In the book de mortibus: quod quidem (should perhaps be, quid quid est,) divinitas (perhaps divinitatis) in sede cœlesti nobis atque omnibus, qui sub potestate nostra sunt constituti, placatum ac propitium possit existere.

[3] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XV. c. 13. Constantinus cum limatius superstitionum quæreret sectas, Manichæorum et similium, nec interpres inveniretur idoneus, hunc sibi commendatum ut sufficientem elegit. Having fulfilled this duty to the satisfaction of the emperor, he was afterwards called by him Musonianus, rose to a still higher post, and finally became præfectus prætorio in the East.

conduct towards that class of his subjects, without appearing to contradict his previous regulations, and to accommodate himself to influences from another quarter; but to do this he was obliged to resort to various shifts and evasions. In a rescript addressed to Sabinus, his prætorian prefect, he declared it to be generally known, that Dioclesian and Maximian, when they observed *how almost all were forsaking the worship of the gods and joining themselves to the Christian party*, had rightly decreed that whoever forsook the worship of the immortal gods should be brought back again to the same by open punishments. But when he first came to the East,[1] and found that very many such people, who might be serviceable to the state, had on this ground been banished by the judges to certain places, he had given directions to the several judges, that they should no longer use forcible measures with the inhabitants of the provinces, but rather endeavor to bring them back to the worship of the gods by friendly persuasion and admonition. Now so long as the judges had acted agreeably to these directions, no one in the Eastern provinces had been exiled or otherwise treated with violence; but for the very reason, that no forcible measures were employed against them, they had been reclaimed to the worship of the gods. The emperor proceeds to explain how he had been afterwards induced to yield to the petitions of certain heathen cities, who were unwilling to tolerate any Christians within their walls. He next renewed the ordinance which secured the Christians against all oppressive measures, and forbade other means to be employed than those of kindness, for bringing his subjects to acknowledge the providence of the gods. If any individual was led, out of his own free conviction, to profess veneration for the gods, he should be joyfully received; but every other one was to be left to his own inclination, and no reproachful and oppressive conduct was to be allowed in any man. This will of the emperor was everywhere to be made publicly known. But although this was done, yet the Christians had so little confidence in the disposition of the man who had deceived them once already; the rescript itself wore so plainly the marks of constraint, and gave them so little security, inasmuch as the public and common exercise of their religious worship was nowhere distinctly permitted, that they could have no encouragement to avail themselves of this more favorable declaration. It was the misfortune of the emperor, which procured for them what they could hardly have expected from his free inclination.

After Maximin had with the greatest difficulty barely saved himself out of the war with Licinius in the year 313, which was so unfortunate for him, he proceeded to arm himself for a new conflict with the enemy who was pursuing him and laying waste his provinces. In this difficult situation, the exasperation of so considerable a party as the Christians already formed, could not be regarded by him as a matter of indifference: perhaps, too, he had been led by his misfortunes to believe that the God of the Christians might, after all, be a powerful being,

[1] This took place in fact, after he had already, in his older possessions, followed in some measure the edict of Galerius. (See above.)

whose vengeance he was now made to experience. He therefore published another rescript, in which he declared, that a misconception in some of the judges had betrayed his subjects into a distrust of his ordinances. In order, therefore, that all ambiguity and all suspicion might thenceforth be removed, it should be made publicly known, that all who were disposed to profess the religion of the Christians, were left free to engage in the public exercise of this religion in whatever way they chose. The Christians were expressly permitted to found churches, and the houses and estates of which they had been deprived were to be restored back to them. Shortly afterwards, he met with a terrible death at Tarsus. Constantine and Licinius, who had heretofore both shown themselves favorable to the Christians, became, by the death of this last persecutor of the Christian church, sole masters of the Roman empire.

Ambition, love of power, and the strife for absolute sovereignty in the Roman empire, particularly on the part of Constantine, would not allow them to remain long peaceful neighbors to each other. By the battle of Cibalia in Lower Pannonia, in the year 314, the war was decided in favor of Constantine. It ended, it is true, in a treaty between the two princes; but their respective interests still continued to conflict with each other. Licinius, who perhaps was but little interested in the affairs of religion in themselves considered, had been only moved by his connection with Constantine, and perhaps also by the influence of his wife Constantia, the sister of Constantine, whom he had married in the year 313, to participate in the favorable proceedings begun towards the Christians. The former reason for favoring them was now removed. On the other hand, the Christians, as the friends of Constantine, especially the bishops, to whom Constantine paid so much honor, would become objects of suspicion to him.[1] Perhaps many of the bishops gave occasion for this, by the public manner in which they avowed their friendship for Constantine.[2] The Pagans would naturally avail themselves of this state of feeling in Licinius, — would endeavor to confirm him in his hostile sentiments against the Christians, and to inspire him with the hope, that he was destined by the gods to reëstablish their worship, and prostrate the power of their enemies. His ordinances against the Christians proceeded in part from his political suspicions; and partly it was their design to present the Christians, and especially their bishops, in an unfavorable light. He forbade the latter to assemble together: no bishop was allowed to pass over the limits of his own diocese; where, however, to allow to the pagan emperor what is justly his due, we should notice that, as is evident from the synodal laws of the fourth century, worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about, and entangle themselves in worldly concerns. Whether, however, in the case of Licinius, any well-grounded occasion existed for these proceedings, aside from his excessive suspicion and unwarranted

[1] Probably Sozomen represents the matter most correctly, (I. 7,) when he states that Licinius first altered his conduct towards the Christians after his unfortunate war with Constantine.

[2] Euseb. de v. C. I. 56.

hostility, we are unable to determine with certainty, as the only accounts we have respecting these matters come from prejudiced Christian writers. He moreover directed that the seats of the men and the women should be separate, (a custom which afterwards the ecclesiastical authorities themselves thought proper to retain;) that no bishop should instruct a female in Christianity, but the women should be instructed only by women. The same remark which we have just made, applies also to these regulations: it is impossible to decide whether the hostile disposition of Licinius led him to adopt all these measures on false pretences, merely with a view to degrade the Christians in the eyes of the people, or whether he was led to them by individual examples of abuse and criminality. He commanded the Christians at his residence at Nicomedia to hold their assemblies, not in the churches, but in the open fields without the city, under the sarcastic pretence, that the fresh air was more healthful in such multitudinous assemblies. He caused the churches in Pontus to be closed, and others to be demolished; accusing the Christians, that they had prayed, not for his welfare, but for that of the emperor Constantine. He removed the Christians, who refused to offer, from his palace, also from all the high civil and military posts, and from the service of the military police in the cities. There were not wanting those who would have been willing to surrender even more than their earthly means of subsistence and their honors as a sacrifice to their faith; but there were also to be found those who, being Christians rather from habit than from any inward reason, or who, having become Christians only from outward motives, were hence ready again, from similar motives, to change their religion.[1] Others stood firm, it is true, at first, but afterwards the love of the world overcame their love of religion; they denied the highest and only true good, for an empty name, and gave bribes and good words into the bargain, so they might but be restored to their offices.[2] Licinius published no edict authorizing sanguinary measures; even the canons of the Nicene council represent this persecution as one which was attended with no effusion of blood. Yet it may have been the case, that, in consequence of the popular fury, and the malice of individual magistrates in many districts, and the opportunity which presented itself in the execution of the imperial laws themselves, the Christians suffered from occasional acts of violence and bloodshed. But on this point we are left without any sufficiently distinct and credible information.[3]

[1] Against such the XI. canon of the Nicene council is directed: Περὶ τῶν παραβάντων χωρὶς ἀνάγκης ἢ χωρὶς ἀφαιρέσεως ὑπαρχόντων ἢ χωρὶς κινδύνου ἢ τινὸς τοιούτου, ὁ γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῆς τυράννιδος Λικινίου.

[2] Against such the XII. canon of the Nicene council is directed: Οἱ προσκληθέντες μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὁρμὴν ἐνδειξάμενοι καὶ ἀποθέμενοι τὰς ζώνας, (the singulum utriusque militiæ, palatinæ et militaris,) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐμετον ἀναδράμοντες ὡς κύνες, ὧν τινάς καὶ ἀργύρια προέσθαι καὶ βενεφικίοις κατορθῶσαι τὸ ἀναστρατεύσασθαι.

[3] Particularly famous in the ancient church were the forty soldiers at Sebaste in Armenia, whom their commander endeavored to compel to offer incense, by exposing them naked to the most extreme cold, of whom thirty-nine are said to have remained steadfast, and were brought to the stake almost frozen. By the rhetorical descriptions of the ancient Homilists, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Gaudentius of Brescia, Ephraem Syrus, this story has been variously embellished; but we are in want of credible historical accounts, such as would enable us to deter-

Finally, in the year 323, the second war broke out between Constantine and Licinius. This war was, it is true, very far from being a religious war, inasmuch as on both sides the grounds of contention were merely political, and not religious. But yet it may notwithstanding be truly affirmed, that the triumph of the Pagan or Christian party was hanging on the issue. This, too, was well understood on both sides; and it is therefore natural to suppose, that the Pagan and the Christian parties would embark in the war each with the feeling of their different interests, and that the two emperors also, in different ways, according to the difference of their religious convictions, would place their hopes of success in religion. A characteristic fact to denote the state of feeling among the Christians in the provinces of Licinius, is contained in the tradition cited by Eusebius,[1] that, even before the commencement of the war, men believed they saw several legions of Constantine marching victoriously through the streets at mid-day.[2]

Augurs, haruspices, pagan soothsayers of all sorts, fired the hopes of Licinius. Before proceeding to the war, he conducted the heads of his prætorians, and the most distinguished officers of his court, into a grove consecrated to the gods, where their images had been set up, and wax-candles placed burning before them.[3] After having sacrificed to the gods, he spoke as follows: "Here stand the images of the gods, whose worship we have received from our fathers. But our enemy, who has impiously abandoned the sanctuaries of his country, worships a foreign God, who has come from I know not whence, and dishonors his army by the disgraceful sign of his God. Placing his confidence upon this, he carries on the war, not so much with ourselves as with the gods whom he has forsaken. The issue of this war must settle the question between his God and our gods. If that foreign thing which we now deride, come off victorious, we too shall be obliged to acknowledge and worship it, and we must dismiss the gods to whom we vainly kindle these lights. But if our gods conquer, as we doubt not they will, we will turn ourselves, after this victory, to the war against their enemies."

Constantine, on the other hand, relied upon the God whose symbol accompanied his army. He caused the Labarum to be borne in turn by fifty of his choicest soldiers, who constantly surrounded it. He had observed, as he supposed, that victory everywhere accompanied the appearance of this sign, operating with supernatural power, and that those divisions of his army which had already begun to give way, were often rallied by its means; an observation which, especially if the emperor had a considerable number of Christians in his army, might doubtless be correct, and which may be easily explained from natural causes. Constantine imagined that, among other instances, he had met with a proof of the magical power of the sign of the cross, in an incident which he afterward related to the bishop Eusebius, and which we may

mine what degree of truth lies at the bottom of this tale.

[1] De v. C. II. 6.

[2] It is well known that similar legends respecting such visions occur also in the case of other wars.

[3] Eusebius relates this after the report of eye-witnesses, (de v. C. II. 5,) and there is no existing reason for doubting the essential part of the narrative.

cite as furnishing a characteristic trait of Constantine's religious way of thinking.[1] A soldier who bore the ensign of the cross, suddenly overcome with fear, gave it over to another, meaning to save himself by flight. Soon after, he was transfixed by an arrow; while he who bore the ensign, although many arrows were shot at him and the staff of the ensign was struck, was yet unharmed himself, and came out of the battle without receiving a wound.

The defeat of Licinius, whom Constantine dishonorably and faithlessly allowed to be killed, made the latter sole master of the Roman empire; and, certainly, this fortunate accomplishment of his political plans had also an important influence upon his religious convictions, and the manner in which he exhibited them. Before we pass to these matters, we may take a retrospective glance of the manner in which he conducted himself in relation to matters of religion, from the time of the above-cited edict until this decisive epoch. To form a correct judgment of his conduct during this period, we must make the following remarks.

Constantine had indeed gradually abandoned his system of religious eclecticism, and gone over to Monotheism; but yet the belief in the power of the heathen ceremonies, (sacra,) which had taken so deep root in his soul, could not at once be entirely removed, especially as his superstition had in many respects but altered its dress, in exchanging the Pagan for a Christian form; and it was natural, that the influence of Heathens who were about him, of the philosophers and rhetoricians, such as Sopatros, who still retained much of their ancient authority, as well as other circumstances, would again call forth the superstition that had been suppressed. In the next place, although Constantine already looked upon the pagan deities as evil spirits, yet, on this very account, he might still attribute a supernatural power to the magical arts of Paganism, and regard them with dread. To this we must add the political motives that forbade him to destroy at once the ancient religion of the state, which still had a considerable party in its favor; while it may be observed in general, that, by his naturally unbiassed judgment, by the experience which he had already obtained in the persecution of Dioclesian, and by his earlier eclecticism, Constantine was for the most part inclined to toleration, except when his mind had been thrown in an opposite direction through some paramount foreign influence.

Although Constantine had manifested in many ways, before that first edict,[2] a disposition to promote the Christian form of worship, yet, even down to the year 317, we find marks of the pagan state-religion upon the imperial coins.[3] Laws of the year 319 presuppose the prohibition of sacrifices in private dwellings. No haruspex was allowed to pass the threshold of another's house. Whoever transgressed this law should be burned; whoever had called an haruspex into his house should be banished, after the confiscation of his goods. Haruspices, priests, and other ministers of the pagan worship, were not allowed to go into the private dwelling of another, even under the plea of friendship.

[1] Euseb. v. C. II. 9.

[2] See onward, the section concerning the relation of the church to the state.

[3] Vid. Eckhel doctrina numism. Vol. VIII. p. 78.

These rigid ordinances are still insufficient of themselves to prove, that Constantine meant to suppress the heathen worship out of religious motives. His motives may have been merely political. He may have feared that the consultation of the haruspices and the use of the heathen rites, (sacra,) might be taken advantage of to form conspiracies against his government and against his life, the suspicions of men being at that time constantly awake on these matters; and *he* might be the more fearful of all this, since he was by no means free as yet from all faith in the power of the pagan magic.[1]

How far he was, at the same time, from wishing to suppress the public rites of Heathenism by force, is sufficiently manifest from what he declares in the two cited laws of the year 319:[2] "They who are desirous of being slaves to their superstition, have liberty for the public exercise of their worship;"[3] and "You who consider this profitable to yourselves, continue to visit the public altars and temples, and to observe the solemnities of your usage; for we do not forbid the rites of an antiquated usage to be performed in the open light."[4] In this concession, we see only a wise toleration, the consciousness of the natural limits of civil power, and a knowledge of that human nature whose cravings are but the more strongly excited for that which has been forbidden. By the manner in which the emperor speaks of the heathen worship, — when he calls it a superstition, a *præterita usurpatio*, — he lets it be sufficiently seen, that he was no longer held by any religious interest in favor of Paganism. With this, however, a law of the year 321 seems to conflict, in which Constantine not only repeats that permission in respect to the institution of the *haruspicia*, but expressly ordains, that whenever lightning should strike the imperial palace or any other public building, the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use.[5] It is indeed possible, that he gave this direction, simply because he knew the power of this kind of superstition, of the belief in omens and similar things, which continued for so long a time over the minds of the Roman people; and because he feared, that if the haruspices and their consultors were left wholly

[1] Libanius says of Constantine, praising his gentleness in other respects: *χαλεπώτατος δὲ ἦν τοῖς ὀργομένοις βασιλείαν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπιβουλεύουσι, καὶ οὐ τούτοις δὲ μόνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσοι μάντεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποῖ χωρήσει τὰ ἐκείνων διελέγοντο. καὶ οὐδεμία τέχνη τόν γε τοιοῦτον ἐξείλετ' ἂν τοῦ πυρός.* π. *θεοδόσ. περὶ στάσεως.* II. vol. I. ed. Reiske, page 635. Eunapius, whose testimony, to be sure, in such things, is not wholly to be relied on, being a zealous pagan, relates that Constantine, at the delay of the provision fleet from Alexandria, whereby Constantine was exposed to the danger of a famine, ordered Sopatros, who had stood high in his favor, to be executed, because the people accused Sopatros of being the cause of this delay, alleging that he had bound the winds by the power of the heathen magic. See Eunapius vit. Ædes. vol. I. p. 23, ed. Boissonade. Similar accusations are said to have been brought even against the bishop Athanasius. Ammian. Marcellin. hist. l. XV. c. 7.

[2] Cod. Theodos. l. IX. Tit. 16, c. 1 et 2.

[3] Superstitioni suæ servire cupientes poterunt publice ritum proprium exercere.

[4] Qui vero id vobis existimatis conducere, adite aras publicas atque delubra, et consuetudinis vestræ celebrate solemnia. Nec enim prohibemus præteritæ usurpationis officia libera luce tractari.

[5] Cod. Theodos. l. X. Tit. 10, c. 1. Altogether in the technical language: Si quid de palatio nostro aut cæteris operibus publicis degustatum fulgore esse constiterit, retento more veteris observantiæ, quid portendat, ab haruspicibus requiratur.

to themselves, or if none but indefinite reports of their interpretations went abroad, the thing might be followed by still more dangerous consequences. On the other hand, he might hope to be able to dissipate more easily the public anxieties, if he reserved to himself, as the Pontifex Maximus, the supreme control of the whole. In this manner might we defend Constantine against the reproach of having fallen back into pagan superstition, and explain the whole as proceeding from a Roman policy, by which he seemed to confirm the pagan superstition; although we must admit, that such a course can never be justified in a Christian prince. Yet the other hypothesis, namely, that Constantine had actually fallen back into heathen superstition, may undoubtedly be regarded as the more natural. By a law of the same year, he declares also the employment of heathen magic, for good ends, as for the prevention or healing of diseases, for the protection of harvests, for the prevention of rain and of hail, to be permitted, and in such expressions, too, as certainly betray a faith in the efficacy of these pretended supernatural means, unless the whole is to be ascribed simply to the legal forms of Paganism.[1]

As Constantine, by the defeat of Licinius, had now become master of the whole Roman empire, he expresses everywhere, in his proclamation issued to his new subjects in the East, the conviction that the only true and Almighty God had, by his undeniable interpositions, given him the victory over all the powers of darkness, in order that his own worship might by his means be universally diffused. Thus, in one of the proclamations of this sort issued to the inhabitants of the Eastern provinces of the Roman empire, he says: "Thee, the Supreme God, I invoke; be gracious to all thy citizens of the Eastern provinces, who have been worn down by long-continued distress, bestowing on them, through me thy servant, salvation. And well may I ask this of thee, Lord of the universe, holy God; for by the leading of thy hand have I undertaken and accomplished salutary things. Everywhere, preceded by *thy sign*,[2] have I led on a victorious army. And if anywhere the public affairs demand it, I go against the enemy, following the same symbol of thy power.[3] For this reason, I have consecrated to thee my soul, deeply imbued with love and with fear; for I sincerely love thy name, I venerate thy power, *which thou hast revealed to me by so many proofs, and by which thou hast confirmed my faith.*"[4] And in a letter to the bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea, he says: "Freedom being once

[1] L. c. c. III. Nullis vero criminationibus implicanda sunt remedia humanis quæsita corporibus, aut in agrestibus locis, ne maturis vindemiis metuerentur imbres aut ruentis grandinis lapidatione quaterentur innocenter adhibita suffragia, quibus non cujusque salus aut existimatio lædentur; sed quorum proficerent actus, ne divina munera et labores hominum sternerentur. So that what the devotedly pagan, and on this point extremely prejudiced historian, Zosimus, says of Constantine, (II. 120,) — ἐχρῆτο δὲ ἔτι καὶ τοῖς πατρίοις ἱεροῖς, οὐ τιμῆς ἕνεκα μᾶλλον ἢ κρείας, ἢ καὶ μάντεσιν ἐπείθετο, πεπειραμένος, ὡς ἀληθῆ προειποῦσιν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κατωρθωμένοις, αὐτῷ, — may be true so far as this, namely, that at a time when Constantine would no longer be consciously a Pagan, he was still involuntarily governed by pagan superstition.

[2] Τὴν σὴν σφραγῖδα (the symbol of the cross) πανταχοῦ προβαλλόμενος.

[3] Τοῖς αὐτοῖς τῆς σῆς ἀρετῆς ἑπόμενος συνθήμασιν, ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους πρόειμι.

[4] Euseb. de v. C. II. 54.

more restored, and, by the providence of the great God and my own ministry, that dragon driven from the administration of the state, I trust that the divine power has become manifest even to all; and that they who through fear or unbelief have fallen into many crimes, will come to the knowledge of the true God,[1] and to the true and right ordering of their lives." What Constantine expresses in this written declaration, he represented visibly under an emblem which he caused to be publicly exhibited before the palace in his new residence at Constantinople, consisting of a group of wax-figures, in which the emperor was seen with the sign of the cross over his head, treading under foot a dragon transfixed by an arrow.[2]

It would be a very unjust thing, to suppose that all these public declarations and exhibitions amounted to nothing but mere Christian cant, or deliberate and intentional hypocrisy. Constantine's language and conduct admit of a far more natural explanation, when we consider them as in part the expression of his real convictions. We have already remarked, that he was not lacking in susceptibility to certain religious impressions; he acknowledged the peculiar providence of God in the manner in which he had been delivered from dangers, made victorious over all his pagan adversaries, and finally rendered master of the Roman world. It flattered his vanity to be considered the favorite of God, and his destined instrument to destroy the empire of the evil spirits, (the heathen deities.) The Christians belonging to his court were certainly not wanting on their part to confirm him in this persuasion, having many of them come to the same conclusion themselves, dazzled by the outward splendor which surrounded the emperor, and which passed over from him to the visible church, and by looking at what the imperial power, which nothing any longer withstood, could secure for the outward interests of the church.

Constantine must indeed have been conscious that he was striving, not so much for the cause of God, as for the gratification of his own ambition and love of power; and that such acts of perfidy, mean revenge, or despotic jealousy, as occurred in his political course, did not well befit an instrument and servant of God, such as he claimed to be considered; but there was here the same lamentable self-deception, the same imposition upon one's own conscience, which is so often to be seen in the mighty of the earth who wear religion as their motto, and which, in their case, so easily insinuates itself and gains the mastery, because it is so difficult for truth to find its way through the trappings

[1] Τὸ ὄντως ὄν, after the Platonic form of expression. The language of the imperial court inclined sometimes to the doctrinal and biblical style of the church, at others to that of the Greek philosophy.

[2] Euseb. de v. C. III. 3. Quite like the coins which Eckhel represents, l. c. p. 88: a serpent lying beneath the Labarum — above it, the monogram of Christ — symbol of the spes publica. Although many coins of Constantine are not to be found, which allude to the victory by means of the cross, yet this cannot be considered as any proof, that the above legend has no true foundation. Else we might also argue from the general fact of so few coins of Constantine being found with Christian symbols, against the undeniable public measures adopted by that emperor in favor of the Christian church. It may be questioned also, whether there are any sufficient grounds for pronouncing the coins to be not genuine, which in Eckhel (l.c. 84, col. II.) present an exhibition of the whole event, as Constantine related it to Eusebius.

of pomp which surround them; because they are approached by so many who, blinded themselves, dazzled by this splendor, blind them still more in return; and because no one has ever got access to them, who had the impartiality or the courage to discover to them the cheat, and teach them how to distinguish between outward show and truth. Thus was it with Constantine. And what wonder that he should proceed under such a delusion, when even Eusebius, one of the best among the bishops at his court, is so dazzled by what the emperor had achieved for the outward extension and splendor of the church, as to be capable of tracing to the purest motives of a servant of God, all the acts which a love of power that would not brook a rival, had, at the expense of truth and humanity, put into the heart of the emperor in the war against Licinius; and of even going so far as to represent him giving out the orders of battle by a special divine inspiration, bestowed in answer to his prayers, in a war that beyond all question had been undertaken on no other grounds than those of a selfish policy; although we must allow, that, waged as it was against a persecutor of the Christians, it would naturally be regarded by Eusebius as a contest in behalf of the cause of God.[1] Bishops in immediate attendance on the emperor so far forgot indeed to what master they belonged, that at the celebration of the third decennium of his reign, (the tricennalia,) one of them congratulated him as constituted by God the ruler over all, in the present world, and destined to reign with the Son of God in the world to come. The feelings of Constantine himself were shocked at such a parallel. He admonished the bishop that he should not venture to use such language as that, but should rather pray for him, that he might be deemed worthy to be a servant of God both in this world and in the next.[2]

It was now the wish of Constantine that all his subjects might be united in the worship of the same God. This wish he expressed publicly, and gladly employed every means in his power to bring it about; but he was determined not to resort to any forcible measures. He still continued to express publicly the principles of toleration and of universal freedom of conscience, and distinctly contradicted the report, which had arisen from very natural causes, that he intended to suppress Paganism by force. Thus he declares, in the proclamation, already cited, to the people of the East: "Let the followers of error enjoy the liberty of sharing in the same peace and tranquillity with the faithful: this very restoration of common intercourse among men[3] may lead these people to the way of truth. Let no one molest his neighbor, but let each act according to the inclination of his own soul. The well-disposed must be convinced, that they alone will live in holiness and purity, whom Thou thyself dost call to find rest in thy holy laws. But let those who remain strangers to them retain, since they wish it, the temples of falsehood: we have the resplendent house of thy truth, which thou hast

[1] De v. C. II. 12. Θεοφανείας ἐτύγχανεν, θειοτέρᾳ κινηθεὶς ἐμπνεύσει.

[2] Euseb. v. C. l. IV. 48.

[3] Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ τῆς κοινωνίας ἐπανόρθωσις, (perhaps ipsa hæc commercii restitutio.) The indefinite words may also mean, "the improving influence of intercourse." The connection, however, favors the first interpretation.

given us in answer to the cravings of our nature. We could wish that they too might share with us the joy of a common harmony. Yet let no one trouble his neighbor by that which is his own conviction. With the knowledge which he has gained, let him, if possible, profit his neighbor. If it is not possible, he should allow his neighbor to go on in his own way; for it is one thing, to enter voluntarily into the contest for eternal life, and another to force one to it against his will. I have entered more fully into the exposition of these matters, because I was unwilling to keep concealed my own belief in the truth; and especially because, as I hear, certain persons affirm [1] that the temple-worship and the power of darkness are abolished. I would avow this as my counsel to all men, if the mighty dominion of error were not too firmly rooted in the souls of some to permit the restoration of the common happiness." [2]

In the particular instances in which Constantine first caused temples to be destroyed and ancient forms of worship to be suppressed by force, the criminal excesses sanctioned under the name of religion, or the fraudulent tricks resorted to for the maintenance of heathen superstition among the credulous multitude, gave him special and just occasion for these proceedings; as, for example, when he caused to be demolished the temple and sacred grove of Venus at Aphaca in Phœnicia,[3] where from the remotest times the most abominable licentiousness was practised under the name of religion; and when he suppressed the like abominable rites at Heliopolis in Phœnicia. At the same time he sent to the inhabitants of this ancient heathen city a letter, in which he represented to them the hatefulness of these rites, and exhorted them to embrace Christianity. He founded here a church, with a complete body of clergymen and a bishop; — somewhat too early, indeed, since there were as yet no Christians in the place. He bestowed on this church *large sums* for the *support of the poor;* so that the *conversion of the Heathen might be promoted by doing good to their bodies* — a measure, doubtless, which was calculated rather to mislead these people into hypocrisy, than to conduct them to the faith.[4] Again, there was at Ægæ in Cilicia, a temple of Æsculapius of ancient fame, where the priests availed themselves of their knowledge of certain powers of nature, perhaps of magnetism, (the incubationes,) for the healing of diseases; and these cures were ascribed to the power of the god who appeared there, and employed as a means to promote the declining Paganism. The temple was filled with the consecrated gifts and the

[1] These "certain persons" may have been fearful Pagans, or Christians triumphing in a false zeal — more naturally the latter, especially as the emperor made use of expressions which only a Christian could employ. At all events, it is clear how important it was considered by Constantine, to repress the zeal of the Christians, which might easily lead to violent proceedings, and to inspire confidence in the anxious Pagans.

[2] Euseb. de v. C. II. 56 and 60.

[3] Euseb. de v. C. III. 55.

[4] Eusebius (l. c. III. 58) says that the views of Constantine on this matter were precisely like those of the Apostle Paul, Philippians 1: 18, "Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached." This, however, is manifestly a wrong application of that passage, which has been often enough repeated. Paul is speaking of a preaching of the gospel from motives not altogether pure, and not of a hypocritical conversion.

inscriptions of those who supposed themselves indebted to it for their recovery. Far-famed in particular were the remedies which, as it was pretended, the god himself prescribed in dreams to the sick who slept in the temple. Not only the populace, but many even of the better class, men of learning, and self-styled philosophers, lauded these wonderful cures. With a view to put an end to the knavery at a single blow, Constantine ordered the temple to be destroyed.[1] How important a prop of Heathenism, which needed such means for its support, was taken away by the destruction of this temple, appears from the complaints which a man like Libanius utters over this impiety and its attendant consequences: "The sick now," he says, "in vain make their pilgrimages to Cilicia."[2] By dismantling and publicly exhibiting those images of the gods to which miraculous powers had been ascribed, many a trick of the priests was exposed, and what had been venerated by the deluded populace, became the objects of their sport. Magnificent temples and statues of the gods were despoiled of their treasures, and stripped of all their costly materials; and then were either turned to the public use, or bestowed as presents on private individuals. Many objects of art taken from the temples were used for the decoration of the imperial residence.[3]

For the rest, this method of proceeding against the heathen cultus did not everywhere produce upon the Heathen themselves the same effect; owing to the differences of character. The fanatical Heathen, especially the educated who had constructed for themselves a mystical Heathenism spiritualized by Platonic ideas, and reasoned themselves into an artificial system composed of heterogeneous elements, could not be disturbed by any exposure of facts, and only felt exasperated by that desecration of their venerated sanctuaries, which they were obliged patiently to endure. There were others who were under the dominion of no such fanaticism, and whose superstition therefore, when it was stripped of its pompous array, might be more easily exposed in its emptiness. These might, by such sudden impressions, be brought to a sense of their error, and by degrees made capable of receiving a knowledge of the gospel. Others made sport of that which they had formerly believed, without receiving the true faith in place of their superstition. They fell into total skepticism, or contented themselves with a general system of Deism.[4] It is a fact worthy of remark, and a proof of the already diminished power of Heathenism over the popular mind, that officers, commissioned with full powers by the emperor, could venture, without any protection of an armed force, to pass through immense crowds of people, and plunder famous temples, bearing off

[1] Euseb. de v. C. III. 56.

[2] Liban. de templis, vol. II. 187. Καὶ νῦν οὓς ἄγει μὲν εἰς Κιλικίαν νοσήματα, τῆς τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ χρῄζοντα χειρὸς, αἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν τόπον ὕβρεις ἀπράκτους ἀποπέμπουσι. And quoting from the eulogy of a pagan rhetorician, in the time of the emperor Julian, probably in reference to the destruction of this temple: Νῦν μὲν τὴν τοῦ θέου δύναμιν δεικνύς ἐκ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων, ἃ ἦν τῶν ὑγιανόντων, νῦν δὲ τραγῳδῶν τὸν τῶν ἀθέων κατὰ τὸν νέω πολέμου, ἀδικουμένους ἱκετας, οὐκ ἐῶ μένους ἀπαλλαγῆναι κάκων. Liban. ep. 607.

[3] De v. C. III. 54, Liban. ed. Reiske, III. 436, concerning Constantine: Ἐγύμνωσε τοῦ πλούτου τοὺς θεούς. He calls him plainly the σεσυληκὼς. Pro templis, vol. II. p. 183.

[4] Euseb. de v. C. III. 57.

their venerated treasures.[1] What fierce commotions, on the other hand, were excited at a later period by the seizure of the *Christian* images in the Byzantine empire!

Again, Constantine endeavored to place Christians in the highest offices of state, and to appoint them governors in the provinces. Since, however, it was difficult at that time to carry this plan into execution, and wholly exclude the Pagans from the public service of the state; and since, moreover, he was unwilling to pass any law of this kind, he contented himself with forbidding the holders of office to sacrifice;—a practice which the previous importance of Paganism, as the religion of the state, had made a duty incumbent upon them in the execution of many kinds of public business. At length the erection of idolatrous images and the performance of religious sacrifices were universally forbidden. But as many Pagans still occupied important civil stations, and as Constantine moreover was not inclined to resort in this case to arbitrary force, it naturally followed that these laws were but little observed. Hence the succeeding emperor, Constantius, was under the necessity of reënforcing this ordinance.[2]

It was a religious interest which actuated Constantine in his attempts to introduce the Christian form of worship; but he never employed forcible measures for its extension: he never compelled any person whatever to act in matters of religion against the dictates of his own conscience. To those of his soldiers who were Christians, he gave full liberty to attend church on Sunday. Upon those of them who were not Christians, he did not enforce a Christian form of prayer, nor did he compel them to unite in any of the Christian forms, as the pagan emperors had endeavored to force Christians to join in the pagan ceremonies. He simply required the Pagans among his soldiers to assemble before the city in the open fields, and here, at a given signal, to repeat in the Latin language the following form of prayer: "Thee alone we acknowledge as the true God; thee we acknowledge as ruler; thee we invoke for help; from thee have we received the victory; through thee have we conquered our enemies; to thee are we indebted for our present blessings; from thee also we hope for future favors; to thee we all direct our prayer. We beseech thee, that thou wouldst preserve our emperor Constantine and his pious sons in health and prosperity through the longest life."[3] The same thing indeed becomes clearly apparent here, which we have observed on various other occasions, that the emperor had no just conception of the true nature of

[1] Euseb. III. 54.

[2] This prohibition of the emperor, Eusebius cites in his work, de v. C. II. 44, 45; IV. 23; and Sozomen, I. 8, who seems, however, here merely to copy from Eusebius, and that not accurately. The surest proof that Constantine did actually enact such a law, lies in the fact, that Constantius, by renewing the prohibition in the year 341, presupposed this law as already existing. If Libanius, on the contrary, in his discourse defending the temple, (vol. II. 162,) says of Constantine: Τῆς κατὰ νόμους θεραπείας ἐκίνησεν οὐδὲ ἓν, and 183, ὡς οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰς θυσίας προῆλθε, we remember not only that Libanius was interested here to represent what had been done by the first Christian emperor for the suppression of Paganism, as of the least possible account; but also that he confounded what was done at different times, and that he was looking at the effects of those laws, which it must be allowed were insignificant.

[3] Euseb. de v. C. IV. 18, 19.

divine worship and of prayer, and that he laid an undue stress on outward religious forms; for it was hardly possible surely, that, in repeating, at the word of command, a prayer committed to memory, and that in a language which to a part of the soldiers was not their own, there could be any of that devotion which alone gives to prayer its significance; but yet it is worthy of remark, how the emperor respected the religious convictions of his soldiers. He avoided in this prayer everything peculiar to Christianity, and nothing in it but the Monotheism would be incompatible with the pagan religion. As it respects this, Constantine perhaps regarded the belief in one God, as that which the contemplation of the universe would teach every man, and the necessary acknowledgment of which might be presupposed in every man: [1] besides, the heathen soldiers, who were not so scrupulous in regard to every word, might easily interpret the whole as an address to their own Jupiter.

But, if Constantine was unwilling to employ any forcible measures for the extension of Christianity, it by no means follows that he rejected *all outward* means for this end, and that he had come to understand how Christianity, disdaining all outward means of persuasion and outward supports, would make its own way, simply by the power with which it operates upon the inner convictions and in the life of men. We have from himself a remarkable declaration, concerning the means which he supposed necessary to promote the spread of Christianity. At the counsel of Nice he exhorted the bishops not to be envious of each other, on account of the applause bestowed on their discourses and the reputation of oratorical gifts; not to lay the foundations of schisms by their mutual jealousies, lest they should give occasion to the Heathen of blaspheming the Christian religion. The Heathen, he said, would be most easily led to salvation, if the condition of the Christians were made to appear to them in *all respects* enviable. They should consider, *that the advantage to be derived from preaching could not belong to all. Some*, he said, *might be drawn to the faith by being seasonably supplied with the means of subsistence; others were accustomed to repair to that quarter where they found protection and intercession*, (alluding to the *intercessions* of the bishops, see below;) *others would be won by an affable reception; others, by being honored with presents. There were but few who honestly loved the exhibitions of religious doctrine; but few who were the friends of truth*, (therefore, few sincere conversions.[2]) For this reason, they should accommodate themselves to the characters of all, and, like skilful physicians, give to each man that which might contribute to his cure, so that in every way the

[1] See his declaration in Euseb. II. 58.

[2] Euseb. III. 21. I place the passage here, which, as it seems to me, has been corrupted by a transposition of the words, in the way in which I suppose it ought to be corrected, by restoring the words to their proper order: Ὧν μάλιστα σωθῆναι δυναμένων, εἰ πάντα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοῖς ζηλωτὰ φαίνοιντο, μὴ δεῖν ἀμφιγνοεῖν, ὡς οὐ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἡ ἐκ λόγων ὠφέλεια συντελεῖ· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὡς πρὸς τροφὴν χαίρουσιν ἐπικουρούμενοι· οἱ δὲ τῆς προστασίας (ταῖς προστασίαις or τὰς) ὑποτρέχειν εἰώθασιν· ἄλλοι τοὺς δεξιώσεσι φιλοφρονουμένους ἀσπάζονται, καὶ ξενίοις τιμώμενοι ἀγαπῶσιν ἕτεροι· βραχεῖς δ' οἱ λόγων ἀληθεῖς ἐρασταὶ καὶ σπάνιος αὖ ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας φίλος.

saving doctrine might be glorified in all. A course of proceeding upon such principles must naturally have thrown open a wide door for all manner of hypocrisy. Even Eusebius, the panegyrist of Constantine, blinded as he was by the splendor which the latter had cast over the outward church, although he would gladly say nothing but good of his hero; yet even he is obliged to reckon among the grievous evils of this period, of which he was an eye-witness, the *indescribable hypocrisy* of those who gave themselves out as Christians merely for temporal advantage, and who, by their outward show of zeal for the faith, contrived to win the confidence of the emperor, which he suffered them to abuse.[1]

It must appear surprising that Constantine, although he exhibited so much zeal for all the concerns of the church, although he took part in the transactions of a council assembled to discuss matters of controversy, had never as yet received baptism; that he continued to remain without the pale of the community of believers; that he could still assist at no complete form of worship, no complete celebration of a festival. He continued to remain in the first class of catechumens, (not catechumens in the stricter sense of the word, see below,) though already sixty-four years of age. Thus far he had enjoyed sound and uninterrupted health. He now, for the first time, began to feel the infirmities of age; and illness induced him to leave Constantinople, and repair to the neighboring city of Helenopolis in Bithynia, Asia Minor, recently founded by his mother, in order to enjoy the benefit of the warm springs in that place. When his malady grew worse, and he felt a presentiment of the approach of death, he repaired, for the purpose of prayer, to the church consecrated to the memory of the martyr Lucian. Here first he made the confession which was customary before entering into the class of the catechumens, so called in the stricter sense; and the bishops gave him the blessing.[2] He next repaired to a castle, near the city of Nicomedia, where he called together an assembly of the bishops, and, surrounded by them, received baptism from Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. This took place shortly before his death, in the year 337. Now, for the first time, he could profess it to be his purpose, that, if God spared his life, he would join in the assembly of God's people, and join with all the faithful in all the prayers of the church.[3]

Doubtless we should consider here, that it was not the custom in this period for all to receive baptism immediately after embracing the faith; but many, especially in the East, deferred it until some special occasion, inward or outward, brought about in them a new crisis of life.[4] But still it must ever seem strange, that an emperor who took such interest in the concerns of the Christian church, should remain without baptism till his sixty-fourth year. We may indeed give credit to what

[1] See c. IV. 53. Εἰρωνείαν ἄλεκτον τῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑποδυομένων καὶ τὸ χριστιανῶν ἐπιπλάστως σχηματιζομένων ὄνομα, οἷς ἑαυτὸν καταπιστεύων τάχα ἄν ποτε καὶ τοῖς μὴ πρέπουσιν ἐνεπείρετο.

[2] He received for the first time the χειροθεσία, and was thus taken among the γονυκλινόντες.

[3] Euseb. IV. 62. Οὕτως ἐμὲ συναγελάζεσθαι λοιπὸν τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λαῷ, καὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς ὁμοῦ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐκκλησιάζοντα κοινωνεῖν ἅπαξ ὥρισται.

[4] See below, under the history of worship.

he says, and suppose — what was quite in character with his religious notions — that he entertained the design to receive baptism in the Jordan, whose water Christ had first consecrated by his own baptism.[1] This does not suffice, however, to explain his long delay. It is most probable that, carrying his heathen superstition into Christianity, he looked upon baptism as a sort of rite for the magical removal of sin, and so delayed it, in the confidence that, although he had not lived an exemplary life, he might yet in the end be enabled to enter into bliss, purified from all his sins. He was doubtless sincere, therefore, when, on receiving baptism, he said, as Eusebius reports, that from thenceforth, if God spared him his life, he would devote himself to God's worthy laws of life.[2] This remark leads us to notice a report, which circulated among the Heathen of this period, respecting the cause of Constantine's conversion; for the mode of thinking which betrays itself in his notion of baptism, furnishes us also with a key to the right interpretation of this story.

Constantine, instigated by the calumnious representations of his second wife Fausta, had, in a paroxysm of anger, caused his son, the Cæsar Crispus, step-son of Fausta, to be put to death. Reproached for this act by his mother Helena, and convinced afterwards himself that he had been falsely informed, he had added another crime to this by a cruel revenge on Fausta, whom he caused to be thrown into the glowing furnace of a bath. Suspicious jealousy had misled him to order the execution of his nephew, a hopeful prince, the son of the unfortunate Licinius; and several others, connected with the court, are said to have fallen victims to his anger or his suspicion. When at length he began to feel the reproaches of conscience, he inquired of the Platonic philosopher Sopatros, or, according to others, of heathen priests, what he could do to atone for these crimes. It was replied to him, that there *was* no lustration for such atrocious conduct. At that time an Egyptian bishop from Spain (probably Hosius of Cordova is meant) became known at the palace, through the ladies of the court. He said to the emperor, that in the Christian faith he could find a remedy for every sin; and this promise, which soothed the conscience of Constantine, first led him to declare decidedly in favor of Christianity.[3] Certain it is, that any *true* herald of the gospel, if he found the emperor suffering under these misgivings of conscience, would not have begun with calming his fears; but he would have endeavored first of all to bring him to the full conviction of the corruption within, of which these gross and striking outbreaks of sin were but individual manifestations; he would also have discovered to him the vanity of those seeming virtues by which he had often sought to gloss over this inward corruption; he would have shown him, that in general no opus operatum by outward lustrations could have any effect to cleanse the inner man from sin; — and then, after having cleared the wounded conscience of all those deceitful and soothing hopes which serve only as a prop for sin,

[1] Euseb. v. C. IV. 62.
[2] Θεσμοὺς ἤδη βίου θεῷ πρέποντας ἐμαυτῷ διατετάξομαι.
[3] Zosim. II. 29. Sozom. I. 5.

and shown him what true repentance is, he would have presented before him Christ, as the Redeemer of the truly penitent and believing sinner; constantly warning him against the seeming faith which leads men to seek in Christ only a deliverer from that outward suffering which a violated conscience holds up to their fears, and a stay for the sinfulness of their nature. But we may well suppose that, among the bishops of the court, there was none who would have spoken to the emperor in this manner. As it would be quite in character for Constantine, when suffering under the reproaches of conscience, to seek after some magical expiation, so we may easily suppose that a bishop who possessed little of the simple temper of the gospel and of pure Christian knowledge, and who was moreover blinded by the splendor of the court, might point the emperor to such a means of expiation in the rite of baptism, or in an empty profession of faith, and thus poison for him the very fountain of salvation. But the testimony of Pagans, inimical to Christianity and the emperor, furnishes no sufficient evidence *for the truth* of a story which they could have so easily invented; while, on the other hand, the silence of Christian historians, whose prejudices were all on one side, furnishes no evidence *against its truth.* That this account cannot, however, be literally true, appears, as Sozomenus has justly remarked, from the gross anachronism which it contains; for, long before Constantine had committed these crimes,[1] he had taken his decided stand in favor of Christianity. The whole story, therefore, may have no other foundation than the fact, that Constantine strove to quiet his sins by relying on the opus operatum of outward means of justification, especially upon the justifying power of outward baptism, which he reserved against the time of his death, and upon the merit of what he had done to promote the outward splendor of the church; and it may be that the bishops of the court, instead of teaching him better, confirmed him in this destructive error.[2] This doubtless would be observed by the Pagans, who would not be slow in taking advantage of it to misrepresent Christianity.[3]

[1] The execution of Crispus took place at the same time with the vicennalia of Constantine, or the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of his assuming the dignity of Augustus, that is, in 326; and it was in the preceding year that Constantine displayed, at the council of Nice, so decided a zeal in favor of the Christian faith.

[2] Eusebius of Cæsarea was a man conversant with still higher things than mere worldly interests, and cannot be reckoned among the number of the ordinary court bishops of this period; yet mark how he describes a banquet which the emperor gave to the bishops at the breaking up of the Nicene council, in celebration of the *vicennalia* of his entrance upon the dignity of Cæsar: "When the emperor held a banquet with the bishops, among whom he had established peace, he presented it, through them, as it were an offering worthy of God. No one of the bishops was excluded from the imperial table. The proceedings on this occasion were sublime beyond description. The soldiers of the emperor's body-guard were drawn up before the door of the palace with their bare swords. The men of God (the bishops) passed along undaunted between their files into the interior of the palace. Some sat at the same table with the emperor himself; the others, at side-tables. One might easily imagine that one beheld the type of Christ's kingdom." Euseb. vit. Constant. l. III. c. 15. Making due allowance for the corrupt rhetorical taste of those times, in passing our judgment on these expressions, still we must feel certain, that a man who was capable of using such language was in no condition to speak to the emperor in the spirit of the gospel, as one charged with the care of souls.

[3] Thus Julian, in his satirical performance entitled "the Cæsars," makes Constan-

If the reign of Constantine *bears witness that the state which seeks to advance Christianity by the worldly means at its command, may be the occasion of more injury to this holy cause than the earthly power which opposes it with whatever virulence*, this truth is still more clearly demonstrated by the reign of his successor Constantius.

Constantius, in the outset, shared the government with his two brothers, Constantine the younger and Constans, to whose portion fell the dominion of the West. The younger Constantine having, in the war against his brother Constans, lost his life, Constans made himself master of the whole Western, as Constantius was already of the whole Eastern empire; and when Constans perished, in the year 350, in the revolt of Magnentius, Constantius was left sole master of the entire Roman empire. Now, although the measures adopted for the suppression of Paganism proceeded directly from Constantius, although they were executed in his empire with the greatest severity and rigor, — despotism in the East being, as a general thing, the most oppressive; yet, on the whole, the principles upon which he proceeded, were those which prevailed throughout the entire empire. Constantius, in reënacting, in the year 341, the law of the previous reign against sacrifices, gave the following peremptory command: "Let superstition cease; let the folly of sacrifices be abolished.[1] Whoever, after the publication of this law, continues to sacrifice, shall be punished according to his deserts;" yet the nature of the punishment is not clearly defined.

Although this law might properly refer only to the Eastern empire, yet in a law of the year 346, enacted in common by the emperor Constantius and Constans, and therefore valid for the whole Western and Eastern empire, it is presupposed that the extirpation of the entire pagan superstition had already been commanded;[2] and in the same year the two emperors again conjointly directed, that the temples should everywhere be closed, that access to them should be forbidden to all, and thus liberty for crime taken away from abandoned men.[3] Sacrifices were forbidden on pain of death and the confiscation of goods. When at a still later period, under the usurper Magnentius, who himself[4] professed to be a Christian, the pagan cultus in the West had recovered a certain degree of freedom — whether it was that the usurper, from political reasons or want of interest in religious matters, made show

tine in the lower world proclaim to all: "Whoever is a voluptuary, a murderer, whoever is a vicious man, a profligate, let him boldly come hither. Having washed him with this water, I will instantly make him pure. And should he fall into the same crimes again, let him only beat on his breast and on his head, and I will bestow on him power to become pure." Ὅστις φθορεύς, ὅστις μιαφόνος, ὅστις ἐναγὴς καὶ βδελυρὸς ἴτω θαῤῥῶν. ἀποφανῶ γὰρ αὐτὸν τουτῳὶ τῷ ὕδατι λούσας, αὐτίκα καθαρόν, καὶ πάλιν ἐνοχος τοῖς αὐτοῖς γένηται, δώσω τὸ στῆθος πλήξαντι καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν πατάξαντι, καθαρῷ γενέσθαι. And Libanius sees in the cruelty of Constantine towards his own family, a punishment inflicted on him for his plundering of the temples: Τὶς οὕτω μεγάλην τῶν περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ χρήματα δέδωκε δίκην τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς αὐτὸν μείων; Pro templis, p. 184, vol. II.

[1] Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. 10, c. 2. Cesset superstitio, sacrificiorum aboleatur insania.

[2] Omnis superstitio penitus eruenda.

[3] Licentiam delinquendi perditis abnegari.

[4] As the ensigns of the cross on his coins prove. See Eckhel, VIII. 122.

of greater toleration; or whether it was that, without any interference of his own, the laws which had been passed against the pagan worship had, in the turmoils of this revolution, lost their power — yet for this cause Constantius thought it necessary, after he had suppressed the insurrection in the year 353, and became the sole ruler, to issue a new law against sacrifices by night, which had been again introduced. Three years later, in 356, he passed a law, in the name also of the Cæsar Julian, who was even then secretly inclined to Paganism, by which law he made it once more capital to sacrifice and worship the images of the gods. The relation of things had become reversed. As in former times the observance of the pagan ceremonies, the religion of the state, had appeared in the light of a civil duty, and the profession of Christianity in that of a crime against the state; so now it was the case, not indeed that the outward profession of Christianity was commanded as a universal civil duty, for against this the spirit of Christianity too earnestly remonstrated; but that the exercise of the pagan religion was made politically dangerous. There was an inclination to regard the Heathens, as unsatisfied with the present order of things; and the suspicious despot Constantius feared, whenever he heard about the celebration of pagan rites, especially about augurs, haruspices, consultation of oracles and sacrifices, that conspiracies were brooding against his government and his life. It was especially the notary Paulus, widely known under his well-deserved soubriquet, the *Chain*, (catena,) who, in the later times of this reign, working upon the suspicious temper of Constantius, and using him as the instrument of his own designs, ravaged the land as a cruel persecutor. It thus happened that a heathen philosopher, Demetrius Chytas of Alexandria, was convicted of having repeatedly sacrificed. Not so much for religious as for political reasons, this trangression of the laws was interpreted as a grievous crime; his judges pretending to look upon it as a magical ceremony, undertaken in a hostile spirit against the emperor.[1] No credit was given to his assurances, that from his early youth he had been accustomed to sacrifice, simply to propitiate the favor of the gods. But when he steadfastly persisted in the same assertion under the rack, he was dismissed to his home; although, if the imperial law had been strictly carried into execution, he must have suffered the penalty of death, as a Heathen who, by his own confession, had offered sacrifices. To wear heathen amulets for keeping off diseases, to consult an astrologer on any private affair whatever, might easily involve one in a crimen majestatis, leading to tortures and death.[2]

To the great vexation of the Pagans, Constantius caused several celebrated temples to be destroyed. Some he plundered, and presented others or their treasures to Christian churches, or to his favorites among the courtiers; and sometimes, therefore, to the most unworthy of men. The property of the temples, which might have

[1] See Ammian. Marcellin. l. XIX. c. 12.

[2] Ammian. Marcellin. l. c. Liban. pro Aristophane, vol. I. p. 430. The words of Ammianus Marcellinus are particularly worthy of notice: "Prorsus ita res agebatur, quasi Clarium, Dodonæas arbores et effata Delphorum, *olim solennia* in imperatoris exitium sollicitaverint multi."

been employed to a better purpose in the cause of religion, often became a prey to cupidity and rapine;[1] and when many, who had become rich by the plundering of temples, abandoned themselves to every lust, and finally brought ruin upon themselves by their own wickedness, the Pagans looked upon this as the punishment sent by their gods for robbing the temples; and they predicted that similar punishments would follow every instance in which the temples were desecrated, as appears from the asseverations of Libanius and Julian.

The emperor, however, thought it advisable to keep under some restraint the fury for destroying temples, in order to preserve certain national antiquities which were dear to the people. By a law of the year 346, he ordained that all temples, existing without the walls of the city, should be preserved uninjured, since with many of them were connected national festivities, and certain of the public games and contests had derived their origen from them.[2] When Constantius, after his victory over Magnentius, resided in Rome and there saw the heathen temples in their full splendor, he took no measures against them; and Heathenism, as the old religion of the Roman state, still retained so much consequence, that much that belonged to the heathen forms of worship was left unaltered in the Western empire. Thus it was with the privileges of the vestals and the priestly dignities, which were given to Romans belonging to the noblest heathen families,[3] although we must allow that these dignities had lost much of their ancient importance. Subsequently to the establishment of the law which made the offering of sacrifice a capital crime, Tertullus, the prefect of the city, did not hesitate, when a storm at sea hindered the provision fleet from arriving at Rome and threatened a famine, to offer public sacrifices in the temple of Castor, near the mouth of the Tiber, that the gods might calm the fury of the storm.[4]

Whilst falsely flattering pagan rhetoricians, such as Libanius and Themistius, publicly spoke in praise of the emperor, whom at heart they detested as the enemy of the gods; there were still among the teachers of the Christian church many bold and fearless voices, which plainly told him that he rather injured than aided Christianity, when he sought to advance its interests by outward power, — voices which now presented before a professedly Christian emperor, who confounded the Christian with the political standing-ground, the principles of liberty of conscience and belief brought to light by Christianity, just as they had been presented before the pagan emperors by its first defenders. Very pertinently says Hilary to the emperor Constantius: "With the gold of the state you burdened the sanctuary of God; and what has been torn from the temples, or gained by the confiscation of goods, or extorted by pun-

[1] Liban. de accusatorib. III. 436. Κατέσκαψε τοὺς ναοὺς καὶ πάντα ἱερὸν ἐξαλείψας νόμον, ἔδωκεν αὐτον (αὐτους,) οἷς ἴσμεν. Liban. Epitaph. Julian. 529: Τὸν τῶν ἱερῶν πλοῦτον εἰς τοὺς ἀσελγεστάτους μεμερισμένον. Ammian. Marcellin. l. XXII. c. 4. Pasti quidam templorum spoliis.

[2] Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. X. c. 3. Nam cum ex nonnullis vel ludorum vel circensium vel agonum origo fuerit exorta, non convenit ea convelli, ex quibus populo Romano præbentur priscarum sollennitas voluptatum.

[3] See Symmach. relat. ad Valentinian. l. X. ep. 61.

[4] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XIX. c. 10.

ishments, that you force upon God."[1] Concerning the resort to violent measures for the advancement of religion, Athanasius finely remarks:[2] "It is an evidence that they want confidence in their own faith, when they use force, and constrain men against their wills. So Satan, because there is no truth in him, wherever he gains admittance, pays away with hatchet and sword. But the Saviour is so gentle that he teaches it is true: '*Will* any one come after me, and who *will* be my disciple?' while he *forces* none to whom he comes, but only knocks at the door of the soul, and says: 'Open to me, my sister;' and if the door is opened, he goes in. But if any one is unwilling to open, he withdraws; for the truth is not preached by sword and javelin, nor by armies, but by persuasion and admonition.[3] How can there be anything like persuasion, where the fear of the emperor rules? How can there be anything like admonition, where he who contradicts has to expect banishment and death?" Says the same writer, in another place:[4] "It is the character of true piety, not to force, but to convince; since our Lord himself forced no man, but left free the choice of each individual, saying to all: 'If any man *will*, let him come after me;' but to his disciples: '*Will* ye also go away?'" The men who expressed such truths with Christian boldness, were thinking indeed, in this case, not so much of the conduct of the emperor towards the Pagans, as of his conduct towards the contending parties of the Christian church; their own interest (for they belonged to a party which lay under the constraint of outward power) coincided in this case with what the spirit of Christianity requires; and hence they might the more readily perceive this, and be led to make it a prominent point in opposition to the prevailing sentiments of their time. It is plain, that the same could have been said also concerning the emperor's conduct towards the Pagans; but it may be justly questioned, whether they would have been equally free to recognize and proclaim the same truths in this wider application. It is certain at least, that many of the fathers were actuated by another spirit than this Christian one: they were concerned only for the outward suppression of Paganism, without considering whether the means employed for this purpose agreed with the spirit of the gospel, and were suited to destroy Paganism in the hearts of men. Julius Firmicus Maternus[5] thus addresses the emperors Constantius and Constans: "Take off without scruple the decorations of the temples; use all their consecrated gifts for your own profit, and that of the Lord. After destroying the temples, ye are, by the power of God, exalted higher." He paid homage to the error, so ruinous to the emperors, which led them to imagine that, by merely destroying the outward monuments of Paganism, they proved themselves to be Christians, and secured the divine favor. He also describes the political success of the emperors in the usual style of exaggerated flattery,

[1] C. Constant. imperator. lib. c. 10.

[2] Hist. Arian. § 3.

[3] *Οὐ γὰρ ξίφεσιν ἢ βέλεσιν οὐδὲ δία στρατιώτων ἡ ἀληθεία καταγγελέται, ἀλλα πειθοῖ καὶ συμβουλίᾳ.*

[4] Hist. Arian. § 67.

[5] Concerning whom we shall speak further in another place, under the head of the Apologists.

peculiar to the panegyrists of the age, and says nothing of their misfortunes. He next invites them to punish idolatry, and assures them that the divine law required them to suppress all Paganism by force.[1] Forgetting the spirit which it became Christians to cherish, and by what means the Christian church had overcome all earthly powers that had opposed her and finally rendered them subservient to her own interests, he employs those passages of the Old Testament which threatened with the punishment of death those who became idolaters from among the people of God, to show how Christian emperors should deal with the same class of men. Worldly-minded bishops, who by their proceedings caused the name of the Lord to be blasphemed among the Gentiles, such as Georgius of Alexandria, raged against Paganism, and stood ready to reward with everything which their powerful influence at court enabled them to procure, with the favor of the prince, and titles, and stations of honor, the hypocrisy of those who accounted earthly things of more value than divine.[2]

If we consider more closely the relation, as it now stood, of Christianity to Paganism in the Roman empire, we cannot fail to see that a reaction of the latter, to recover itself from its depression, was already prepared. As nothing can be more hurtful to the cause of truth, than attempting to support and further it by some other power than its own, thus converting truth itself into a falsehood; so nothing, on the other hand, can contribute more to promote the cause of error, than raising up martyrs for it, and thus lending it the appearance of truth. It certainly had been possible for Paganism, under the existing circumstances, to gain vastly more, if this religious system, which consisted of the old popular superstition, coming out in a new dress from the school of pompous, mystical sophists and conceited rhetoricians, had not been in itself so utterly unsubstantial and powerless; an idle gewgaw, hardly capable of imparting to any soul, enthusiasm enough to become a martyr.

Many had hypocritically assumed the profession of Christianity, while at heart they were still inclined to Paganism, or were ready to adopt any religion which happened to be in favor at court; others had framed a system for themselves, mixed up of Paganism and Christianity, in which often there was nothing more than merely an exchange of pagan

[1] C. 30. Ut severitas vestra idololatriæ facinus omnifariam persequatur.

[2] Libanius doubtless expresses what he had seized from the life of the times, when he says, speaking of a certain Aristophanes, who, even under the reign of Constantius, had continued steadfast in the profession of Heathenism: "What rewards might he not have obtained from Georgius, if he had been willing to make in the church a public profession of Christianity, and to insult the gods? What prefecture of Egypt, what power with the eunuchs of the court, and with the emperor himself, would not Georgius have procured for him? Ποίαν οὐκ ἂν προὔπιεν Αἴγυπτον ἀντὶ ταύτης τῆς κωμῳδίας; παρὰ τίσιν οὐκ ἂν εὐνόυχοις τὸν ἀνθρωπον ἀπέφηνεν ἰσχυρόν; ἤπτετ' ἂν εὖ ἴσθι, καὶ τῆς Κωνσταντίου κεφαλῆς εἰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλὴν πρὸς Γεώργιον ἤρειδεν." Pro Aristophane, vol. I. 448. This agrees with the description which Athanasius gives of those who became Christians for the sake of spiritual offices, to obtain exemption from the burdens of the state, and to secure powerful connections, — men who were satisfied with any creed, provided only they could be released from state burdens, and maintain their connections with those in power: Ἕως μονὸν εἰσὶν ἀλειτουργήτοι καὶ προστασίαν ἀνθρωπίνην ἔχουσι. Athanas. hist. Arianor. ad monachos, § 78.

for Christian names, — in which only Christian forms and ceremonies were substituted in place of the Pagan, and from which, under a change of circumstances, it would not be difficult to retreat back to Paganism. The passions which in controversial disputes excited the Christians to rail at each other; the impure motives which crept in on these occasions, especially through the influence of the court; the zeal for a formal orthodoxy and church ceremonial among so many who in their lives manifested a spirit so different from that of the gospel, — all this must have served to give support to the false accusations against Christianity current among the Pagans; as in the earlier times the effects of the gospel on the lives of its followers had tended to further its progress. Thus a heathen party had kept itself alive, which, in its fanaticism, rising under the pressure of distress, and taking advantage of all that was bad in the Christian church, flattered itself with the hope of one day seeing the worship of its gods victoriously restored.

The spirit which for the most part animated this party, was by no means a purely religious fanaticism. It was a blind love for the old antiquities of Greece and Rome; for Grecian art and science, which, to these Pagans, seemed, not without reason, to be closely connected with the old religion. It was their enthusiastic attachment to everything connected with the old Greek and Roman manners, which filled them with hatred to Christianity, — a religion which introduced a new, spiritual, and to them unintelligible, creation. Hence it was that Paganism found its most zealous promoters among the rhetoricians, philosophers, and men of learning; and that the attachment to it lingered especially in many of the ancient and noble families of Greece and Rome. The rhetoricians who made an open profession of Paganism, or who, although they professed Christianity, were Pagans at heart, had opportunities enough, although they did not venture publicly to attack the latter in their lectures, yet, in expounding the ancient authors, to communicate imperceptibly to the minds of the youth a direction hostile to Christianity. What we have already remarked with reference to the preceding period, still continued to be true; — that the religious symbolism, derived from the Neo-Platonic philosophy, was the most important means resorted to for dressing out Paganism as a rival of Christianity, and for imparting an artificial life to that which was already effete. Speculative ideas and mystical intuitions were to infuse into the old insipid superstition a higher meaning. Theurgy, and the low traffic in boastful mysteries, contributed greatly also to attract and enchain, by their deceptive arts, many minds, influenced more by a vain curiosity, which would penetrate into what lies beyond the province of the human mind, than by any true religious need. Yet in art and science there was nothing truly creative, which could spring any longer out of the withered trunk of Paganism. All the creative power dwelt in Christianity. This alone could impart the spirit of a new life into the forms borrowed from the Grecian art and science. Those who, instead of yielding to the new creation by which everything was to be restored to the freshness of youth, mourned over the grave of the ancient world, which had long since perished, could do nothing more than form an

idle patch-work out of the old fragments of rhetoric, philosophy, and literature.

From what has now been said, it is easy to see that, should a pagan emperor once more ascend the throne, this Paganism would make another attempt to gain the supremacy; since for the moment everything in fact depended upon the will of the emperor, although indeed no human will had the power of actually calling back to life what was already dead. And to this very end, that a pagan emperor should once more be established on the throne, Constantius was to prove the instrument, — Constantius, who had ever been the chief cause of mischief to the Christian church, for which he displayed so much zeal.

The new emperor was Julian, the nephew of Constantius, whose desertion to Paganism admits of an easy explanation, both from the peculiarity of his character, and from his course of life and education. In fact, a very slight turn seemed all that was necessary to change the peculiar bent, manifested by the whole family of Constantines, for the outward show and form of religion, from Christianity to Paganism; and this turn Julian took from his earliest youth. Having lost, as it is said, early in life his nearest relatives, through the jealousy of his uncle, who discarded the natural feelings of kindred, this circumstance would leave on the mind of Julian no very favorable impression of the religion which prevailed at the imperial court, and for which Constantius manifested such excessive zeal; although, at the time this took place, he was too young to be conscious of any such impression. Every pains was taken to keep him away, while a boy and a young man, from the infection of Paganism, and to fasten him to Christianity. This was done as well from political as from religious motives; since any connection of the prince with the pagan party might prove dangerous to the state. But the right means were not chosen to secure this end. What was thus forced upon him could not easily take root in a mind which naturally hated constraint. This careful surveillance would only have the natural effect to excite his longing after that which they were so anxious to keep from him. And the men, too, whom the court employed as its instruments, were not such as would be likely to scatter in the mind of Julian the seeds of a thorough Christianity, and to leave impressions on his heart calculated to give a decided Christian direction to his inner life. It was in a diligent attention to those outward religious forms which busy the imagination, that he and his brother Gallus were chiefly exercised, while pursuing their education under vigilant masters, in the solitude of Macellum, a country-seat in Cappadocia. Their very sports were made to wear the color of devotional exercises; as when they were taught to emulate each other in erecting a chapel over the tomb of Mamas, a pretended martyr, held in special veneration throughout this district. The boys might easily become accustomed to all this; and, unless some mightier reaction took place in the inmost recesses of the mind, the habits thus formed might become fixed, as they actually were in the case of Gallus; but not so, where a mightier influence than religious mechanism began to work in an opposite direction, as in the case of Julian.

Both are said to have been educated as ecclesiastics; they were consecrated as pre-lectors in the church, little as the disposition of either one of them was suited for the clerical profession. This office, which had been given to Julian when young, must have made him quite familiar with the scriptures; and the writings of Julian do actually show, that he possessed a ready acquaintance with the letter of the scriptures: but of what avail could that be, when his mind had taken a direction which unfitted him altogether for entering into their inward meaning, and his heart was ever wholly disinclined from submitting to the doctrines which they taught? Homer, on the other hand, was expounded to him by a man much more skilful in imparting to the imagination of the young student an enthusiasm for his author, than the clergy had proved to be in implanting a love of the divine word in his heart. This was Nicocles, a civilian, enthusiastically devoted to the Grecian literature, who, after the fashion of the Platonists of that period, contemplated Homer, through the medium of an allegorical interpretation, as the guide to a higher wisdom.[1] Probably, in his own convictions, he was a Pagan,[2] although he might not openly avow this to be the case; and we may well conceive, that such a person was far more fitted to disseminate imperceptibly in the mind of the young student something hostile to Christianity, than to cherish in him the Christian tendency. Besides, the light in which such an instructor must have taught him to contemplate Homer, would not be likely to harmonize with Christianity. Two heterogeneous and hostile elements were here brought at once into his soul; the one penetrated deeply, the other only touched lightly upon the surface. These two elements might, it is true, rest peaceably side by side; and the more so, the less deeply Christianity took hold of the life: but a conflict between them might afterwards easily be excited by outward causes, and a religion afterwards find its way to his soul, the medium of entrance for which had been prepared by that fundamental element of his education. Thus he contracted a great fondness for the study of the ancient Greek poets and orators generally; and this love for ancient literature next formed a point of transition to the love of ancient Paganism, as the living spring of this literature, the two things being in fact intimately connected in the view of the pagan party among the learned. It was said, indeed, that the ancient literature had sunk with the ancient religion, and that the disgrace of that literature had followed close after the degradation of the temples in the time of Constantine; — a complaint which in one respect was wholly groundless, inasmuch as this literature, without inward life, had long carried within it the germ of its own decay, and nothing but Christianity remained to infuse new life into the dead bones of antiquity.[3]

[1] Liban. Πρεσβευτικὸς πρὸς Ἰουλιανόν. Vol. I. p. 459. Ἐιδὼς εἴπερ τις, τῆς Ὁμήρου γνώμης τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα.

[2] Otherwise Libanius would hardly have bestowed on him so much praise in the passage just referred to.

[3] Libanius, not without reason, says to Julian: Ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τιμὴν τῶν θεῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐκινήθης τῶν λόγων. Πρὸς φωνητικ. Vol. I. p. 405, οἰκεία καὶ συγγέννη ταῦτα ἀμφοτέρα, ἱερὰ καὶ λόγοι. Vol. III. p. 437.

After six years' residence at the country-seat in Cappadocia, Julian was called, in the year 350, to Constantinople, where he occupied himself exclusively with literary pursuits. Here he was not allowed to avail himself of the instructions of the rhetorician Libanius, who openly acknowledged himself a Pagan; but the rhetorician Ecebolius, a man of less elevated mind, who accommodated his religion to the air of the court, and who, under Constantius, was a zealous Christian and a violent antagonist of Paganism, while under Julian he became an equally zealous Pagan and antagonist of Christianity, obtained, as the reward of his hypocrisy, the charge of the prince's education.[1] How could such an instructor imbue the youthful mind of his pupil with the love of Christianity!

The foolish Constantius, who must be so often deceived and led to act contrary to his own interests where he thought that he was doing the utmost to promote them, was afraid to leave a young prince, that already began to attract a good deal of attention, behind him at Constantinople, while he himself went to the West on his expedition against Magnentius. He gave him leave, therefore, to visit Nicomedia, in Bithynia, for the purpose of prosecuting his literary pursuits at a flourishing seat of learning, where several distinguished rhetoricians were teachers. Yet there he was exposed much more to the infection of Paganism than at Constantinople, where fear and worldly interest induced even those who were Pagans at heart to wear the mask of Christianity. He was obliged to promise, on departing from Constantinople, that he would not attend the lectures of the pagan Libanius, who also then taught at Nicomedia. But the prohibition, as might be expected, served only to stimulate his curiosity; and he contrived to procure copies of the lectures of Libanius, which indeed, if we may judge from his writings that remain, barren as they were of ideas and sentiments, dry in their contents, and rich only in the ornaments of rhetoric, could have attractions only for a very disordered mind, unaccustomed to healthy nourishment, weaned from simplicity, and easily pleased with the glare of superficial ornament. The gratification which he found in the lectures of Libanius, doubtless brought him gradually into connection with the whole pagan party. At its head, stood at that time, along with the rhetoricians, *the Platonists*, who had schools in Asia Minor, particularly at Pergamos. The most renowned among these Platonists were the old Ædesius, Chrysanthius, Eusebius, Maximus. The last-mentioned was also an adroit juggler, who boasted of his power to do great things by means of supernatural agents. These Platonists maintained a close correspondence with the Pagans at Nicomedia. To gain over a young man who was destined to hold so important a posi-

[1] Liban. epitaph. Julian. vol. I. p. 526. Σοφιστὴς τις πονηρὸς τοῦ κακῶς ἀγορεύειν τοὺς θεοὺς μισθὸν εἶχε τὸν νέον. Socrates (l. III. c. 1) mentions his name. The same writer also relates the rest which is noticed in the text, and moreover adds, that after Julian's death he was for once more playing the Christian, and proposed to subject himself to the penance of the church, that he might be again admitted to its communion; that he prostrated himself on the earth before the door of the church, and called out to the people, — "Tread me under foot; I am the senseless salt, πατησατέ με, τὸ ἅλας τὸ ἀναίσθητον. Socrat. l. III. c. 13.

tion in the state, was naturally regarded by them as a great object, worthy of the most skilful finesse. It may easily be conceived that the mind of Julian, already perverted and made vain by his rhetorical education, and eagerly catching at the glitter and pomp of words, would be more strongly attracted by the dainty philosophico-mystical Paganism which these people set forth — by their high-sounding phrases about the heavenly derivation of the soul, its debasement to matter, its bondage, and its freedom, and by their pretended clearing up of the doctrine concerning gods and demons — than by the simple gospel, even if this had been preached to him. But the Christianity which he actually possessed, a Christianity that turned wholly on externals, could easily make the transition to Paganism. They now gave him proofs of the pagan art of divination, which surprised and deceived him. They showed him predictions[1] of an approaching triumph of the gods; and, indeed, flattered him with the hope that he himself was the destined instrument to achieve it. The greatest influence over him was possessed by the braggard Maximus, who had come over from Ephesus; for he was precisely the man to entrap a youth like Julian. He took him along with him to Ionia; and there, in the society of Neo-Platonic philosophers and hierophants, the work begun at Nicomedia was finished. Julian was converted, from being an outward Christian, with a secret leaning to Paganism, of which perhaps he was himself unconscious, into a decided and zealous Pagan.[2]

[1] To this Libanius alludes in ep. 701, when, under Julian's reign, he writes: Νῦν τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ κρατός, τὰ μὲν λογίσμοις, τὰ δὲ μαντείαις εὑρισκομένης.

[2] Here especially the narratives of Libanius, who was then a rhetorician at Nicomedia, and in part an eye-witness of the facts, are of weight. Προσφωνητικ. πρὸς Ἰουλιανόν, vol. I. p. 408. Respecting Julian's residence in Nicomedia, he says: Ἦν γὰρ τις σπινθὴρ μαντικῆς αὐτόθι κρυπτόμενος, μόλις διαφυγὼν τὰς χεῖρας τῶν δυσσεβῶν (the severe persecutions, by the Christian emperors, of the pagan art of divination, see above) ὑφ' ᾧ δὴ πρῶτος τἀφανὲς ἀνιχνεύων τὸ σφοδρὸν μῖσος κατὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐπέσχες (perhaps hopes, which were entertained by himself with regard to what he should one day become;) then he mentions his journey to Ionia, where, by the δοκοῦντα καὶ ὄντα σοφόν, that is, by Maximus, he was led to the full knowledge of the truth. Epitaph. Julian. l. c. 528, he mentions less distinctly how Julian, during his residence in Nicomedia, having once fallen into company with Platonicians, and heard them discourse on divine things, suddenly changed his opinions. Εἰς Ἰουλιανον Αυτοκρατορ. ὑπατον, l. c. 376, ἐκείνην ἐγὼ τὴν ἡμέραν ἀρχὴν ἐλευθερίας τῇ γῇ καλῶ, καὶ μακαρίζω τόπον τε ὃς τὴν μεταβολὴν ἐδέξατο καὶ τὸν τῆς γνώμης ἰατρὸν, ὃς κινδύνου τὸν κάλλιστον αὐτός τε κινδυνεύσας, καὶ τόνδε πείσας, μετὰ τοῦ μαθητοῦ τὰς κυανέας διέπλευσεν· (the voyage to Ionia in company with Maximus, which beyond question would have exposed both him and Julian to great danger, if Julian's conversion to Paganism had been discovered). What Eunapius relates, particularly in the life of Maximus, (ed. Boissonade, vol. I. p. 49, ff.) cannot, indeed, be received as literally true; and besides, it is too inexact to be used in deciding about the time when events occurred in this portion of Julian's history: yet these accounts contain a good deal which serves to illustrate the characters of both Julian and Maximus. When Chrysanthius first tells the young man about the magical arts of Maximus, (how, by his forms of incantation, he had caused the statue of Hecate to laugh, and the torches in her hands to kindle of themselves,) as it is said, for the purpose of warning him against these things, so foreign from the pure spiritual philosophy. Julian exclaims: — "Keep to your books; you have shown me the man whom I seek;" and he hastens from Pergamos to meet him at Ephesus. Something like this may perhaps have happened, though the time, place and circumstances are here not correctly stated. The warning letter which Gallus wrote to Julian, during the residence of the latter in Ionia, because the reports that Julian had gone over to Paganism had excited his alarm, agrees with the above account; as also the remark of Julian in his proclamation to the Athenians, that he was a zealous and decided Christian until his one and twentieth year; for this would coincide with the time of his residence in Nicomedia, with the year 351: though it ought

Although Julian had special reasons for concealing his conversion to Paganism, which, if it became known to Constantius, might have cost him his life; yet he could not avoid exciting suspicions with regard to his connections in Ionia. His brother Gallus, who happened to be at that time in the neighborhood, heard reports which troubled him. But Ætius, an ecclesiastic of Antioch, who was on friendly terms with Julian, quieted his suspicions by informing him, that Julian frequented the churches, and especially the chapels of the martyrs;[1] and since it can hardly be supposed that Ætius invented this story merely to soothe Gallus, it may hence be gathered to what arts of dissimulation Julian descended. The assassination of Gallus (in 354;) the danger in which he was himself for a long time involved through the jealousy of Constantius; the imprisonment in which he was held;—all this could only serve to render the Byzantine court, and the Christianity which was here worn for a show, still more hateful to him. The ever-deluded Constantius finally gave him permission to reside for some time at Athens, the ancient flourishing seat of literary studies and Hellenism.[2] Pagan priests, hierophants, and rhetoricians, here combined their efforts to stimulate his zeal in the cause of Paganism; pagan youth were his companions; and he became the secret hope of the whole pagan party.

While Julian, already elevated to the dignity of Cæsar, was carrying on the war in Gaul, his fear of the jealous temper of Constantius led him to adopt every possible expedient for keeping his pagan way of thinking concealed; and so, on the feast of Epiphany of the year 361, he assisted at the celebration of the Christian worship at Vienna.[3] He was attended by only three men, who agreed with him in their religious views, and joined with him in his secret observance of the pagan cultus,—a slave who was his librarian; his physician Oribasius,[4] an enterprising man, whose pretended knowledge of magic, divination and the interpretation of dreams, gave him great influence with Julian; and Sallustius, a learned civilian, whom the emperor had sent with him for the purpose of watching his proceedings, but who, by his friendly intimacy with Julian, soon excited suspicion, and was removed.

Thus the religious convictions of Julian had been rendered doubly dear to him by these measures of constraint, when, in the year 361, he was placed himself on the imperial throne, and found it in his power not only freely to express his true principles, but also to aim at remodelling after them the whole state of religion in the Roman empire.

to be taken into consideration, that this cannot well be understood literally, and that Julian himself perhaps would not be able distinctly to recall that which had taken place in his mind by gradual and progressive changes.

[1] See the letter of Gallus to Julian. Julian, opp. 454.

[2] Gregory of Nazianzen, who just at that time was also studying at Athens, writes in his orat. 90, p. 331: Βλαβέρα τοῖς ἀλλοῖς Ἀθῆναι τὰ εἰς ψύχην τοῖς εὐσεβεστέροις καὶ γὰρ πλουτούσι τὸν κακὸν πλοῦτον τὰ εἰδώλα μᾶλλον τῆς ἄλλης ἑλλάδος, καὶ χαλεπόν μὴ συναρπασθῆναι τοῖς τούτων ἐπαινέταις καὶ συνηγόροις.

[3] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XXI. c. 2.

[4] Comp. Julian, ep. ad Atheniens. Eunap. vit. Oribas. Eunapius says, indeed, that he made Julian emperor, which probably has reference to those higher arts in which Oribasius was supposed to be a proficient. See the letter of Julian to Oribasius in his critical situation, where he also communicates to him a dream. Ep. 17. Respecting Sallust, Zosim. l. III. c. 9. Julian's consolatory address at taking leave of Sallust, orat. 8, and ep. ad Athenienses.

Perhaps beyond any one of his predecessors among the Roman emperors, he made account of the office of supreme pontiff. He took special delight in offering multitudes of sacrifices and in slaughtering the victims with his own hand, and, by the great zeal which he manifested on these occasions, often exposed himself to the ridicule of the Christians. He labored to found a mystical hierarchy, fashioned after his own Neo-Platonic ideas, leaving ample room, however, for the admission of the old superstitions of Paganism; a phenomenon of which history furnishes many examples, where it is attempted, by means of some arbitrary speculative system, to infuse artificial life into the dead form of an antiquated superstition. In his letter to a high priest, Julian declares himself an enemy to all innovation, especially in whatever pertains to the gods: "The traditional laws of the country ought invariably to be observed from the beginning; for these were manifestly given by the gods, otherwise they could not have been so excellent."[1] We may learn from a set of instructions, which he probably drew up for the use of his priests, how he would attempt to restore the whole worship of images, and defend himself against the objections of the Christians. "Out of the supreme unity emanated first the pure world of intelligence,[2] embracing the gods, who are exalted above all contact with sensible things, and who live only in pure spiritual intuition: the intermediate link between these and the partly spiritual, partly sensual race of mankind, is formed by the eternal living images of those invisible gods in the heavens, viz. the divine souls veiled under the resplendent heavenly orbs, which visibly represent the former, and by which their influence is diffused down to the earth. But since these great heavenly beings are still too far removed from the sensual race of man, and since, moreover, no sensual worship, such as is adapted to man's sensual nature, can be paid to these, images of the gods have been invented on earth, in order that, by paying homage to them through these, we might thereby obtain their favor; just as those who pay homage to the emperor's images, obtain thereby the favor of the emperors, not because the emperors stand in need of such homage, but because, by showing our willingness in whatever it is possible for us to do, we evince the true piety of our dispositions. But whoever, neglecting that which lies in his power, pretends to strive after what transcends his powers, only neglects the former, without really being in earnest about the latter. If we are to offer God no sensible worship, because he is the self-sufficient Being, it would also follow that we must not praise him by words, nor honor him by our actions. Accuse us not of holding the gods to be wood, stone, and brass. When we look at the images of the gods, we ought not to see in them stone and wood; but neither ought we to suppose that we see the gods themselves. We should not think of calling the *images* of the *emperors*, stone, wood, and brass, nor the emperors themselves, but we should call them images of the emperors. Now, whoever loves the emperor, is pleased at beholding his image —

[1] Ep. 63 ad Theodos. Φεύγω τὴν καινοτομίαν ἐν ἁπᾶσι μὲν, ὡς ἐπὸς εἰπειν, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τοῦς θεοῦς.

[2] The κοσμὸς νοῆτος.

whoever loves his child, is pleased at beholding the image of his child. So whoever loves the gods, looks with pleasure on their images, penetrated with awe towards those invisible beings that look down upon him."[1] But what good could that man's heart whose necessities impelled him to seek after the fountain of salvation, and to whom religion was something more than a mere play of idle speculations or an entertainment of rhetoric or poetry, derive from all these fine-spun explanations? How great the difference between *this religion*, which, flattering man's sensual nature, offers him the most beautiful forms, only that he may never come to the consciousness of what he is, and of what he needs — and the religion which deprives man of every sensual prop to which he would fain cling in order to evade this sacrifice and self-renunciation, so that he may rise through faith in the only Redeemer, who has come down to him in order to raise him up to himself, to heaven, to that life which is hid in God, to the worship of God in spirit and in truth! And of what advantage were Julian's explanations to the rude populace, who did not understand them? They, at least, saw *their gods*, in the images of wood, stone, and brass. The emperor, therefore, is right indeed, when, from his own point of view, he says that the Christians could not derive from the destruction of the idols and of the temples under the former reigns any evidence against them, since everything that is transient and temporal must share the fate of the temporal. "Let no one," says he, "refuse to believe in the gods, because he has seen or heard that some have committed sacrilege on the images of the gods and on the temples." But against the *popular superstition*, this evidence was after all by no means so feeble. And of this Julian himself seems to be aware — hence he is so indignant on the subject.[2] He proceeds next to deduce the whole sensual pagan worship out of those general ideas: "We are bound," he says, "to pay religious worship, not only to the images of the gods, but also to the temples, — to the sacred groves and the altars. It is right, moreover, to honor the priests, as ministers of the gods, the mediators between us and the gods, who help to procure for us those blessings which flow to us from the gods, since it is they who sacrifice and pray for all." Here indeed Julian needed only to transfer the ideas of the priesthood which he might have derived from his Christian education, back again to the pagan soil which was most congenial to them. Very consistently, he required that even in unworthy priests, the objective dignity of the priesthood should be honored: "So long as he sacrifices for us, and stands before the gods as our representative, we are bound to look upon him with reverence and awe, as an organ of the gods most worthy

[1] See opp. Julian. fol. 293, seq.

[2] He appeals to the fact, that at this time all the insults on the sanctuaries had met with due punishment. An argument which, we must allow, was often employed in like manner by the Christians; and which in no case proves anything, since God's judgments are unsearchable to men. In many cases, without doubt, the divine judgments, so far as they had their ground in the uniform law of moral order in the world, could be very justly pointed out; and Julian was mistaken only in his interpretation of them. The depraved men who, under the reign of Constantine, had enriched themselves at the expense of the temples, met with the punishment of their wickedness; and sometimes Julian himself did his own part to bring about these pretended punishments of the gods.

of all honor. If the priest were only spirit, not soul and body together, he might uniformly maintain the same tenor of life. But since this is not so, the life which he devotes to his sacred functions must be distinguished from the rest. During the whole of that time, he must live like a super-earthly being, be constantly in the temple, occupied with holy contemplations; he may not go into any private house, visit any public place, nor even see a public magistrate elsewhere than in the temple. In performing the functions of his office, he should also wear *the most costly apparel.*" The divine, therefore, was to be represented by earthly pomp — quite in accordance with the *pagan* way of thinking.

The species of intellectual and moral culture which Julian would give to his priests had been, until now, foreign from the mechanical ritual of Paganism. The priest was to live a life worthy of the gods, — he was never to hear or to use any unbecoming language, nor to read any improper poet. It behoved him especially to occupy himself wholly with philosophy, and particularly with that which begins from the gods, as the philosophy of Pythagoras, of Plato, and Aristotle, of Chrysippus and Zeno. The priest should restrict himself to those doctrines of philosophy which lead to piety; and these, we must allow, make up a very meagre list: "First, that the gods exist; next, that they take an interest in the affairs of this world; and next, that they bring no evil on men, that they are free from jealousy, not the enemies of mankind." The last, he says, ought to have been taught by the Grecian poets, and by the prophets whom the Galileans admire. Thus to Julian, who had very superficial notions respecting the nature of God's holiness, and of sin which is opposed to it, everything said in the Old Testament of God's vindictive justice seemed jealousy and enmity to mankind. "Of Epicurus, of Pyrrho, the priest should read nothing; indeed, it had been so ordered by the gods for the general good, that of the writings of these men, the greatest part had already perished." [1]

Julian was obliged to borrow much from the Christian church, in order to bring about, by means of his spiritualized Paganism, a reaction against Christianity; — a thing which could not last, however, but which must eventually turn to the advantage of Christianity. He wished to introduce the didactic element from the Christian church into his pagan forms of worship. Garlanded priests appeared upon the tribune, clothed in a purple mantle; it being the wish of Julian, that, in performing the functions of their office, they should wear sumptuous vestments, and thereby command respect.[2] Here, in pompous language, they gave

[1] In like manner as when Christian ecclesiastics were forbidden to read the writings of pagan authors or of the heretics.

[2] Gregory of Nazianzen pertinently remarks on the conduct of these Pagans in this particular: "I have often observed, that they study after what is dignified and imposing, what surpasses the ordinary experience; as if the common things of every day were easily despised, while the pompous and seemingly sublime inspired faith." Πολλαχοῦ τὸ σέμνον ἔγνων αὐτοῖς σπουδαζόμενον, καὶ τὸ ὑπεράνω τοῦ ἰδιώτου, ὡς τοῦ μὲν κοίνου καὶ πέζου τὸ εὐκαταφρονήτου ἐχόντος, τοῦ δὲ ὑπερόγκου καὶ δυσαφίκτου τὸ ἀξιοπίστου. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. steliteut. I. vel orat. III. opp. I. p. 103.

allegorical expositions of the pagan fables, expositions which the populace did not understand, or which at least could not affect their hearts.

Julian would not admit that there was anything of divine power in Christianity: he sought, therefore, to explain, and to account for, its spread by outward causes; and he endeavored to make these available for the promotion of his own new pagan hierarchy, without duly considering that these outward means were closely connected with the peculiar spirit of Christianity. In his letter to Arsacius,[1] supreme pontiff of Galatia, he says, what has especially contributed to the spread of Atheism is philanthropy towards strangers, care for the burial of the dead, and an affected dignity of life (things, evidently, which had sprung of their own accord out of the peculiar influence of Christianity on the minds of men;) Christian brotherly love, that tenderness of feeling which showed itself in honoring the memory of the dead, and the moral sobriety which was so opposed to pagan licentiousness.[2] "All these things the Pagans should make matters of earnest study. And let it not be thought enough if Arsacius himself leads a *worthy* life;[3] he must prevail upon the priests generally in Galatia to pursue the same course, or depose them from the priestly office, if they would not, *with their wives, children, and slaves, devote themselves* to the honor of the gods; if they would suffer their wives, servants, or sons, to unite themselves with the Galileans. Their priests were not to visit the theatre nor the shops; they were not to engage in any unsuitable occupation.[4] In every city, houses were to be established for the reception of strangers, (*ξενοδοχεία,*)[5] where not only Pagans, *but all others who needed assistance, might find entertainment.*[6] To meet the expense of these establishments, he caused to be distributed among the priests thirty thousand measures of grain; and whatever was left, after they had provided for their own support, was to be distributed among the strangers and paupers; since it was shameful, he said, that no Jew ever begged, and

[1] Ep. 49.

[2] So also in the fragment of the Instruction for a high priest, opp. 305. The Galileans, having observed that the poor were neglected by the priests, had taken care to pay special attention to these acts of philanthropy, and had thus enticed men to their ruin. In the same manner as men coax children with cakes, so they had commenced at once with the agapæ, with the liberal reception of strangers, and with the office of deacons, — *ἀρξάμενοι διὰ τῆς λεγομένης παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀγάπης καὶ ὑποδοχῆς καὶ διακονίας τραπεζῶν,* — alluding to the oldest institutions and arrangements of the church. From this point should begin the cure. In other words, then, Julian was in hopes *to bring over* many to Paganism by the *distribution* of *money;* and doubtless, where there were so many whose highest object was the satisfaction of their earthly wants, he may not have calculated wrong. Constantine had in fact pursued a similar course (see above.) To be sure, this method of conversion accords badly with Julian's declamation, — that the gods had respect only to the disposition of the heart. But there was a similar contradiction also between Constantine's proclamations and his conduct.

[3] That however no great stress was laid on the moral character of those who were thought to assist towards restoring the pagan worship, and that sometimes the moral principles of these persons were extremely lax, may be shown from a passage in Libanius. He applauds it as a proof of the chastity of his Aristophanes, that he had never been guilty of adultery, — *ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἀφειμέναις εἰς Ἀφροδίτης ἐξουσίαν τὰς τῆς φύσεως ἐκούφιζεν ἀνάγκας.* And yet he says: *Ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐδ' ἱερὰ τῶν κειμένων ἀνοικοδομεῖν ὑπὸ ταῖς τοῦδε φροντίσι, φαίην ἂν πλημμελές, ὁρῶ γὰρ οὐκ ὀλίγων τῶν νῦν ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τεταγμένων τόνδε σωφρονέστερον,* vol. I. p. 446.

[4] Imitation of the laws of the church respecting the clergy.

[5] Imitation of the Christian *ξενοδοχεία* and *πτωχοτροφεία.*

[6] It is easy to see Julian's design in this.

that the godless Galileans, besides their own poor, supported those of the Pagans; while the pagan poor obtained no assistance from their own people. He should also accustom the Pagans themselves to such acts of kindness, and the pagan villagers to offer their first-fruits to the gods.[1] The governors he should seldom see in his house; for the most part he should only write to them. Whenever they made their entrance into the city, no priest should go out to meet them; but if they came to the temple, the priest might go out to meet them as far as the court. In that case, no guard should accompany them; *for as soon as he crossed the threshold of the sanctuary, the magistrate became a private man;* the priest was supreme in the interior of the temple."

This last principle, Julian applied to his own person, and not without reason, at that time; since he could not fail to remark, that in the temples many paid more attention to the emperor than to the gods. Thus he was not pleased with the general salutation, "Long live the emperor!" which broke forth, when on a certain occasion he unexpectedly (as he supposed, although, perhaps, the assembled crowd had been long waiting only for him) appeared in the temple of Fortune at Constantinople; and he therefore issued the following rescript to the people of that city: "Whenever I appear unexpectedly in the theatre, you are permitted to salute me with acclamations. But when I come unexpectedly into the temple, preserve quiet, and transfer your praises to the gods, or rather the gods require no praise."[2]

The objective dignity of the priesthood, Julian sought zealously to maintain. For example, an officer, whose duties were in some way or another connected with the administration of the pagan cultus, had caused a pagan priest to be beaten, and on this ground was accused before the emperor by the high priest of his province. Julian severely reprimanded him for not respecting the priesthood, even in its unworthy representative, if such he were; and for having dared to expose to such violent treatment the priest, before whom he was bound to rise even from his chair of office. Having observed, probably, that many, to please him, represented themselves as cherishing different opinions from what they really entertained, he added: "Perhaps the bishops and presbyters of the Galileans sit with you, if not publicly out of regard to me, yet secretly in your house." The individual here addressed was punished by being excluded for three months from all business which stood connected with the functions of the pagan priesthood.[3]

[1] Imitation of the church collects and of the oblations among the Christians. To this imitation of the ecclesiastical regulations of the Christians in the founding of schools, in the institutions of charity, in the epistolis formatis for travellers, and in the system of penance, Gregory of Nazianzen very justly refers in orat. III. p. 102.

[2] Published by Muratori, anecdota Græca. Patav. 1709, p. 332. Εἰ μὲν εἰς τὸ θέατρον λάθων εἰσηλθον, εὐφημεῖτε, εἰ δὲ εἰς τὰ ἱέρα, τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγετε καὶ μετενέγκατε ὑμῶν τὰς εὐφημίας εἰς τοὺς θέους, μᾶλλον δὲ οἱ θεοῖ τῶν εὐφημίων οὐ χρηζοῦσιν. Muratori was of the opinion, that the οὐ, which the manuscript has here, originated in a misconception; but the negation is required by the δε, by the whole construction of the passage, and by the sense. It is moreover altogether in Julian's manner, to conclude with a dignified philosophical sentence of this sort, in whatever contradiction it might stand with his superstition.

[3] Julian. ep. 62. It is difficult to determine to whom this letter was addressed. From the condemning sentence, τῶν εἰς

As Constantine caused the churches which had been destroyed in the Dioclesian persecution, to be rebuilt, and restored to them the estates of which they had been deprived; so Julian undertook to pursue a similar course in regard to the temples which had been destroyed and plundered in the preceding reign. Many of the governors prosecuted this business with great zeal; some, led on by their own interest in the cause; others, because they knew that by so doing they would in the surest and easiest way gain favor with the emperor. The images of the gods, which had been rescued from the hands of the Christians, were conveyed back to the temples in the midst of festive processions.[1]

But, in rebuilding the temples, Julian did not proceed in the same upright and honorable manner as Constantine had done in restoring the churches. The latter, as we have remarked, had caused these to be rebuilt at his own expense; and he had indemnified those who had legally come into possession of the buildings belonging to the churches, or of the grounds upon which they stood. But Julian compelled the Christians who had taken any share in the destruction of the temples during the preceding reign, or who perhaps were only accused of this by popular rumor, to be at the expense of rebuilding them. To those who were required to give up property of this sort, he allowed no indemnification; thus giving occasion to many acts of oppression and violence, resorted to against individual Christians under the pretence of restoring the temples[2] — which oppressions sometimes fell on those who in the former reign had been distinguished for their gentleness and forbearance, and the moderate use of the power which was in their hands. The letters of Libanius, the rhetorician, to Antioch, in which he intercedes with the pagan governors and priests in behalf of those who are said to have suffered under such acts of injustice, furnish indubitable evidence of this; while they redound to the honor of the man, in spite of his many foibles, who, zealous Pagan as he was, so earnestly remonstrated against the injustice done to the Christians.[3]

ἱερέα μηδὲν ἐνοχλεῖν, it might be conjectured, that the matter related to a priest; yet the whole contents of the letter contradict this supposition. The language, moreover, does not lead us to suppose, that a mere excommunication from the pagan ceremonies (sacris) is here meant. Hence I have represented the matter as it stands in the text.

[1] See respecting the festivities at the restoration of an image of Artemis, which had been torn down by the Christians, Liban. ep. 622, etc. The emperor himself was informed by the governor of the province, how great expense had been made at this festival, and how many sacrifices had been offered, ep. 624. Libanius writes to a certain Seleucus, who probably held civil office: "At present we behold altars, temples, sacred groves, and images of the gods, which have been decorated by you, but which will also decorate you and your posterity. Since you have so great allies, count the arrows of the godless race to be pointless (he should give himself no concern about the enmity of the Christians.) Make them to weep, who have long time made merry with the better cause. You are bound to give thanks to the gods, that they have caused you to become a father; which thanks you must render to them, by helping to erect their prostrate temples," ep. 680.

[2] See Sozomen, Hist. V. 5. The edict was made known at Alexandria on the X. Mechir, (4th of February,) 362: — "Reddi idolis et neocoris et publicæ rationi, quæ preteritis temporibus illis sublata." See the anonymous biography of Athanasius, p. 69.

[3] Thus to Hesychius, a priest at Antioch (ep. 636:) "That I am no less desirous than you priests, that the temples should be preserved in their beauty, you are aware of more than others. Yet I should be unwilling to have that done by the destruction of houses, which might be done if they remained standing; since I prefer that what already exists should remain, and what has been prostrated should be restored, — and not that we should beautify the cities in one

It was a topic on which Julian often declaimed, that the gods regard only the disposition of their worshippers. He declared, that no godless person ought to take part in the holy sacrifices, until he had purified his soul by prayer to the gods, and his body by the prescribed lustrations.[1] Yet he was quite satisfied, if he could but induce goodly numbers to sacrifice, without troubling himself any further about their disposition; and to promote this object, he spared neither money nor places of honor: though we must admit, that the Christian emperors had done the same thing, and in a manner still less becoming, with regard to

respect, while we deform them in another. True it is easy to bring a complaint against the house of Theodulus; but it deserves to be spared, since it is beautiful and spacious, and makes our city more beautiful than other cities. In the next place for this reason,—because Theodulus did not plunder the temple with arrogance and impiety, but purchased it from the sellers, paying the price for it, which was a privilege allowed to all those who could buy." In like manner he intercedes with Bacchius, one of those who had it in charge to restore the temple-worship, as he was about to re-erect a demolished temple of the Graces, and intended to collect the necessary money in ready cash from a certain Christian, named Basiliscus, who had perhaps had a hand in the destruction of the temple, or had in some way come into possession of its treasures, thus throwing the latter into great embarrassment. Libanius petitions for this individual, that he might be required to pay only half the sum at once, and permitted to discharge the remainder of the demand at a future time. He entreats Bacchius to have some regard to Æmylianus, the father or relative of this Christian, who, although the power was in his hands, yet under the former reign had conducted towards the Pagans with so much moderation: Οὐ γὰρ ἦν τῶν ὑβριζόντων, καὶ ταῦτα ἐνὸν, εἰπερ ἐβούλετο. This noble feeling deserved to be rewarded. "Show your care for the sanctuaries, by increasing the multitude of sacrifices, by seeing that the sacred rites are accurately performed, and by restoring the prostrate temples; for you must be devout to the gods, must *show yourself compliant to the will of the emperor,* (τῷ βασιλεῖ χαρίζεσθαι,) and embellish your native city." Ep. 669. Thus he intercedes with a certain Belæus, who, from a rhetorician, had become a judge at Antioch, in behalf of a certain Orion, who in the preceding reign had distinguished himself in a public office by his moderation, but who now was charged with having robbed the temples of their treasures, and, although he was quite poor, was called upon to pay large sums of money, and, as he found himself unable to do this, was to be compelled to it by bodily punishment. In his first letter to Belæus, ep. 673, he says: "Orion proved himself, under the preceding reign, to be a mild and generous man; he did not imitate those who made a bad use of their power, but, on the contrary, blamed them. But I have also heard from the citizens of Bostra, that he neither made war against our worship, nor persecuted priests; and that he saved many from misery by the mild administration of his office. This man I have now seen cast down and full of distress. And shedding a flood of tears before he could give utterance to his words, he said, 'I have but just escaped from the hands of those to whom I have shown kindness. Though I have done evil to no man, when I had the power to do so, I have notwithstanding been almost torn in pieces.' And he added to this, the flight of his brother, the breaking up and scattering of his whole family, and the plundering of his furniture; all which, as I know, is not according to the will of the emperor. But the emperor says, that if he has any of the property which belongs to the temples, let him be called upon to give it up; but if he has not, then let him neither be insulted nor abused. Yet it is manifest, *that those men are coveting the goods of others, while they pretend to be desirous of helping the gods.*" In the second letter, he writes: "Although he differs from us in his religious persuasion, it redounds to his own injury, that he has deceived himself; but he ought not, in justice, to be persecuted by his acquaintance. I could wish that those very persons who now oppress him, would only recollect the cases in which he has so often assisted them, and would prefer rather to show him their gratitude, than seek to bury their benefactor alive. Having long since persecuted and plundered his relations, they seized at last upon the person of this man, as if they would thereby fulfil the wishes of the gods, while in truth they are very far from honoring the gods by any such conduct as this. But it can be no matter of surprise, that the multitude allow themselves to be hurried along without reflection, and follow their impulses, instead of that which is right. He says, he made no robbery. But granting that he did, how is it that you now hope, when the whole has been consumed, to find mines of gold in his skin?" Ep. 731.

[1] Ep. 52 ad Bostrenos.

Christianity.[1] In this way, as a matter of course, many would be gained over, who, in the preceding reign, had been induced, by similar motives, to profess Christianity; men, who, as a father of this period (Asterius of Amasea, in Pontus,) remarks, changed their religion as easily as their dress.[2] In a discourse preached in the reign of one of the next succeeding emperors, the same contemporaneous writer describes this class of people as follows: "How many abandoned the church, and ran to the altars? How many allowed themselves to be enticed to apostasy by the bait of honorable offices? Branded with disgrace, and despised, they wander about the cities, and are pointed at by the finger of scorn, as those who also have betrayed Christ for a few pieces of silver."[3] As Julian attached a superstitious value to sacrifices, he labored, for nine months, to prevail upon the soldiers of the army which he was preparing against the Persians, to offer to the gods. When the arts of persuasion had been tried in vain, he employed gold and silver, for the purpose of buying over the soldiers to his views.[4]

His hatred of Christianity, and of the Christians, might of itself, it is true, have rendered Julian more favorably disposed towards Judaism and the Jews; but, as in everything he was glad to take the contrary course from that which had been pursued in the previous reign, it was agreeable, both to his inclination and his principles of government, to patronize the Jews, who had been oppressed under Constantius. It must be added, however, that he was more favorable to Judaism than to Christianity, for the same reasons that had influenced the Pagans before him. He saw in that religion, at least, a national ritual, addressed to the senses, from which he conceived it possible to prove an affinity between Judaism and Paganism. Said he to the Christians: "I am a true worshipper of the God of Abraham, who is a great and mighty God; but you have no concern with him. For I worship him as Abraham worshipped him; but you do not follow Abraham. You erect no altars to God, nor do you worship him, as Abraham did, with sacrifices."[5] In his opinion, the worship of the God of Abraham might blend harmoniously with the worship of the Grecian gods; he blamed only the exclusive, intolerant character of Judaism. So very imperfectly did he understand the nature of pure Theism, which, wherever it exists, will have absolute supremacy, and must strive to destroy, as an ungodly element, everything which claims authority along with it, that the jealous God of the Old Testament, who, to all

[1] Gregor. Nazianz. orat. funeb. in Cæsar. orat. 10, fol. 167. Τοὺς μὲν χρήμασι, τοὺς δὲ ἀξιώμασι, τοὺς δὲ ὑποσχέσεσι, τοὺς δὲ παντοίαις τιμαῖς ὑφελκομένους.

[2] Adv. Avaritiam, ed. Rulben. Antverp. 1615, p. 43. Ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον ταχέως τὴν θρησκείαν μετεμφιεσάντο.

[3] See l. c. Modestus, an officer of state, who had for a long time supported the party of the emperor Constantine in opposition to Julian, probably in order to acquire the favor of the latter, embraced Paganism, and obtained for this not only pardon, but the præfecture of Constantinople, although Libanius writes to him: Πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, οὓς πάλαι θαυμάζων νῦν ὡμολογήσας. Ep. 714.

[4] This Libanius narrates in praise of the emperor, Epitaph. in Julian. vol. I. p. 578. He says on this occasion: "By means of a small gain, the soldier obtained a greater one; by gold, the friendship of the gods, on whom depends the fortune of war." Such was the religion of these persons, who, in contrast with the Christians, assumed the air of enlightened men!

[5] Julian. ap. Cyrill. c. Julian. l. X. p. 354.

the ungodly, is a consuming fire, appeared to him as an envious God, subject to human passions. He supposed there could be only two possible cases; either that the God whom the Jews worshipped was the universal Architect of the world, the δημιουργός, to whom the other particular divinities were subordinated; in which case it was only his prophets who had been unworthy of him; men, who, because their minds had not been purified by scientific culture, had transferred to him their own false notions, and represented him as so selfish and intolerant; or else, that they had in reality had only a limited national God, whom they regarded, however, as that Supreme Being; just as the Gnostics maintained, that the Jews had confounded their Demiurge with the Supreme Deity.[1] He seems to have inclined, for the most part, to the former view, — that the God of the Old Testament was, in truth, the great Architect and Ruler of the whole visible world, whom the Pagans also worship under other names.[2]

Since, then, he entertained a high respect for the Jewish worship, as an ancient national institution, he conceived the wish to restore the Temple at Jerusalem, as a splendid memorial of his reign; in doing which he perhaps hoped, also, that he should be able to defeat the prophecy of Jesus, although this had already been fully accomplished. He expended vast sums upon this object; but the work which had been undertaken with so much labor, did not succeed. Volumes of fire, bursting forth from the subterranean vaults which had been opened, destroyed the unfinished labors, and frightened the workmen.[3] Although this may have proceeded from natural causes, yet might it be a warning rebuke to the emperor, that no human will could rebuild what had once been destroyed by a divine judgment.[4] But he did not, on this account, as yet relinquish his plan.[5] Having relieved the Jews from the heavy impositions by which they hitherto had been oppressed, he invited them now, with minds free from anxiety, to implore their great God, who could turn everything to the advantage of his government, that, after having brought the Persian war to a successful termination,

[1] L. c. l. IV. f. 48, 155, where he calls the doctrine of a θεὸς ζηλώτης a βλασφημία.

[2] Ep. 63, p. 454, fragment. epist. ad sacerdot. p. 295. Τὸν μὲν θέον εἶναι μεγάν, οὐ μὴν σπουδαίων προφήτων οὐδὲ ἐξηγήτων τυχεῖν, αἰτοῦν δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἑαυτὴν ψύχην οὐ παρέσχον ἀποκαθᾶραι τοῖς ἐγκυκλίοις μαθήμασιν. f. 306, Cyrill. c. Julian. l. IX.

[3] The historian Ammianus Marcellinus, who was not a Christian, gives the simplest and most impartial account of this event, l. XXIII. c. 1: Metuendi globi flammorum prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes, fecere locum deustis aliquoties operantibus inaccessum: hocque modo elemento destinatius repellente cessavit inceptum. The exaggerating legend added a great deal more about fire falling from heaven, fiery shapes of the cross on the clothes of the workmen, &c.

[4] It is noticeable how lightly he himself touches on the subject. Fragm. epist. p. 295: Τί περὶ τοῦ νεὼ φησούσι, τοῦ πὰρ' αὐτοῖς τριτὸν ἀνατραπέντος, ἐγειρομένου δὲ οὐδὲ νῦν. Pagi places the command for the rebuilding of the temple in the year 363, in which fell the celebration of the Decennalia in honor of Julian's accession to the Cæsarean dignity; and the position which Ammianus Marcellinus gives to this event might seem to favor this view. But as the above-cited letter of Julian must have been written after the frustration of the plan for rebuilding of the temple, and that letter cannot be placed in so late a period, this circumstance would stand opposed to such a determination of the chronological date.

[5] That is, in case the letter mentioned in what follows in the text was written after the frustrated attempt to rebuild the temple, which is indeed possible, although the contrary is generally assumed to be the fact.

he might be enabled, with them, to dwell and worship the Almighty in the holy city Jerusalem, rebuilt by his labors.[1]

As it respects Julian's conduct towards the Christians, he was not inclined by nature to cruel and violent measures. Besides, he was fond of assuming an air of philosophical toleration, and, in this particular respect, wished to present a direct contrast to the character of Constantius, who had occasioned so much evil by his fanatical and despotic spirit of persecution. Moreover, the Christian party was already so powerful, that violent measures might easily prove dangerous to the public peace, which he sought to preserve. And Julian was wise enough to learn, from the oft-repeated trials, that persecution would but tend to increase the spread of Christianity. There were, moreover, examples, under his own reign, of individual Christians, who, after having been exposed to ill-treatment, on account of their faith, from a fanatical pagan populace or cruel governors, and exhibited constancy under all their sufferings, became objects of universal reverence among the Christian population, and obtained the greatest influence; as was remarkably shown in the case of Marcus, bishop of Arethusa in Syria. When, therefore, Libanius, in the letter which we have just cited, would restrain a governor from indulging in the cruel persecution of a Christian who had been accused of robbing the temples, he warned him thus: "If he is to die, then, in his chains, look well before you, and consider what will be the result. Take heed lest you bring upon us many others like Marcus. This Marcus was hung up, scourged, plucked in the beard, and bore all with constancy. He is now honored as a god, and, wherever he appears, everybody is eager to take him by the hand. As the emperor is aware of this, *he has not allowed the man to be executed*, much as he is grieved at the destruction of the temple. Let the preservation of Marcus be a law for us." [2]

It may, indeed, be questioned, whether rational grounds, wise purposes, and humane feelings, would have availed anything against a fanaticism made up of such heterogeneous elements, — a fanaticism which is ever the most easily inclined to persecution, — whether they could have checked his natural disposition, which impelled him to violence wherever he met with opposition. Yet deep within his soul there existed another principle, which prompted him to bring back the erring to their own good, to the way of truth, though at first it might be against their will. This he undesignedly illustrates in a rescript, issued by him in a state of mind very much excited by opposition, where he

[1] See ep. 25, f. 397.

[2] See Liban. ep. 731. The same Libanius says, in his Epitaph. in Julian. p. 562, that the Christians, in the beginning of Julian's reign, expected to suffer similar persecutions as they did under the earlier pagan emperors. But Julian, he observes, censured those measures, by which, after all, they could not attain their end. "For men may indeed bind the bodily sick in order to heal them, but a false opinion respecting the gods cannot be expelled by the knife and cautery. Though the hand may offer incense, the soul is still dissatisfied with it, and there is only a seeming change. Some afterwards obtained pardon (those who, yielding to force, had offered, and were afterwards restored to the fellowship of the church.) But those who died for their convictions, were honored as gods." Yet it is very evident, that these truths were rather worn for a show, than consistently carried out.

says: "It were right, that these persons, like madmen, should be cured in spite of themselves. Yet to all who are suffering under this sort of disease, indulgence must be shown; for I am of the opinion, that we ought to instruct, and not punish, the unreasonable."[1] How easily might it happen, under some particular outward excitement, that the principle to which the voice of reason and the feelings of humanity were still opposed, should finally become the ruling one!

At first, however, Julian was best pleased, when, by covert attacks, in which indeed he often forgot what honesty and justice required even in an opponent, and what became the dignity of an emperor, he could injure the church, and undermine its interests, by means which betrayed no hostile design. To this class of measures belongs that edict, well conceived for this purpose, by which, at the very beginning of his reign, *he recalled all the bishops and clergy who had been banished in the reign of Constantius, and granted equal freedom to all parties of the Christian church.* He might have found sufficient inducement for enacting such a law, in the relation he stood in to the Christian church; for it was impossible for him to take the same interest in the controversies of the Christians which Constantius had done. Although some among the Christian sects may have come nearer to his own views, in the character of their doctrinal opinions, than others, — as indeed he himself allowed,[2] — yet all the Christian parties were exposed to his hatred, on account of their opposition to Paganism.[3] He was desirous also, at the same time, to place the mildness of his own government, in this respect, in direct contrast with the severity of Constantius. "I believed," he says in a letter to the inhabitants of Bostra,[4] "the leading men of the Galileans would feel themselves more indebted to me than to my predecessors in the government; for it happened under the latter, that many of them were banished, persecuted, deprived of their property; and, indeed, whole masses of heretics, as they are called, were swept off at a stroke; so that, in Samosata, Cyzicus, Paphlagonia, Bithynia, Galatia, and among many other races of people, entire villages were made utterly desolate. But under my government the fact has been the very reverse; for the banished have been permitted to return, and their property is restored back by our laws to those whose estates had been confiscated." But Julian certainly entertained the hope, — a fact respecting which both Christian and pagan historians are generally agreed, — that the different parties of the Christians, who persecuted each other with so much fury, would in this way each destroy the other. In this hope he was doomed to be disappointed; and from the very nature of the case it could not be otherwise. Party pas-

[1] Ep. 42.

[2] Thus, for instance, he praises Photinus, because his representation of Christ's person was more rational than the prevailing doctrine of the church. See the fragment of Julian's letter to Photinus, in Facund. Hermian. defensio trium capitulor. l. IV. p. 379. Sirmond. opp. T. II. f. 376, ed. Venet. 1728. The special honor which he showed to the Arian Ætius was owing, not so much to his doctrinal opinions, as to his earlier personal connection with the emperor. See ep. 31, Julian.

[3] Thus, in another passage, to be found in Cyrill. c. Julian. VII. f. 262, he places Photinus in one and the same class with the other Christian dogmatists, and says he did not concern himself with their doctrinal disputes, *ἀφίημι δῆτα τὴν μάχην ὑμῖν.*

[4] Ep. 52.

sion among the Christians would, undoubtedly, never have risen to so high a pitch, had it not been for the interference of the state. As this disturbing and circumscribing influence of a foreign power now fell away of itself, and the church was left to follow out naturally its own development from within itself, the right relations were everywhere more easily restored. No patronage of the Christian church by the civil power could have been so advantageous to it, under the then circumstances, as this indifference of the state towards all that transpired within its pale.

The edict by which Julian recalled the bishops from their banishment, may, without doubt, have been very indistinctly expressed;[1] so that it could be understood to refer merely to their return into their country, or also to their return to their posts. As Julian allowed to all religious parties the free exercise of their religion, it was understood, as a matter of course, that the bishops of all Christian parties could enter freely into the administration of their offices. But the emperor might have expressed himself indistinctly on purpose; or he might sometime afterwards have given the law this construction of indistinctness, in order to provide himself with liberty to act against those bishops whose influence seemed to him too powerful a counterpoise to his own designs. To this class belonged the zealous and energetic bishop Athanasius of Alexandria.

After this bishop had again administered his office for eight months,[2] earnestly laboring for the interests of the Christian church, there appeared an edict of the emperor, addressed to the Alexandrians, in which it was charged upon him as a grievous crime, that, after having been banished by many rescripts of many emperors,[3] that is, of Constantine and Constantius, he had not waited for a single imperial edict authorizing him to return back again to his church;[4] for the emperor had given permission to those who had been banished by Constantius to return home, not to their churches, but only to their country. Yet Athanasius, it was alleged, hurried on by his usual pride, had arrogated to himself what among them was called the episcopal throne. But this was not a little displeasing to that God-fearing people, the Alexandrians. By this God-fearing people, Julian meant, of course, only the Pagans, to whom, indeed, it could be no otherwise than in the highest degree unpleasant, that Athanasius should be bishop. As soon as this letter[5] arrived at Alexandria, Athanasius was commanded to leave the city, under the threat of far severer punishments. Sorely

[1] The edict arrived at Alexandria on the XIV. Machir, (the 8th of February, according to Ideler's tables,) of the year 362, and was published on the day following: "Episcopos omnes factionibus antehac circumventos et exiliatos reverti ad suas civitates et provincias." Thus it is stated in the life of Athanasius, which was composed by an anonymous contemporary writer, and of which a fragment in an ancient Latin translation has been published by Maffei, Osservazioni letterarie. Verona, 1738. Tom. III. pag. 69.

[2] See the above-cited Life.

[3] Where Julian might take advantage of the fact, that various charges were brought against Athanasius, which did not relate barely to doctrine, passion at that time mixing everything up together.

[4] Yet Gerontius, the prefect of Egypt, had thought himself authorized to recall Athanasius to his bishopric. (See l. c.)

[5] See ep. 26.

vexed must have been Julian, when he found that the diseased portion, as he expressed it, of the Alexandrians, (the Christians,) showed no disposition to follow the healthy portion, (the Pagans;) but the diseased part, who in fact constituted by far the majority, ventured to call themselves the city, and, in the name of the whole city of Alexandria, to send him a petition, in which the community besought him, that their bishop might be spared to them. In a declamatory letter,[1] he not only rejected their request, but immediately banished Athanasius from the whole province of Egypt. His remarks to the Alexandrians, on this occasion, show how little he knew what the heart of man, thirsting after righteousness, requires, and what religion is designed to bestow on man, — how accustomed he was to confound worldly and spiritual things. "Tell me," says he to them, "what good have they ever done to your city, who have now introduced among you this new proclamation? Your founder was Alexander, the Macedonian, who, indeed, ought not to be brought into comparison with any of these; nay, not even with the Hebrews, who were far superior to these." He then goes on to rebuke them severely for refusing to worship the god visible to all, the Sun, whose powerful and benign influence they must all experience; and for thinking themselves bound to receive Jesus, whom neither they nor their fathers had seen, as the God-Logos. He descends to rude and vulgar language, equally unbecoming a philosopher and an emperor, in speaking of the great man whom he ridiculed,[2] without a sense to appreciate the spirit which actuated him; and yet the anger he shows towards him, proves how much he dreaded his influence. In this letter, he assigns, it is true, political reasons as his motives for banishing Athanasius: "It was a dangerous thing for so cunning and restless a man to be at the head of the people." Yet, in his letter to the prefect of Egypt, he betrays the true cause of his displeasure against the man, expressing his vexation, that, through the influence of Athanasius, all the gods should be despised; and declaring that nothing would give him greater joy than to hear that Athanasius, the godless wretch who had dared *under his reign to baptize noble Grecian women*, was banished from every district of Egypt.[3]

Julian descended to many an unworthy trick, for the purpose of bringing men, without a resort to forcible measures, to join against their will in the ceremonies of the pagan religion. He caused his statues, which were set up in the public places, to be surrounded with emblems taken from the pagan religion. A Jupiter over his head reached down to him the purple mantle and the crown; while Mercury and Mars looked on with an approving smile. Whoever now paid obeisance, as was customary at that time, to the emperor's image, must at the same time testify respect to the gods; and whoever declined to do so, was liable to be accused as a violator of the imperial authority.[4] It might here be said that Julian, according to his own religious princi-

[1] Ep. 51.

[2] He styles him a man who deserved not to be called a man, a miserable little man — ἀνθρωπίσκος εὐτελής — alluding probably to his bodily stature.

[3] Ep. 6.

[4] Sozom. V. 17.

ples, was compelled to regard all the affairs of state as standing in this connection with religion; and was without any design, in this case, of injuring the conscience of the Christians. But, judging from the spirit which he evinces on other occasions, we may well believe him capable of such banter; and, at all events, if he understood the rights of conscience, he ought to have been more indulgent to the religious convictions of a majority of his subjects. In like manner, when he distributed from the imperial throne a donative among the soldiers, he had placed beside him a censer, with a dish of incense. He who would receive the donative from his hands, must first cast some of the incense into the censer. This was to signify, that he offered incense to the gods, whose images, perhaps, were standing somewhere near by. If Julian looked upon it as so important a thing, when, by the distribution of money, he could prevail upon his soldiers to sacrifice, it would doubtless gratify him, even when he could do no more than bring them to the mechanical act of scattering incense; and he might hope, by accustoming them to such a mechanism, and by the golden bait, to carry them a step farther. When they had once become aware that by such conduct they had violated the obligations of the Christian faith, and that the love of earthly gain had overpowered the voice of conscience, one step in sin would easily lead them to another. But many were really not aware of what they had done; and when they afterwards learned that they had been betrayed into an act of idolatrous worship, they became despondent, publicly declared before the emperor that they were Christians, and begged him to take back the money, if it was to be the price of their denial of the faith. A particular case of this sort is related, in which a number of soldiers were first made aware of what they had done at a festival which followed the distribution of the donative, when, drinking to their comrades, as was customary on such occasions, in the name of Christ, they were reminded, that they had just denied him whose name they now invoked.[1]

Among the artifices by which Julian hoped to undermine the Christian church without resorting to sanguinary persecutions, was also his forbidding the Christians to set up schools of rhetoric and grammar, and to explain the ancient authors. He supposed that Christianity could not dispense with these foreign supports; that, unless it had appropriated to its own purposes the scientific culture of the Greeks, it would not have spread so far; and that the scriptures, which the Christians called divine, did not afford a sufficient fountain in itself of human cultivation, but that this must be derived by them from the creations of the gods whom they denied, from the literature of the Greeks. In his work against Christianity, says Julian to the Christians: "Why waste your energies on the literature of the Heathens, if the reading of your own scriptures contents you? Certainly you ought to be more solicitous to keep men from the former, than from eating the meat of the

[1] See Sozom. V. 17. Gregor. Naz. orat. III. steliteut. I. fol. 85. According to the latter's description, it took place when, at the conclusion of the meal, the cup of cold water was handed round, and each, before he drank, made over it the sign of the cross in the name of Christ.

sacrifices; for, according to Paul himself, the latter can harm no one; but, by those sciences, every noble spirit that nature has produced among you, has been led to renounce your godless doctrine." A very bold assertion, directly in the face of plain facts; such, for example, as that the most zealous students of the ancient writers were precisely those who had become the most distinguished teachers of the church. But, if Julian really believed his own assertion, he must have vastly preferred that the Christians should teach the ancient classics, than than that they should explain the Bible to their youth. "Let them," said he, "try the experiment of instructing a boy from the first in nothing but the Bible, and see if he would turn out anything better than a slave." [1]

The truth is, however, that it was not the design of these scriptures to serve as a means of *human cultivation*, but rather to impart the element of a divine life, without which no human cultivation can truly thrive, — an element whereby the human education becomes ennobled to a divine one. And what the spirit of these scriptures, wherever received in its purity, can accomplish, independent of any means of human culture, is taught by the history of the effects of Christianity among the laity at all times; effects of which even Julian might have found examples, if he had only inquired into what took place in the retirement of private life. Christianity, indeed, as Julian understood it, — a Christianity which consisted merely in a certain mechanical routine of outward actions, or in a system of formal and lifeless notions, — was incapable of producing such effects.

Ancient art and literature appeared to Julian, as we have already remarked, closely connected with the worship of the gods; but it was unjust, and a manifest tyranny over conscience, to force these, his own subjective opinions, on all his subjects. It was a policy which unprejudiced Pagans themselves — as, for example, Ammianus Marcellinus [2] — openly condemned. We see to what result this system of religion, at once sophistic and fanatical, could lead. "How scandalous," he declares in his law relating to this matter, "that they should expressly teach that which they hold to be most detestable; that they should entice away by their flatteries those to whom they would inculcate their own bad opinions! All teachers, in whatever department they teach, should be honest men, and *cherish in their soul no opinions at variance with those which are publicly recognized.*[3] But they, beyond all others, should be such who, as expounders of the ancient authors, exert an influence upon the education of the youth, whether they be rhetoricians, or grammarians, or, above all, sophists; [4] for they will be teachers, not of words only, but also of morals." They might either avoid teaching

[1] C. Christian. l. VII. p. 229.

[2] L. XXV. c. 4.

[3] Καὶ μὴ μαχομένα τοῖς δημοσίᾳ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψύχῃ φέρειν δοξάσματα, — a principle which, avowed with some consistency on the ground assumed by Julian, who was for establishing a pagan state-religion, was often very inconsistently expressed by Christian magistrates, on the ground of Christianity, which should never be a state-religion.

[4] The sophists, in the stricter sense of the word, who were to diffuse an influence into the *whole* literary and intellectual culture, were then distinguished from the *rhetoricians* in the more restricted sense of the word.

what they themselves considered not good; or else, by their own act, first convince their pupils that none of the authors whom they explained, erred and blasphemed in religion, as they had hitherto been accustomed to say. But in attempting to gain their subsistence in so dishonorable a manner, by means of the writings of those authors, they must confess themselves the most covetous of men, and ready to commit any meanness for a few drachms.

Julian would have had good cause for this accusation, if Christians had consented to become pagan priests, and, under this outward appearance, made sport of the pagan religion. But the case was different, when they gave instruction in such matters as, in their own opinion, stood in no connection whatever with religion, and at the same time openly avowed their Christianity; so that it was at the pleasure of heathen parents, if they feared the influence of these teachers upon their children, to keep them away from such schools. We see here a most unjustifiable instance of arguing consequences, which all others must be obliged to adopt, because they seemed just as regarded from the emperor's own religious point of view; but in this we must allow that Julian was by no means alone. He goes on to say: "If they believe those men to be in error on the most important subjects, then let them go into the churches of the Galileans, and expound Matthew and Luke." At the same time, however, he permitted the Christian youth to attend the schools of pagan teachers,[1] — a permission of which he would of course be gratified to have them avail themselves, as he might hope they would be gained over by pagan teachers to embrace their religion.[2]

Two celebrated men of that age are known to us, who relinquished their stations as rhetorical teachers for the sake of their faith; Proæresius, a distinguished rhetorician at Athens,[3] and Fabius Marius Victorinus at Rome. The latter had shortly before embraced Christianity in his old age. He had been a diligent student of the Greek philosophy, and had translated several of the works of Plato into Latin. He was probably attached to the Neo-Platonic Hellenism, and was esteemed one of the most important pillars of the old religion. But in his old age, he became conscious of a craving after some more certain and stable ground of faith. He went to the study of the Bible, and examined it carefully. He was convinced of the truth of the divine doctrine; and in confidence informed the presbyter, Simplicianus of Milan, that he was at heart a Christian. The latter replied to him, that he would not believe it until he saw him within a Christian church. "What! then," rejoined Victorinus, "do walls make Christians?" The truth was, however, that his heart still clung too strongly to the world, — he was not willing to sacrifice everything to the Lord; and it was this which prevented him from making a public profession. He was

[1] Without troubling ourselves about manifestly exaggerated and inaccurate accounts, we confine ourselves simply to the words of Julian, and to the narrative of the impartial Ammianus.

[2] I suppose that in the passage above referred to, ep. 42, the reading should be: οὐδὲ φόβῳ καὶ . . . Otherwise the second οὐδὲ required here would be wanting, and the appropriate reference would be wanting to the following antithesis. Besides in Julian, τὰ πατρία is always used to designate the national pagan sacra.

[3] See Eunap. vit. Proæres. T. I. pag. 92.

afraid of those zealous Pagans, the noble Romans who were his disciples, and with whom he stood in the highest consideration. But as the word entered more deeply into his heart, his own conscience forced him to a public profession; and he demanded that it should be made in the most public manner, when, to spare his feelings, the presbyters of the church proposed to omit some part of the usual ceremony. After this, it cost him no struggle to lay aside his rhetorical office.[1]

The two learned Christians from Syria, Apollinaris, father and son, as a compensation to the Christian youth for that which they had been deprived of, were in the habit of writing historical and doctrinal portions of scripture in all the forms of Greek verse. This, however, would prove but a sorry substitute for that which the study of classical antiquity was designed to furnish, in order to that natural development of the human mind which Christianity presupposes. As the church historian, Socrates, very justly remarks in stating this fact: "Divine Providence was mightier than the pains-taking of these two men, and than the will of the emperor."[2]

Julian hated especially the bishops, who were so active in propagating the faith; and these would most easily have become the objects of persecution, if his fanaticism had but once proved too strong for his feelings of humanity and principles of civil polity. Like the pagan emperors before him, he saw in those who presided over the instruction and government of the Christian communities, the chief supports of Atheism (ἀθέοτης.) He imagined that by a crafty policy he could easily gain over the misguided people, if he was not counteracted by the bishops. And, for the reasons just mentioned, hated above all others by him were those bishops who had been zealous students of the Greek literature, and who applied this literature itself to the service of Christianity and the subversion of Paganism; for instance, those men with whom, when a youth, he had studied at Athens, the two friends, Basilius, bishop of Cesarea, and Gregory of Nazianzen; and those who, under his reign, dared to employ Grecian science in combating Paganism and in defending Christianity, such as Apollinaris of Laodicea, and Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia.[3]

[1] Augustin. Confession. l. VIII. c. 2, et seqq.

[2] The remarks of Socrates on this occasion, respecting the necessity of the study of ancient literature in order to the progressive culture of the Christian church, are very correct. L. III. c. 16.

[3] Well worthy of notice are the fierce declamations of Julian against this latter, in his letter to Photinus, of which Facundus of Hermiane has preserved to us the fragment already mentioned, in a bad Latin translation, Defens. trium capitulor. l. IV. 379. He reproaches him with having attended the school at Athens; there studied philosophy, music, and rhetoric; and thereby armed his tongue to fight against the gods. Hence he was punished by the gods with consumption; for his sunken features, full of wrinkles, and his emaciated body, were not, as those whom he deceived would have it appear, the effects of his rigidly ascetic life, (of his πολιτεία φιλοσοφική,) but the just punishment of the gods. Quod non est philosophicæ conversationis judicio, sicut videri vult a se deceptis; sed justitiæ pro certo deorumque pœnæ, qua percutitur competenti ratione usque ad novissimum vitæ suæ finem asperam et amaram vitam vivens et faciem pallore confectam. Assuredly we can more easily pardon such judgments in Pagans, than, in Christian teachers and writers of this period, the altogether similar way, in which, unmindful of the book of Job, and of the words of our Saviour, John 9: 3, they interpret attacks of disease and other calamities which befell heretics.

In a very unworthy manner did he conduct himself towards Titus, bishop of Bostra, in Arabia. When he had made him responsible for the preservation of the public peace and order in that city, where, on account of the excited state of feeling between Pagans and Christians, the slightest cause might lead to scenes of violence, the bishop, in a memorial, drawn up in the name of the whole body of the clergy, and intended for their defence, declared to him: "Although the Christians, on account of their numbers, might bid defiance to the Pagans, yet they were restrained from disorders by the admonitions of the clergy." Upon this, Julian despatched a letter to the inhabitants of Bostra, in which he exhorted both parties, Christians and Pagans, to maintain quiet and use forbearance towards each other; and then proceeds to describe the clergy (whose conduct, indeed, in many countries, had, under former reigns, well deserved this reproach) as being the authors of all the disturbances. "It is," says he, "because they look back with longing to their former authority, because they are not permitted to hold tribunals, to dictate wills,[1] to seize upon the possessions of others, and appropriate the whole to their own uses, that they throw everything into confusion." He next quotes to the Christian communities, the above-cited declaration from the bishop's letter, wrested out of its proper connection, for the purpose of representing him as their accuser, and of holding him up to their detestation. They ought, he said, to rise of their own accord against such an accusing bishop, and drive him from the city; and the masses should be united together. This latter hint, certainly, did not agree well with his general exhortation to quiet; but it is easy to see that Julian hoped, if he could get them into a quarrel with their bishop, to make them unite more easily with the Pagans.[2]

Sometimes the bishops forgot the duties which, according to the Christian doctrine, they owed to the supreme magistrate, even though a Pagan, and gave the emperor just cause for persecuting them; yet, in such cases, he did not do everything which in strict justice he might have done. In general, he was more apt to be excited where anything was attempted in his reign against the gods and their worship, than where the honor due to his person was attacked. Gregory, bishop of Nazianzus, the old father of the celebrated Gregory, had allowed public prayers to be offered in the church against the emperor, as a godless man. The occasion of this, without much doubt, was, that the governor of the province had sent soldiers to tear down the church; but opposed by the firmness of the old man, who failed, indeed, to unite to this quality the gentleness becoming the Christian and his own spiritual office, they did not venture to make the attempt.[3] The bishop Maris, of Chalcedon, an old man almost blind, who had to be led about by the hand, seeing the emperor offering a sacrifice in the temple of Fortune at Constantinople, went in, and, hurried on by his over-passionate zeal, publicly called him a renegade and an infidel. Julian

[1] See below, in the section concerning the constitution of the church.

[2] Julian, ep. 52. It should be remarked, however, that Julian wrote this letter to Antioch in an excited state of mind.

[3] Gregor. Nazianz. orat. XIX. f. 308.

forbore, it is true, from punishing such a violation of the duty of a subject, as he might justly have done: but he forgot, too, his own dignity, by indulging in vulgar sarcasms after his usual way; and, bantering the old man on his blindness, said: "Will not thy Galilean God, then, heal thee too?"[1]

It could not fail to be the case, however, that, even without any instigation from Julian, in those cities where there still existed a considerable pagan party, and this party had not, till now, given loose to its pent-up fury, and where they had been exasperated by the violent proceedings of the bishops under the previous government, sanguinary tumults would sometimes arise. Thus it happened at Alexandria, soon after Julian's accession to the throne. The bishop Georgius, a worldly man, of a violent and headstrong temper, who had been thrust by an armed force upon the community devoted to the bishop Athanasius, had administered his office after the same manner with its commencement; and by his persecuting spirit towards all who thought differently from himself, by acting as a spy and an informer to the emperor Constantius, by misusing his influence at court for the gratification of his own passions, had made himself hateful to all parties except his own.[2] He had drawn upon himself the anger of the Pagans, by destroying splendid temples, by exposing the sanctuary of the Mithras worship to universal derision, and finally, because he had been heard to say to his attendants, when passing by a temple at Tychæ: "How much longer shall this tomb stand?" Scarcely had Julian's accession to the throne become known at Alexandria, when the pagan populace seized upon Georgius; upon the knight Dracontius, director of the mint; and upon a third, who had also rendered himself hateful to the Pagans; and threw them into prison. After they had been kept in prison twenty-four days, the multitude poured together again. All three were murdered; the body of Georgius was carried through the city upon a camel, and, after being exposed to every indignity, was towards evening burnt.[3] Probably it was not Pagans alone who engaged in this riot: at all events, the affair could never have been carried to such an extreme, if Georgius had not made himself so universally hated. In consequence of these riotous proceedings, Julian addressed to the Alexandrians one of his declamatory rescripts, censuring their conduct in most emphatic language; but he punished no one. So, too, in other similar cases, the emperor went no farther than words, which, however, were of little use, especially as men were aware how much the emperor was pleased by any manifestation of zeal for the gods. He seems, in fact, in many cases, to have approved rather than rebuked the outbreaks of popular fury against those who had been guilty of destroying the temples, or who were unwilling to rebuild the temples which had been destroyed.

[1] This, Sozomen (V. 4) cites as a flying story; but many a bishop at that time might venture to do this, and Julian's conduct on the occasion is not unlike him; so that the story may perhaps be true.

[2] Ammianus Marcellinus says of him, (l. XXII. c. 11:) Professionis suæ oblitus, quæ nihil nisi justum suadet et lene, ad delatorum ausa feralia desciscebat.

[3] Sozom. V. 7. Ammian. Marcellin. XXII. 11, and the most accurate account in the above-cited anonymous life of Athanasius, p. 68.

Marcus, a bishop of Arethusa, on Mount Lebanon, had in the preceding reign drawn upon himself the hatred of the pagan inhabitants, by causing the destruction of a magnificent temple, and by resorting to forcible measures to make converts. According to the law which Julian everywhere published,[1] he was, under these circumstances, bound to make good the value of the temple in money, or else to cause it to be rebuilt. Being in no condition to do the former, and thinking he could not conscientiously do the latter; fearing, at the same time, for his life, amidst a ferocious populace, he betook himself to flight. As others, however, were involved in danger on his account, he returned back, and voluntarily offered himself to his enemies. The fanatical multitude now fell upon him; he was dragged through the streets, treated with every sort of abuse, and at last given up to be made sport of by ungoverned school-boys. When the old man had almost done breathing, they besmeared him with honey and other liquids, laid him in a basket, in which he was swung up in the air, and left to be preyed upon by bees and wasps. Marcus shamed his cruel enemies by the cool indifference which he exhibited under all his sufferings; an indifference, however, which seemed more that of the cynic than of the Christian. The governor, himself a pagan, is said to have represented to Julian what scandal it must occasion, if they allowed themselves to be outdone by the constancy of a weak old man — and the emperor finally commanded him to be set free; for it was not his wish to give the Christians any martyrs.[2]

As Julian was in the habit of appointing zealous pagans to the high sacerdotal and civil offices, and as the latter were aware that nothing would serve better to ingratiate them with the emperor than zeal for the spread of Paganism; as they were incited by the double stimulus of their own fanaticism, and of their wish to please the emperor; so it was a matter of course that individual instances of the oppression and persecution of Christians would easily happen, which might proceed even to cruelty.

Julian became still more embittered against the Christians, in the summer of 362, during his stay at Antioch. In this city, Christianity had for a long time been the prevailing religion; insomuch that Libanius remarked on the spot, that only a few old men remained who were still familiar with the ancient pagan festivals, when Julian came to the government.[3] In this great capital of Asia, which, while maintaining the form of Christianity, had become the seat of mingled oriental and Roman splendor, licentiousness and corruption of manners, Julian, the emperor, was resolved to affect the ancient simplicity, which was wholly abhorrent to the prevailing manners, and in such a place could only expose him to the jeers and sarcasms of the disaffected. His zeal in the pagan worship, in which he would fain set an example

[1] See above.

[2] See, above, the letter of Libanius, who confirms the asseverations of the Christian authors, Sozomen, Socrates, Theodoretus, and Gregory of Nazianzen.

[3] Liban. de vita sua, vol. I. p. 81. Libanius plays the rhetorician here perhaps only in this respect, that he represents what might be said of Antioch, as universally the case.

to his subjects, only made him ridiculous to the higher classes and hated by the people, in this ancient Christian city. Frugal in his expenses for the maintenance of his court, he spared no cost in offering sacrifices of all kinds. He often slaughtered a hecatomb of cattle; and it was his delight to bring the victims to the priests with his own hands, followed by a train of old women, who still clung to Paganism. Wherever an ancient temple was to be found on the mountains around Antioch, Julian clambered to the spot, however steep and rugged the path, for the purpose of presenting an offering.[1]

He was seen standing at the altar, under an open sky, though the rain poured down in torrents, and all the others present sought protection under the roof of the temple, and although his attendants besought him to pay some regard to his health.[2] The greater his zeal for the pagan worship, the more confidently he had hoped that when the heathen sanctuaries, which had so long been closed, were re-opened, he should witness the same enthusiasm among the people at Antioch, by which he was inspired himself; and the more painful it must have been to him to find his expectations so completely disappointed. True, multitudes of the people and of the higher classes assembled in the temples and groves which he visited; not, however, for the sake of the gods, but for the purpose of seeing the emperor, and being seen by him, as he himself must have known. He was saluted on these occasions with the loud shout of "Long live the emperor!" just as if he had made his appearance in the theatre. Hence he was led to address to the people of Antioch an admonitory discourse, complaining that they converted the temple into a theatre, to which they resorted rather for his own sake than on account of the gods.[3] Yet soon the voice of praise, with which he had been received out of respect for his person, was exchanged for that of mockery and disdain; for an injudicious regulation, the object of which was to force a reduction of the price of provisions to a degree disproportionate to the produce of the year, and the result of which was directly the reverse of what had been intended, made him hated both among the higher classes and the populace, and his attempts to injure Christian sanctuaries alienated the popular feeling; and he was obliged to hear men express their longing for the return of the Kappa and the Chi, that is, of the reign of Constantius and Christianity.[4]

One incident which made him extremely unpopular with the zealous Christians, was this: In the grove of Daphne, about five miles from Antioch, but still reckoned as belonging to the suburbs of the city, stood a famous temple of Apollo; and the fountain which flowed near by was said to possess virtues which communicated the gift of divination.[5]

[1] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XXII. c. 12, ff. Augebantur cærimoniarum ritus immodice, cum impensarum amplitudine antehac inusitata et gravi. The same writer relates, that, owing to the vast multitude of sacrificial banquets, rioting and drunkenness were spread among the soldiers. Οὐδὲν οὕτω χαλεπὸν, οὐδὲ δύσβατον, ὃ μὴ λεῖον ἐδόκει νεῶν ἔχον ἢ προτερόν γε ἐσχηκός. Liban. Monodia in Julian. vol. I. p. 513.

[2] Liban. presbeut. Julian. vol. I. p. 476.

[3] Julian in Misopogon. p. 344. Liban. de vita sua, p. 82.

[4] Misopogon. 357.

[5] To which legend perhaps in this and in similar cases, the exhilarating and intoxi-

Hence an oracle of Apollo had sprung up on this spot. But, ever since the times of the emperor Hadrian, this fountain had been neglected and had gone to decay. With a view to suppress the old pagan cultus, as well as to check the dissipation which the amenity of this spot, famous as the seat of vicious pleasures, invited, Gallus, when governor of the province, had caused to be buried here the bones of the martyr Babylas, and had erected a church for the use of those who wished to perform their devotions at the tomb of the martyr. Julian caused the long-closed temple of Apollo to be re-opened, and surrounded it with a new and magnificent peristyle. Setting great value upon soothsaying of all kinds, he wished to restore also the ancient oracle, and directed the fountain to be cleared out. The priests now declared that the oracle could not go into operation. The god would give no response, on account of the vicinity of the dead; besides, according to the pagan notions, no dead body could be suffered to remain in contact with the holy place. Julian construed this, as referring particularly to the neighbouring bones of Babylas; for the Christian worship among the tombs, as he called it, was his special abomination, and above all, in the present case, so near to the shrine of his own Apollo. He caused the bones to be exhumated. Multitudes of Christians, young and old, men and women, now assembled to bear away the bones of the martyr, in solemn procession, to a place about forty stadia (five miles) distant; and, through the whole of the way, they chanted choral psalms, which alluded to the vanity of idolatry. The whole throng joined with one voice in the words: "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, and boast themselves in idols!"[1] Julian, who saw himself and his gods insulted at the same time, did not manifest on this occasion the philosophical calmness which he was so fond of exhibiting in other cases of a like nature. He commanded the prefect Salustius to search out the guiltiest of those engaged in the tumult, and punish them severely. Salust, although a Pagan, yet from motives of humanity and prudence, reluctantly executed the command. He caused a number of individuals to be seized, but subjected only one, Theodorus, a young man, to torture. The latter continued firm and unmoved, and in the midst of his sufferings sung the psalms which the day before he had sung with the others in the procession.[2] Salust, now reminded the emperor how much the cause of the Christians gained by such constancy in their suffering companions. This led to the release of the young man and of all the rest.[3]

When Julian, for the first time after so long a period, restored the ancient feast of Apollo Daphnicus, he hoped that it would be celebrated by the inhabitants of Antioch with great display. But as he says in a sarcastic defence of himself against the reproaches of the

cating influence of the exhalations of some mineral spring had given occasion.

[1] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XXII. c. 12, 13. Sozom. v. 19.

[2] The presbyter Rufinus, who knew him when an old man at Antioch, relates that he told him, that during all his sufferings he imagined he saw a young man standing by him, who wiped away his sweat, and poured over him cold water. Rufin. vers. Euseb. X. 36.

[3] Sozom. V. 20.

people of Antioch:[1] "Not an individual brought oil to kindle a lamp to the god; not one brought incense; not one, a libation or a sacrifice."[2] But one solitary priest appeared, bringing a goose for an offering. The emperor was greatly astonished and excited at this result; he severely reprimanded the noble inhabitants of Antioch, who knew no better how to appreciate the restoration of an ancient national festival; just as if his religion must necessarily be theirs. He complains of them in this writing, that they allowed their wives to carry away every thing from the house for the support of the Galileans, or to bestow it upon the poor; while they themselves were unwilling to expend the smallest trifle to sustain the worship of the gods.[3]

It happened afterwards, that a fire broke out in this temple; as it was said, through the carelessness of Asclepiades, a pagan philosopher, who had come on a visit to the pious, philosophical emperor. Asclepiades had left standing, with lighted tapers, before the statue of Apollo, a small silver image of the Dea cœlestis, (Venus Urania,) which he carried about with him to perform his devotions by, wherever he travelled. But Julian attributed it to the revengeful spirit of the Christians; and they were accused as the authors of the conflagration. He directed torture to be employed, for the purpose of finding out the guilty, and ordered the great church of Antioch to be closed, to show his displeasure against the whole body of Christians.[4] Although judicial investigation could elicit no evidence against the Christians, yet Julian did not give up his suspicions. He complained, that the senate of Antioch had not done all in their power to detect the guilty.[5] The people of Antioch feared the worst; — as we see from the discourses delivered or written in their defence by Libanius. Julian exhibited, on several occasions, his excited state of feeling against the Christians. He said himself, that, at a signal given by his own hand, the tombs of the martyrs in the neighboring towns, together with the churches erected over them, had been destroyed; and that the people had even gone farther against the enemies of the gods, than he himself designed.[6] Before leaving Antioch, he placed at the head of the judicial department in Syria, a man of a passionate and naturally cruel disposition, named Alexander. He is reported to have said, that Alexander was not worthy of the office; but that the covetous and slanderous Antiochians deserved no better judge.[7] It is evident from particular instances of his conduct, that the administration of justice by this Alexander corresponded entirely with the natural character of the man. He took great pains to prevail on Christians to deny their faith. Many, indeed, suffered themselves to be induced by promises, persuasions, and threats, to sacrifice; but the reproaches and tears of their wives, —

[1] The Misopogon, in allusion to the jokes on the long beard of the emperor.

[2] Misopogon. p. 363.

[3] Misopogon. p. 363. This passage deserves notice, inasmuch as we may see from it, that Julian was well aware of the indifference entertained by many of the higher class of the Antiochians towards the affairs of religion; and that he considered the females as the chief supporters of Christianity in the families of such persons. See, below, a like assertion of Libanius.

[4] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XXII. c. 13.

[5] See Misopogon. p. 361.

[6] Misopogon. p. 361.

[7] Ammian. Marcellin. l. XXIII. c. 2.

among whom, at Antioch, there seems to have been more true piety than among the men, — and the silence of night, suited to lead men to the recesses of their own hearts, roused their conscience, and they returned again to Christianity. This excited Alexander even to fury: he not only persecuted these individuals, but asserted that they could not have gone so far of themselves. He thought he could trace the frustration of all his efforts to propagate the worship of the gods, to the secret plots of a Christian. He was persuaded, by the enemies of a certain Eusebius, to believe that the whole mischief proceeded from him. This man was about to be thrown into prison and confined in chains; but he succeeded in effecting his escape, and took refuge with the pagan rhetorician Libanius, whose friendship he had gained by the moderation and mildness of his conduct towards the Pagans under the preceding reign. Libanius behaved in the same noble manner as he was ever accustomed to do in like cases. He boldly rebuked Alexander for his conduct, and assured him that he would not give up Eusebius.[1]

But, although Libanius did not wish to see men persecuted for the sake of religion, yet he was gratified, when any, even though it might be at first by mere external considerations, were brought back to the worship of the gods. This is evident, from the manner in which he endeavors to take advantage of the dread of Julian's anger, as a means of persuading the noble Antiochians, that they had better restore the worship of the gods, *which*, he said, *was the only effectual and certain means of appeasing the emperor.*[2] In this, doubtless, he was right;

[1] In his letter to Alexander, (ep. 1057,) he thus expresses himself: "It was my wish that you might be zealous indeed for the gods, and gain over many to their law; but that you should not be surprised, however, if many a one of those who have just offered, should consider what he has done as a very wicked thing, and praise again the refusing to offer. For, away from home, they follow you when you advise them what is best, and go to the altars. At home they are turned about, and withdrawn from the altars by the wife, by tears, and by the night. But as to Eusebius, who is accused of having undone again what was accomplished by your pains, he is manifestly calumniated, and far from that which has been laid to his charge; for he well understands the times, and acts uniformly with reflection rather than with foolhardiness: and, as he knows your wrath, he would not, were he ever so foolish, thus throw himself upon a sheaf of swords. But he is not one of those ordinary men who easily change with the changes of the times; but, as one who has busied himself with science, and cultivated his mind, he was, even in the time when he had the power, oppressive to no one, and arrogant to no one. One might say he foresaw the future, so moderate was he. It was this indeed which made the man dear to me and to Nicocles (see above; I suppose that, instead of ᾧ καὶ φιλὸν ἐποιήσας, we should read ὁ καὶ φιλὸν επoίησεν); for, while he honored *his own* religion, he yet did not annoy those who swore by the name of Jupiter." In like manner, Libanius warned this Alexander, in ep. 1375, to take care lest, by the way in which he proposed to help the insulted gods, he might rather do them injury. Probably letter 1346 also has a similar reference.

[2] In the discourse, περὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλεῶς ὀργῆς, which perhaps was only written and not delivered (vol. I. p. 502:) "Ye will appease the anger of the emperor," says he to the nobles of Antioch, "by no petitions, no clamor, no ambassadors, (even though you sent your most talented orators,) unless you desist from these tricks, and give up your city to Jupiter and the other gods, — about whom, long before the emperor, even from your childhood, Hesiod and Homer have taught you. But you seek after the honor of being cultivated, and call an acquaintance with those poets, cultivation. In respect to man's highest interests, however, you follow other teachers (see above;) and you fly from the temples, which are once more thrown open, when you ought to sigh that they were ever closed. In the next place, when the authority of a Plato and a Pythagoras is appealed to in your presence, *you hold out on the other hand that of your mothers and wives, of your butlers and cooks,*

for when the town of Pessinus in Galatia, celebrated in earlier times on account of the worship of Cybele, petitioned the emperor for assistance, on some occasion or other, he replied that, if they wished to enjoy his favor, they must first, by a general procession of penitence, propitiate the mother of the gods, from whose worship they had fallen.[1]

Wherever, in his march against the Persians, Julian passed through any of the Christian cities of Syria, he took this opportunity of exhorting the senators who welcomed him to restore the worship of the gods. Thus it was, for example, when, after two days' journey, he came to Beroa in Syria. But he complained, that the senators all applauded his speeches, though only a few followed his advice; indeed, none but those who seemed already to have cherished sound views in religion, but, until now, had been ashamed to express their convictions openly. His pleasure was the greater, when, on the third day's journey, he came to a place[2] where the odor of incense breathed upon him from all sides, and he everywhere beheld sacrifices publicly offered; although he could not avoid suspecting that these public exhibitions were intended more for himself than for the gods.[3]

As the feelings of Julian against the Christians and against Christianity were continually more and more exasperated by the opposition which he experienced, it may be readily conjectured that, if he had returned back successfully from his Persian campaign, he would have become a violent persecutor of the church. But in this war he perished, in the year 363; and at a single blow, the frail fabric erected by mere human will, was dissolved; although Julian, deceived by his apparent success in making proselytes, had boasted of having produced, in a short time, a wonderful change: for in a letter, in which, indeed, he complained that the cause of Hellenism, through the fault of its professors, did not yet progress according to his wishes, he had asserted that the friends of the gods ought to be satisfied; for who, a short time before, would have ventured to predict that so great and so important a change could be produced in so brief a period?[4]

Had the Christians searched after the real cause of this transient vic-

and the tenacity of your early convictions; thus allowing yourselves to be led by those whom you ought to lead." A great deal in this description of nominal Christians among the fashionable people of the higher ranks, who were held to Christianity by the force of custom and the *influence of their domestic associations*, is doubtless taken from the real life. He concludes thus: "Shall we not hasten to the temples, persuading some, and forcing the rest to follow us?"

[1] Julian. ep. 49.

[2] Βατναι.

[3] See Julian's letter to Libanius, describing his journey (ep. 27.) Sozomen (VI. 1) reports, that Julian, in a menacing letter, summoned Arsaces, king of Armenia, who was a Christian, to arm himself for the war against the Persians; that he announced to him, the God whom he worshipped would not be able to help him; that this letter contained blasphemies against Christ. Muratori has published this letter in the anecdot. Græc. Patav. (see above,) p. 334. All the boastful language, perhaps in imitation of the oriental taste, which Sozomen refers to, is found in it; nothing, however, which would seem expressly pointed against Christ. Yet, when Julian says to the king, "You seek to keep concealed with you an enemy of the public weal," Sozomen, perhaps with reason, may have supposed this referred to Christ. At all events, in the threat expressed against the city Nisibis, which should share that misfortune of king Arsaces the gods had long since predicted against him, we perceive the hatred he entertained against this city, which for many years had been zealously Christian.

[4] Ep. 49. Τίς γὰρ ἐν ὀλίγῳ τοσαύτην καὶ τηλικαύτην μεταβολὴν ὀλίγῳ πρότερον ἐτόλμᾳ;

tory of the heathen party, they might have derived from it many important lessons for the future. In the beginning of Julian's reign, the wise Gregory of Nazianzen, contemplating those evils within the church, without which even this transient ascendency of Paganism could hardly have been gained, had expressed the great truth, *that the Christian church had still more to fear from its enemies within than from those without.*[1] The same father exhorted the Christians, *after the death of Julian*, now to show, by their actions, that they had profited by the divine discipline; to show that God had not given them up as evil-doers into the hands of the Pagans, but that he had chastised them as his children; to be careful that they did not forget the storm in the time of calm, after the deliverance from Egypt. "It ought not to appear," he said, "as if the time of suffering was better for them than the time of rest; for so it would appear, if then they were humble and moderate, and pointed all their hopes to heaven; but now proud and haughty, ready to fall back again into the same sins which brought them into all their misfortunes." He then gave the Christians *the advice* to which he was conscious that he should find the most difficulty in making them listen. He advised them to take no advantage of the power which *they obtained through the change of the times*, in *retaliating upon the Pagans the injuries which they had received.* "Let us show," says he, "what a difference there is between what these men learn from their gods, and the lessons which Christ teaches us, — Christ, who, glorified through sufferings, obtained the victory by forbearing to use his power. Let us pay God our united thanks; let us, by long suffering, promote the spread of the gospel; for this, let us take advantage of the times. Let us by gentleness subdue our oppressors." [2]

The Pagans now saw all their brilliant hopes destroyed; and in their faith they found nothing to console them. Libanius says he supposed that the emperor, who had rebuilt the temples and altars; who had forgotten no god and no goddess, and sacrificed upon the altars whole herds of oxen and lambs; who had called forth troops of priests from their hiding places, would need no mighty armed force, but must conquer through the power of the gods.[3] Now he quarrelled with his gods, because they had permitted Constantius to reign forty years, but Julian only for so short a period, and then, with him, suffered his whole work to fall to the ground.[4]

Julian was immediately succeeded by Jovianus, an emperor who professed Christianity. He had learned from the preceding times the lesson, that religion could not be helped by outward force. Hence, although for his own part a zealous Christian, yet he left to all his subjects the liberty of exercising the religion which they preferred, — a principle which he expressed in one of the laws published on his accession to the

[1] Gregor. Nazianz. orat. I. p. 35.

[2] Gregor. Nazianz. λογ. στηλιτευτ. II. orat. IV. f. 130, 131.

[3] Monod in Julian. T. I. 508. He had actually prophesied that the gods themselves would smite the Persians. Ep. 649.

[4] L. C. p. 510. How strongly contrasted with this is the spirit of Augustin, when he says, "that no emperor should be a Christian in order to procure for himself the fortune of Constantine, — as each should be a Christian *for the sake of eternal life.* God took away Jovian sooner than he did Julian." De civitate Dei, l. V. c. 25.

throne. He permitted the temple-worship and the sacrifices to go on unmolested; and expressly prohibited nothing, except employing the pagan rites for the purposes of magic.[1]

Golden words were those which the moderate Pagan Themistius addressed to Jovian, on his entrance upon the consular office, with a view to confirm him in those principles recognizing man's universal rights, and the toleration in matters of religion connected therewith, which he had expressed immediately after coming to the throne. Having congratulated the emperor, that the first law of his reign related to religion, he says: "You alone seem to be aware, that the monarch cannot force everything from his subjects; that there are things which are superior to all constraint, threatenings, and laws; as, for instance,

[1] That Jovian enacted a law of this import can hardly be doubted, — judging from what Themistius said to him at the consular celebration. We must admit that the accounts of persecutions against the Pagans, and of measures for the suppression of Paganism, under the reign of this emperor, seem to conflict with this supposition; as, for example, when Libanius, in his epitaph, in Julian, p. 619, says, that after Julian's death, those who spoke openly against the gods, once more stood in authority, but the priests were unjustifiably called to an account. An indemnification was demanded for the money expended in sacrifices. The rich anticipated a judicial investigation, and paid the money down; the poor were thrown in chains. (We may conjecture that the writer is here speaking of those who were accused of having expended money which did not belong to them, — whether taken from the public coffer or from elsewhere, — for the offering of sacrifices.) The temples, he continues, were in part demolished, and in part stood unfinished, — objects of mockery and sport to the Christians. The philosophers (i. e. all those who, in the time of Julian, had appeared in the philosopher's cloak, and thereby acquired specially great influence with him) were abused. All who had received presents from the emperor Julian, were accused of theft, and subjected to every sort of torment, in order to extort from them the money they were supposed to have received. In respect to this report of Libanius, what he says as a passionate opponent of the emperor, and with rhetorical exaggeration, cannot be received as altogether credible. It may have been the case that many Pagans, believing that the end sanctioned the means, stimulated by zeal for their religion, or making this a mere pretence and out of sheer cupidity, had allowed themselves, under the preceding reign, in practices which might in some measure give just occasion for judicial investigations against the Heathens. But it also may have been the case, that indemnification was *unjustly* required for that which had been done in a perfectly legal manner, and in compliance with supreme imperial authority, — just as Julian had proceeded in respect to what had been done under his predecessor. And finally, it would be wrong to suppose that every thing which Christian governors, or those that used Christianity as a pretext, under an emperor who appeared zealous for Christianity thought themselves entitled to do, without being authorized by his laws, ought to be laid to his charge. Jovian himself showed respect to Maximus and Priscus, — the two philosophers who possessed the highest influence under the emperor Julian, and the former of whom had labored earnestly for the support of Paganism. See Eunap. vita Maximi, p. 58. But yet, without some occasion given by the emperor, it could not happen that pagan philosophers should be persecuted. This, in fact, is intimated by Themistius, although he absolves the emperor from the charge of having himself had any hand in it, — ad Valentem, de bello victis. ed. Harduin, f. 99, c. Socrates (l. III. c. 24) says that, under Jovian, all the temples were immediately closed; that the Pagans concealed themselves; that the philosophers laid aside their cloaks; that the public sacrifices ceased. All this, although not taken in so general a sense, may have been true, — as a natural consequence of the fears entertained by the Pagans, or of their lukewarmness entering of its own accord, when the atmosphere of the court ceased to be favorable to Paganism. Socrates himself seems to be aware that Jovian was not disposed to oppress any party. L. III. c. 25. etc. What Sozomen says, (l. VI. c. 3,) respecting a letter of the emperor addressed to all the governors, may be understood — supposing it to be correct — as only meaning that Jovian expressed a wish to have all his subjects come to the knowledge of the truth in Christianity, and distinguished the Christian church once more by peculiar privileges. Libanius himself (orat. pro templis, vol. II. p. 163) says that, after Julian's death down to the time of Valens, *μένει τινὰ το θύειν ἱερεῖα χρόνον.*

virtue generally, and, in particular, piety towards God. And you have very wisely considered, that in all these matters, unless there is hypocrisy, the unconstrained and absolutely free will of the soul must move first. For if it is not possible, emperor, by any *new edicts* to make a man well disposed towards you, if he is not so at heart; how much less is it possible, by the fear of human edicts, by transient constraint, and those weak images of terror which the times have often produced, and as often annihilated, to make men truly pious, and lovers of God? We play, in such cases often, the ridiculous part of serving, not God, but the purple; and change our religion more easily than the sea is moved by the storm. There used to be but one Theramenes; but now all are fickle-minded.[1] He who but yesterday was one of the ten (deputies of the Athenians to the Lacedemonians) is to-day one of the thirty (tyrants.) The man who yesterday stood by the altars, the sacrifices, and the images, stands to-day by the holy tables of the Christians. Yet this, O emperor! is not what you desire. While you would now and ever be sovereign as to everything else, you command that religion should be left to the free choice of each individual. And in this, you follow the example of the Deity, who has implanted the capacity for religion in the whole human nature, but has left the particular kind of worship to the will of each man. But whoever employs force here, takes away the freedom which God has bestowed on every man. For this reason, the laws of a Cheops and of a Cambyses hardly lasted as long as their authors' lives. But the law of God, and your law, remains for ever unchangeable, — the law, that every man's soul is free in reference to its own peculiar mode of worship. This law, no pillage of goods, no death on the cross or at the stake, has ever been able to extinguish. You may, indeed, force and kill the body; but, though the tongue may be forced to silence, the soul will rise, and carry along with it its own will, free from the constraint of authority."

The same principles, in regard to matters of religion, were followed by Valentinian, who succeeded Jovian in the year 364. As Valentinian, by his steadfast profession of Christianity, had incurred the displeasure of the emperor Julian;[2] as he hated Julian and his friends; as he was, in other respects, inclined to despotism; it is the more remarkable that he still recognized on this point the limits of human power, and perceived the folly and ruinous consequences of attempting to overstep them.[3] By laws which he issued at the very commencement of his reign, he allowed each of his subjects unlimited freedom of exercising the religion which he conceived to be true.[4] By another law of the year of 371, he expressly declares that neither the practice of

[1] Νῦν ἁπάντες κοθόρνοι.

[2] The thing itself admits of no doubt, since pagan and Christian historians here agree. The only question relates to the particulars, which are stated in many various ways.

[3] Ammianus Marcellinus, who frankly describes the despotic acts of this emperor, says of him, l. XXX. c. 9: — "Postremo hoc moderamine principatus inclaruit, quod inter religionum diversitates medius stetit, nec quemquam inquietavit, neque ut hoc coleretur imperavit aut illud, nec interdictis minacibus subjectorum cervicem ad id quod ipse coluit inclinabat, sed intemeratas reliquit has partes, ut reperit."

[4] Unicuique, quod animo imbibisset, colendi libera facultas. This law is cited in a law of the emperor belonging to the year 371. Cod. Theod. l. IX. Tit. 16, l. 9.

the haruspices, nor any other form of worship permitted by the fathers, should be forbidden.[1]

This toleration of Valentinian was rather helpful, than injurious, to the spread of Christianity. This appears from the fact, that under the reign of this emperor, Heathenism began first to be called by the name of the peasants' religion (Paganismus;[2]) just as, in the primitive times, Christianity was considered as the religion of shoemakers, weavers, and slaves. To be sure, we are not to conclude, because Heathenism was called distinctively the religion of the ignorant countrymen, that it had lost all its followers among the educated and higher classes.

In the East, the political suspicions of the emperor Valens brought many a persecution upon those Pagans who practised divination and sorcery,[3] although the same tolerant laws were recognized also in the East. The pagan rhetorician, Themistius, addressed the emperor Valens in terms very similar to those which he had used before Jovian, extolling these principles of toleration.[4] According to the testimony of Libanius, Valentinian and Valens were finally moved, by the political jealousies growing out of the frequent conspiracies, *to forbid entirely all bloody sacrifices;* though the other kinds of heathen worship continued to be permitted;[5] yet no such law of these emperors has come down to us.[6]

The emperor Gratian, who succeeded his father in the year 375, had not, like the latter, adopted it as an absolute principle, to alter nothing pertaining to the religious condition of his empire; but still he adhered to the rule of allowing a free exercise of the pagan rites. So accustomed were men to consider the pagan religion as the religion of the state, and the emperors as its chiefs, that even the Christian empe-

[1] He gave this direction, perhaps, expressly because a law which he had enacted against the nocturna sacrificia and pagan magic, might be misinterpreted; and even that first law, in consequence of the remonstrances of an influential pagan statesman, did not go into general execution, — if Zosimus (IV. 3) speaks the truth.

[2] The name religio Paganorum, applied to Heathenism, first occurs in a law of the emperor Valentinian, of the year 368. Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. II. l. 18. The above derivation of the name is, however, the only tenable one, and is moreover confirmed by the testimony of Paulus Orosius. This writer, in the preface to his short history of the world, says, — Qui ex locorum agrestium compitis et pagis Pagani vocantur. To this derivation the Christian poet Prudentius also alludes, when (contra Symmachum, l. I. v. 620) he calls the Heathens "pago implicitos."

[3] Liban. de vita sua, p. 113, vol. I. Chrysostom. hom. 38, in act. apost. fin.

[4] Orat. VI. de religionibus, which hitherto has been known to us only in a Latin translation. Socrates (IV. 32) and Sozomen (VI. 36) cite a discourse of similar import, which Themistius is said to have delivered before Valens, dissuading him from the persecution of *Christians entertaining other opinions* in the time of the Arian controversies. If we must suppose that this refers to the discourse above cited, it could not be correct; for that discourse manifestly treats of *toleration only to Paganism.* But both those authors, however, quote distinct expressions of Themistius, which are not to be found in that discourse. Although they quote many other thoughts which do actually occur in it, yet this is no proof that they have in view the same performance; since, in the discourse also which was delivered before Jovian, a good deal is expressed in precisely the same way as in the oration before Valens. It is therefore more probable that Themistius actually delivered a discourse of this sort, of which, however, nothing has come down to our times.

[5] Orat. pro templis, p. 163.

[6] It may be possible that Libanius did not in this case duly separate the affairs of the East and of the West; yet he was doubtless interested in that discourse to bring together everything which could be found, in the ordinances of the earlier emperors, *favorable* to Paganism.

rors still retained the title of supreme pontiffs, and, on ascending the throne, received along with the other badges of the imperial dignity, the robe of the supreme pontiff; but it had now become a mere formality.

Gratian is said to have been the first who declined to receive this robe, because he could not conscientiously do it as a Christian;[1] yet he still retained the title.[2] Moreover, in the place where the Roman senate met, there stood an altar dedicated to Victory, at which the pagan senators were accustomed to take their oaths, and upon which they scattered incense and made offerings. It had been first removed by Constantius, and afterwards replaced by Julian. Jovian and Valentinian had made no alteration, allowing things to remain as they were; but Gratian caused the altar to be removed again. He confiscated estates belonging to the temples. He deprived the priests and vestals of the support they had received from the public treasury, and of all their other privileges.[3] He took away also from the college of priests the right of receiving legacies of real estate. All this took place in the year 382. As a considerable number of Pagans were then still to be found in the Roman senate, it being generally the case that the first and oldest families in Rome adhered to the old Roman religion, along with all the other old Roman customs; they chose a man out of their number, distinguished for his personal merits, Quintus Aurelius Symmachus, as their delegate, to procure from the emperor, in the name of the senate, the abrogation of these laws. But the Christian party of the senate, who claimed to be the majority,[4] transmitted, through the Roman bishop Damasus, a memorial to the emperor, complaining of this proceeding on the part of the Heathens. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, who possessed great influence with Gratian, presented him with this petition; and Gratian was so indignant at the demands of the pagan party, as to refuse even to grant an audience to their delegate.[5] As Rome was visited, in the following year, 383, by a great famine, the zealous Pagans looked upon this as a punishment sent by the gods, on account of the wrong done to their religion.[6]

[1] Zosim. l. IV. c. 36.

[2] Thus, for example, Ausonius gives it to him, in his gratiarum actio pro consulatu, where he styles him "pontifex religione;" and he bears it in inscriptions. See Inscriptionum latinarum amplissima collectio, ed. Orelli, vol. I. p. 245.

[3] See the reports of Symmachus and Ambrosius to Valentinian II. directly to be quoted, and the edict of Honorius, of the year 415. Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. X. l. 20. Omnia loco, quæ sacris error veterum deputavit, secundum *D. Gratiani constituta* nostræ rei jubemus sociari.

[4] Having here nothing but the reports of parties, we cannot determine with certainty as to that which was formally right in the case.

[5] Evil-minded men, says Symmachus in his memorial to the successors of this emperor, had brought this about; because they well knew that, if the emperor heard the deputies, he would not refuse them justice. Denegata est *ab improbis* audientia, quia non erat justitia defutura.

[6] Symmachus writes, in his great extremity, to his brother, with a certain simple piety, which, with all his superstition, yet renders him far more worthy of respect, than those were who embraced Christianity to honor the emperor: Dii patrii! facite gratiam neglectorum sacrorum! Miseram famem pellite. Quamprimum revocet urbs nostra, quos invita dimisit (this is ambiguous, and may refer either to the strangers banished from Rome, with a view to spare the means of subsistence, or to the gods.) Quicquid humana ope majus est, Diis permitte curandum. Symmach. epistolæ, l. II. ep. 7.

When the young Valentinian II. succeeded his brother Gratian in the government, the pagan party of the senate attempted once more, (in the year 384,) through the instrumentality of Symmachus, at that time prefect of the city, to obtain from the emperor a compliance with their demands. He asks of the emperor, that he would distinguish his own private religion from the religio urbis. Taking his stand at the position of Paganism, he explains that men would do better, inasmuch as they are excluded from the knowledge of divine things,[1] to abide by, and to follow, the authority of antiquity; in doing which, their fathers, for so many centuries, had experienced so much prosperity. Rome is personified, and made to address the emperor in the following language: "I wish, as I am free, to live after my own manner. These rites of worship have subjected the whole world to my laws." The famine of the preceding year, he represented as following in consequence of the wrong done to the pagan rites. "What was there," he says, "like this, which our fathers were ever compelled to suffer, when the ministers of religion enjoyed the honor of a public maintenance?" As Symmachus was well aware that the Christians would have the emperor make it a matter of conscience to refuse all support to the idolatrous worship, he endeavored to quiet his scruples on this point, by the distinction, already alluded to, between the religio urbis and the religio imperatoris. If he did but suffer that to remain which the city (urbs) could demand by ancient right, he would, by so doing, concede no privilege to a religion which was not his own.[2]

But Ambrose, bishop of Milan, on hearing of this, sent to the young emperor Valentinian, a letter written with dignified earnestness. He represented, that this compliance on the part of the emperor would be a sanction of Paganism, and a tacit denial of his own Christian convictions. The emperor ought to allow liberty of conscience to every one of his subjects; but he must also maintain the freedom of his own conscience. "Wrong is done no man," he writes, "when the Almighty God is preferred before him. To him belong your convictions. You force no one yourself to worship God against his own will; let the same right be conceded also to yourself. But if some nominal Christians advise you to such a decision, do not suffer yourself to be deceived by mere names.[3] He who advises this, and he who decrees this, sacrifices. We, bishops, could not quietly tolerate this. You might come to the church, but you would find there no priest; or a priest who would forbid your approach. What would you have to reply to the priest, when he says, the church wants not your gifts, since you have honored with presents the temples of the Heathen? The altar of Christ disdains your offerings, since you have erected an altar to idols; for your word, your hand, your signature, are your works. The Lord wishes not for your service, since you have become the servant of idols;

[1] Cum ratio omnis in operto sit.

[2] Symmach. l. X. ep. 61.

[3] Ambrosius was afraid, as it seems, of several of the members of the emperor's privy council, of the consistory, to whom the political interest might be of greater account than the religious. There were several members of the emperor's privy council, also, who were Pagans. See Ambros. ep. 57, ad Eugen. § 3.

for he has said to you: 'Ye cannot serve two masters.'"[1] The strong representations of Ambrose had their effect, and Valentinian rejected the petition.

In the beginning of the reign of the emperor Theodosius, Chrysostom composed at Antioch his noble discourse on the martyr Babylas,[2] in which he described the divine power wherewith Christianity had penetrated into the life of humanity, and obtained the victory over Heathenism. He rightly maintained, that Christianity disdained in this warfare all weapons which were not her own; and he predicted the entire destruction of Paganism, which was crumbling in ruins through its own nothingness. He says: "*It is not permitted the Christians to destroy error by violence and constraint: they are allowed to labor for the salvation of men only by persuasion, by rational instruction and by acts of love.*[3]" He affirms that zeal for Paganism was still to be seen only in a few cities; and that in these the pagan worship was promoted by the respectable and wealthy citizens, who allowed the poor to join them in their heathen and sensual festivities, and thus chained them to their interests. Chrysostom was assuredly right in this, that men might rely upon the divine power of the gospel, which would carry the work, hitherto so successful, completely to its end: but so thought not the emperors.

Theodosius, the reigning emperor in the East, but whose influence extended also to the West, went in his proceedings against Paganism gradually farther in the way struck out by Gratian. At first he was content to abide by those measures against the sacrifices which had already been adopted by him in common with Gratian. Properly speaking, indeed, the employment of sacrifices for the purposes of magic and soothsaying, alone had been forbidden; and even by the new law which Theodosius gave, in the year 385, to the prætorian prefect Cynegius, a man extremely zealous for the extinction of Paganism, soothsaying from the sacrifices only was prohibited; yet these laws were, in their execution, certainly applied, for the most part, to all the forms of sacrificial worship; as appears from the plea of Libanius in defence of the temples — a discourse shortly after to be more particularly noticed, in which the writer, however, drew arguments from every quarter, to limit, as far as possible, the meaning of the existing laws against Paganism. Undoubtedly an exception was made in favor of those capital towns where Paganism still had a considerable party, and in favor of the more noble families; since Libanius could appeal to the fact, before the emperor Theodosius, that the sacrificial worship still existed at Rome and Alexandria.[4]

[1] For the rest, the question whether the emperor was obligated to grant this, and whether he could grant it with a good conscience, admits not of being answered from the purely religious point of view: the consideration of civil rights also enters in here, which Symmachus doubtless alluded to, but at the same time confounded too much with the religious question, and which, as the matter then stood, would certainly make the decision more favorable to Ambrosius than to Symmachus.

[2] Εἰς τὸν μάρτυρα Βαβύλαν λόγος δεύτερος.

[3] Οὐδὲ γὰρ θέμις χριστιανοῖς ἀνάγκη καὶ βίᾳ καταστρέφειν τὴν πλάνην, ἀλλὰ καὶ πειθοῖ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ προσηνείᾳ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐργάζεσθαι σωτηρίαν.

[4] Oratio pro templis, vol. II. p. 180 et seq.

Now, these laws might easily furnish a pretext for the destruction of the temples. The Pagans were found assembled in the temples, for the purpose of sacrificing, or they were accused of having sacrificed. Blind zealots, or those whose avarice prompted them to wish for the plunder of the temples, immediately seized upon this circumstance as a lawful reason for destroying them, pretending that they had caused the imperial laws to be broken. The wild troops of monks, to whom any object which, under the name of religion, excited their passions, was welcome, undertook, especially in the country, these campaigns for the destruction of temples in which sacrifices were alleged to have been performed.[1] As the synagogues of the Jews, whose worship was protected by the laws of the state,[2] were not secure against the fanatical fury of blind zealots and the avarice of men who used religion as a pretext; so the temples of the Pagans, against which they might act under some show of legal authority, must have been much more exposed to danger. In countries where the Pagans still constituted the majority, they returned the Christians like for like, and burnt the churches, as at Gaza and Askelon in Palestine, and at Berytus in Phœnicia.[3] The emperor himself declared at first against those who were for turning the laws which forbade sacrificial worship into a means for wholly suppressing the worship of the temples.[4]

When the temple-destroying fury was now increasing and spreading on all sides, the Pagans could not but fear that the emperor would gradually go further. Libanius addressed to him his remarkable plea in defence of the temples. The immediate occasion of it seems to have been the destruction of a very magnificent ancient temple, on the borders of the Roman empire, towards Persia.[5] In this discourse he

[1] What Libanius (p. 164) says of this destruction of the temples by the monks (the *μελαναιμονοῦντες*) may, compared with what we otherwise know respecting the way of a part of these people, doubtless be received as true. Godofredus, meanwhile, has assuredly misconceived this passage, (p. 170,) when, by *σωφρονισταῖς*, he understands here those whose duty it was to see to the execution of the imperial laws on this point. Libanius evidently means to say that the monks had, upon their own authority, thrust themselves in as *σωφρονισταῖς*.

[2] Secta nulla lege prohibita; see the law of the emperor Theodosius, in the year 393, cited below.

[3] See Ambros. ep. ad Theodos l. V. ep. 29.

[4] By a law of the year 382, he ordered that the temple at Edessa, in which statues were to be found, deserving of estimation more on account of their artistic than of their religious worth, (artis pretio quam divinitate metienda,) should always stand open. The emperor was no doubt inclined, in cases where such violences were committed, to exercise justice, when his purpose was not counteracted by the powerful influence of the bishops. Thus, upon the report of the Comes orientis, in the year 388, he was in fact on the point of punishing the monks, who had destroyed a temple of the Valentinians near the castle of Callinicum in Mesopotamia, and to oblige the bishop, who by his discourses had stirred up the people there to demolish a Jewish synagogue, to cause it to be rebuilt; but the declamations of Ambrose, bishop of Milan, led him to change his mind. See Ambros. ep. 40 ad Theodos. ep. 42 ad sororem. Paulin. vit. Ambros. Still, in the year 393, he issued to this part of Asia a law, that those, qui sub Christianæ religionis nomine illicita quæque præsumunt, et destruere synagogas atque exspoliare conantur, should be punished congrua severitate. Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. VIII. l. 9.

[5] Comparing the above-cited law of Theodosius with the description which Libanius gives of the magnificence of this temple, we might suppose that the temple at Edessa was here meant. The connection of events may be conceived to be as follows: — that Theodosius at some earlier period had been persuaded to approve of the shutting-up of the temple, but had been afterwards induced by the representations of the heathen party to pass the ordinances already cited in favor

calls to his aid all the political and all the religious reasons which he could possibly find, in defence of the temples. Together with much that is sophistical and declamatory, he made also many excellent remarks. Among these belongs what he says to refute the argument for the destruction of the temples, that Paganism, by being deprived of these, would lose the chief means of its support among the people; that the people would now visit the churches instead of the temples, and thus by degrees be led to embrace Christianity. "That is," says he, "they would not embrace another kind of worship, but hypocritically pretend to embrace it. They would join, it is true, in the assemblies with the rest, and do everything like the others; but when they assumed the posture of prayer, it would be either to invoke no one, or else the gods." In the next place, he very justly appeals to the Christian doctrine itself:[1] "Force is said not to be permitted, even according to the laws of your own religion; persuasion is said to be praised, but force condemned by them. Why, then, do you reek your fury against the temples, when this surely is not to persuade,[2] but to use force? Thus, then, it is plain you would transgress even the laws of your own religion."[3]

Many Pagans being still to be found in high civil offices, a fact which Libanius refers to in the above-mentioned discourse as showing the favorable disposition of the emperor towards this party;[4] the imperial commands, of course, were still very far from being carried into rigid execution; and this experience led again to new authoritative measures.

We are by no means to suppose, however, that in these matters Theodosius always acted after the same consistent plan. On the contrary, he might at one and the same time publish ordinances of an opposite character, according as he allowed himself to be influenced, either by those members of his privy council, (the consistorium imperatoris,) who, if they were not themselves Pagans, yet were governed far more by the political than the religious interest, or by the exhortations of the bishops. In the year 384 or 386,[5] he directed the prætorian

of the temple. But it having been reported to him by a governor in these districts, — (the Dux Osrhoënæ,) who (if Libanius does not misrepresent) was led on by his wife, as she was by the monks, — that the devotional exercises in the neighboring cloisters were disturbed by the fumes of the sacrifices diffused abroad from the temple, the emperor finally was prevailed upon to allow it to be destroyed. (The supposition, however, that this governor was the Præfectus Prætorio Cynegius, as well as the fixing of the chronological date by Godofredus on the assumption of this fact, is one which has not been duly proved.) Meanwhile this hypothesis is still not altogether certain; for there may have been many magnificent temples on the borders of Syria, as, for example, at Palmyra.

[1] Page 179.

[2] Instead of εἰ τὸ, the reading, as it seems to me, should be εἰ τοῦτο.

[3] What Libanius elsewhere says in this discourse, so recklessly to the advantage of Paganism and in praise of Julian, is of a sort which he could hardly have ventured to utter before the emperor. We may conjecture that this discourse was delivered or *written* only as a specimen of rhetorical art.

[4] L. c. p. 293.

[5] The question comes up, whether Cynegius received this commission when he was appointed Præfectus Prætorio, or not till afterwards. The accurate determination of the chronological date is attended in this case with many difficulties. See Tillemont, hist. des empereurs Romains, Theodose, N. 15. We must either suppose that the historians have given too wide an extension to the commission entrusted to Cynegius,

prefect Cynegius, well known on account of his zeal for the spread of Christianity, to shut up all the temples, and make an end of the entire temple worship in the East (that is, in the eastern part of the Roman empire and in Egypt.[1]) And yet a law of the emperor, published about the middle of June, 386, presupposes the toleration of the temple worship, and the recognisance of the college of priests.[2]

After the suppression of the public pagan worship, by the commission given to Cynegius, had been effected, so far as that was possible, certain events occurred, which led to the adoption of still more decisive measures. The first occasion was given to these events by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, a man of an altogether worldly spirit, who had little or no hearty interest in the cause of Christ, and whose manner of administering the episcopal office was least of all calculated to exert a good influence in building up the temple of the Lord in the hearts of men. This bishop, who was much more interested in erecting large and splendid edifices than in the spiritual welfare of his flock, had, in the year 389, obtained from the emperor the gift of a temple of Bacchus, and was busily employed in converting it into a Christian church. The symbols of the worship of Bacchus which were found here, and many of which were offensive to the sense of decency and good morals,[3] he ordered to be carried in a procession through the streets, and publicly exposed, so as to bring the Grecian mysteries into universal contempt. Since Alexandria was considered as a central point of the Hellenic religion, a principal seat of the mystical Neo-Platonic Heathenism, where its votaries poured together from all countries of the Roman empire,[4] and since the Alexandrian Pagans were from the most ancient times extremely fanatical; such a transaction could not fail to occasion the most violent excitement. The exasperated Pagans assembled in crowds; they made a furious onset upon the Christians, wounded and killed many of them, and then retired to the colossal and splendid temple of Serapis, situated upon a hill, which was ranked among the greatest pagan sanctuaries in these times.[5] Here, under the direction of a certain Olympius, a fanatical Pagan, who went clad in the philosopher's cloak, they formed a regular camp. This man exhorted them to sacrifice even their lives for the sanctuaries of their fathers. From their strong-hold, they sallied out upon the Christians: those who were dragged away by them as prisoners, they endeavored

and that it concerned only Egypt, where the influence of a certain Theophilus had occasioned it; or that Theodosius, in the same period of time, acted in absolute contradiction to himself, or that this commission was first given to Cynegius after the passage of the above-cited law of June, 386.

[1] See Zosimus, l. IV. c. 37, and Idatii Chronicon, at the death of Cynegius in 388.

[2] In consequenda achierosyna ille sit potior, qui patriæ plura præstiterit, nec tamen a *templorum cultu* observatione Christianitatis abscesserit. Cod. Theodos. l. 12. Tit. I. l. 112.

[3] As the Phallus, Lingam, the symbol of the productive power of life in nature.

[4] Eunap. vita Ædesii, p. 43. Ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρεια διὰ τὸ τοῦ Σαραπίδου ἱερὸν ἱερὰ τῆς ἦν οἰκουμένη, οἱ πανταχόθεν φοιτῶντες ἐς αὐτὴν πλήθος ἦσαν τῷ δήμῳ παρισουμένοι.

[5] In what high veneration this temple stood among the Heathens, we may gather from the words of Libanius, who already expressed his alarm for its fate, when, in speaking of the temple at Edessa, (orat. pro templ. 194,) he said: Ἤκουσα δὲ καὶ ἐριζόντων τινῶν ἐν ὁποτέρῳ τὸ θαῦμα μεῖζον, ἱερῷ τῷ μηκέτ' ὄντι τούτῳ ἢ ὃ μήποτε πάθοι ταὐτὸν, ἐν ᾧπερ ὁ Σάραπις.

to force by tortures to sacrifice; and such as remained steadfast were often put to death in the most cruel manner. After these acts of violence, having the worst to fear, desperation united with fanaticism drove them onward, and all the efforts of the civil and military authorities to restore order were to no purpose. The emperor Theodosius endeavored to profit by this favorable conjuncture, to effect the suppression of Paganism in Egypt. Upon the report of these disturbances, there appeared from Constantinople, probably in the year 391, a rescript ordering that all the Pagans who had shared in this tumult should be pardoned; and that, as an acknowledgment of the mercy which they had experienced, they might the more easily be converted to Christianity, all the heathen temples at Alexandria should, as the cause of this tumult, be destroyed.

Whilst the Heathen were rejoicing at the prospect of saving their lives, and had but just recovered from their alarm, it was a favorable juncture for carrying into execution a stroke of policy, which, under the state of feeling that existed at Alexandria, might at all times be attended with great hazard. Large bodies of men assembled around the temple of Serapis, upon which the imperial command was now about to be executed.[1] But there prevailed among the Heathen a reverential awe before the colossal statue of Serapis; and from ancient times the report had been propagated, that, when this statue was demolished, heaven and earth would fall in one common ruin. This report had some influence even upon the multitude of nominal Christians, who were still inclined to the ancient superstition. No one ventured to attack the image; until at last a believing soldier seized an axe, and, exerting all his strength, clove asunder the vast jaw-bone of the image, amidst the universal shouts of the pagan and Christian multitude. After the first stroke had confuted the superstition, the whole image was easily demolished and consumed to ashes. And, upon this, all the temples at Alexandria, and in the neighboring district, taking its name from the Canopian branch of the Nile, (ὁ Κάνωβος,) which particularly abounded in Egyptian sanctuaries, were in part levelled with the ground, and in part converted into churches and cloisters.[2]

The same course was followed in other countries; sometimes not without bloody conflicts, which might have been avoided if the bishops had been more governed by the spirit of love and of wisdom. Marcellus, bishop of Apamea in Syria, proceeded with great zeal to destroy all the temples in the city and in the country, because he supposed that by these ancient monuments of their worship, so venerated by the people, Paganism would always continue to preserve itself alive. With a train of followers little becoming the Christian bishop, an armed force of soldiers and gladiators, he advanced to destroy the largest temple. It was necessary, that the temple should be forcibly wrested out of the hands of its pagan defenders. While the conflict was going

[1] The case was somewhat similar here, as it was in later times with the thunder-oak of Boniface.

[2] Eunapii vit. Ædes. Rufin. hist. eccles. c. 23. Sozom. VII. 15. Socrates, V. 16. Marcellini Comitis Chronicon ad A. 389, ff. in Sirmond. opp. T. II.

on, some Pagans seized upon the old bishop, who had been left behind alone, and hurried him to the stake. The sons of the bishop were desirous of punishing his murderers; but the provincial synod dissuaded them from this, calling upon them rather to thank God that their father had been deemed worthy of martyrdom.[1] From the present year, 391, and onward, followed many laws, forbidding every description of pagan worship, under penalty of a pecuniary mulct, and still severer punishments. As the pagan magistrates themselves encouraged the violation of these imperial laws, pecuniary fines were established against these and against all their attendants in such cases. By a law of the year 392, the offering of sacrifice was in fact placed upon the same level with the crime of high treason, (crimen majestatis;) and accordingly the offerer incurred the penalty of death.[2]

Whilst these events were transpiring in the East, everything in the western part of the empire continued to remain as it was; and men belonging to ancient and noble families in Rome, still ventured to raise their voice in behalf of the religion of the eternal city. When Theodosius, after the defeat of the usurper Maximus, was, in the year 388, holding his residence in the West, the heathen party of the Roman senate proposed to him once more, perhaps through Symmachus, their former agent, that the revenues and privileges should be restored to the temples and colleges of priests of which they had been deprived. Theodosius seems to have been very near granting them their petition; but the pointed representations which Ambrosius, bishop of Milan, made against this measure, restrained him.[3] The heathen party succeeded, on the other hand, under more favorable circumstances, in obtaining from the emperor Eugenius, who, after the murder of the young Valentinian II., had, in the year 392, been raised to the imperial throne by the pagan commander Arbogast, everything which had been refused them by Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius. The voice of those influential Pagans, upon whom Eugenius felt himself to be dependent, availed more with him than what Ambrosius, with inconsiderate boldness, wrote to him in the name of religion.[4]

But when Theodosius marched into Rome, after the defeat of Eugenius, in the year 394, he made a speech before the assembled senate, in which he called upon the Pagans, who, under the short reign of Eugenius, had once more enjoyed the free exercise of their religion, to desist from their idolatry, and to embrace the religion in which alone they could find forgiveness of all their sins. In spite of all their representations, he took back from the Pagans what Eugenius had accorded to them.[5]

[1] See Sozom. VII. 15.

[2] Cod. Theodos. l. 16. Tit. X. l. 12. Quodsi quispiam immolare hostiam sacrificaturus audebit, ad exemplum majestatis reus accipiat sententiam competentem.

[3] Insinuationi meæ *tandem* adsensionem detulit, says Ambrosius, ep. 57 ad Eugen. § 4. What the pretended Prosper (de Promiss. et Prædict. Dei, pars III. Promiss. 38) says about the disgraceful banishment of Symmachus, may perhaps be a fable.

[4] See Ambros. ep. 57.

[5] Zosimus, a zealous Pagan, is in this case a suspicious witness. It cannot therefore be certainly determined how far what he reports respecting the constancy and boldness of the pagan senators is true or false.

The successors of the emperor Theodosius, Arcadius in the East, and Honorius in the West, from the year 395 and onwards, confirmed, it is true, soon after their accession to the throne, the laws of their father against the pagan worship, with new sanctions; but the weakness of their government, the various political disturbances, especially in the West, the corruption or pagan views of individual governors, would all favor the preservation of Paganism in many districts; and hence it was necessary that those laws should be continually re-enacted.

Whilst in Rome the public monuments of the pagan worship had already vanished, the images of the old Tyrian Hercules could still be worshipped and decorated by the Pagans in Carthage. As in earlier times the popular cry in that city had demanded the destruction of the Christian churches, so now resounded there the cry of the Christian populace, demanding that all idols should be destroyed at Carthage, as they had been at Rome. The people were excited by the folly of a heathen magistrate, who had ventured to order the beard of Hercules to be gilded.[1] The prudent bishops were obliged to take special measures for moderating the ferocious zeal, so as to prevent acts of violence.[2]

Pagan landlords endeavored to maintain the heathen worship on their estates, and, by means of sacrificial feasts and other means which their power over the peasants gave them in spite of the existing laws, to bind them to Heathenism. Pious and prudent bishops like Augustin were obliged, in such cases, to exhort the Christian country people to obey God rather than men;[3] but they were also obliged to restrain the blind zeal of the Christian populace, which was for destroying, in an illegal manner, the idols upon the estates of other men. On this point, Augustin speaks thus: "Many of the Heathen have those abominations upon their estates. Shall we go about to destroy them? No; let us make it our first business to extirpate the idols in their hearts. When they shall have become Christians, they will either invite us to so good a work, or they will anticipate us in it. At present, we must pray for them, not exasperate them."[4]

But it was not pagan landholders alone that promoted the worship to which they themselves were attached: even Christian proprietors were willing to ignore it, when their peasants brought offerings into the temples, because the imposts which were laid upon the temples were a source of profit to them.[5] No doubt they could effect more by instruc-

[1] Quomodo Roma, sic et Carthago! exclaimed the populace.

[2] Augustini Sermo 24, T. V. ed. Ben.

[3] On this point he says (p. 62): "The martyrs endured the laceration of their members, and Christians stood in fear of the wrong which might be done them in Christian times. Whoever at present does you wrong, does it in fear. He does not openly say, 'Come to the idols:' he does not openly say, 'Come to my altars, and feast yourself.' And if he said it, and you would not do it, he might, in presenting his complaint against you, testify this: — 'He would not come to my altars — to the temples which I venerate.' Let him even say this. He dares not say it. But in a fraudulent manner he calls you to answer for something else. He will rob you of your superfluity."

[4] L. c. § 17.

[5] Zeno, bishop of Verona, (l. I. Tract. XV. § 6,) complains on this subject. In præ-diis vestris fumantia undique fana tunc non nostis, quæ (si vera dicenda sunt) dissimulando subtiliter custoditis. Probatio longe non est. Jus templorum ne quis vobis eripiat, quotidie litigatis.

tion and zeal for the spiritual welfare of their tenants in the spirit of love, than by any forcible measures. The bishop Chrysostom, in a discourse delivered at Constantinople about the year 400, justly rebukes them, because they did not procure the erection of churches and the settlement of ministers who could preach the gospel upon their estates. "Is it not the duty," he says, "of the Christian proprietor first to see to it that all his tenants are Christians? Tell me, how is the countryman to become a Christian, when he sees the welfare of his soul is so much a matter of indifference to you? You can perform no miracles to convert men. Well, then, convert them by those means which lie in your power; by charity, by your care for men, by a gentle disposition, by a kind address, and by whatever other means you possess. Many erect baths and forums; but none, churches, or everything else sooner than these. Therefore," said this zealous preacher, whose heart glowed so warmly for the welfare of men, "I exhort you, I beseech you, I require it of you as a favor to be shown me, *or rather I lay it down as the law, that no man allow his estate to be without a church.*" [1]

It being now represented to the government, that the idolatrous temples and images on the country estates contributed much to the promotion of Paganism among the peasantry, the emperor Honorius passed a law, in the year 399, directing *that all temples in the country should be destroyed without tumult, so that all occasion of superstition might everywhere be removed.*[2] This law was expressly confined to the *temples in the country*, which could not reasonably be considered as monuments of art contributing to the ornament of the country; [3] for the latter were protected by new laws against the fury of destruction.[4] Yet, on the *one* hand, it is certain that in those cities in which only a comparatively small number of Pagans were still to be found, and where this small number were kept together by the temples which were still remaining, the zeal of the Christian population would easily bring about the destruction also of these; [5] but, on the *other* hand, however, there can be no doubt, that this law was never universally executed according to the letter.

Among the Pagans in many countries, an impression prevailed, in consequence of one of those predictions by which they were so often deluded, that Christianity would last for *only three hundred and sixty-five years;* and this prediction, by a loose reckoning from the time of Christ's passion, seemed now to be near the time for its accomplishment. Hence the destruction of the temples, which took place this year, made the greater impression upon many of the Pagans.[6] Yet they were still powerful enough on many of the country estates of North

[1] Homil. 18, act. ap.

[2] Si qua in agris templa sunt, sine turba ac tumultu diruantur. His enim dejectis atque sublatis, omnis superstitionis materia consumetur.

[3] Thus in the Codex canonum eccles. Africanæ, (c. 58,) it is said: Quæ in agris vel in locis abditis constituta nullo ornamento sunt.

[4] Cod. Theodos. l. 16. Tit. 10, l. 18.

[5] Augustin (de civitate Dei, l. 18, c. 54) says that in this year all the idolatrous temples and images at Carthage were destroyed by the two comites, Gaudentius and Jovius.

[6] See Augustin. l. c.

Africa, to commit acts of violence on the Christians, while engaged in the exercises of worship.[1]

After the death of the powerful Stilicho, by whom Honorius had been governed, the latter, probably through the influence of some of the great who were favorably disposed to Paganism, enacted a law which contradicted the laws hitherto issued. For, between the years 409 and 410, there appeared in the western empire a law which ordained universal religious freedom.[2] Yet this law remained in force certainly but a very short time; and the old ones soon went once more into operation. By an edict of the year 416,[3] Pagans were excluded from all civil and military places of trust; yet the necessities of the time and the weakness of the empire hardly allowed of its being carried into strict execution.[4]

The consequences which followed the emigrations of tribes in the western empire; the political disturbances which threw everything into confusion; the irruptions of savage and pagan hordes, might sometimes light up a ray of hope in the small pagan party: but it soon dwindled away again to nothing.

In many districts of the East, Paganism maintained itself for a longer time; and the party of pagan Platonists, which continued down into the sixth century, was its principal support. The emperors were moved by their political interests to avoid destroying everything at once in those cities where Paganism predominated, lest they might detroy those interests also. They chose rather to proceed gradually. This principle may be detected in the remarkable answer which the emperor Arcadius gave Porphyry, bishop of Gaza, in Palestine, when the latter, in the year 401, prayed for the destruction of the idolatrous temples in this city, inhabited for the most part by fanatical Pagans.[5]

[1] Thus sixty Christians were murdered at Suffetum in Numidia, probably in consequence of an attack on the statue of Hercules, Augustin. ep. 50. At Calame in Numidia, A.D. 408, the Pagans ventured, in defiance of the laws enacted shortly before by the emperor Honorius against all pagan festivities, to march in an indecent heathen procession before the Christian churches; and, when the clergy remonstrated, a wild uproar arose. The church was attacked with stones, finally set fire to, and a Christian murdered. The bishop, who was hunted after, was obliged to conceal himself. Augustin. ep. 90, 91, 104.

[2] Ut libera voluntate quis cultum Christianitatis exciperet, cod. eccles. Afric. c. 107. It is true, this law, as it here reads, can be understood, according to its letter, to mean only that no one should be forced to embrace Christianity. And this was in fact a thing which, properly speaking, had as yet never been done. But it is clear that it was so interpreted, as if the legal penalties which had been in force against those who exercised any other form of worship than that of the catholic Christians, should be done away.

[3] As late as the year 403, the Spanish Christian poet, Prudentius, had asserted that difference in respect to religion had no influence in the bestowment of posts of honor, and declared this to be right. L. 1, c. Symmachum, v. 617.

Denique, pro meritis terrestribus æqua rependens
Munera, sacricolis summos impertit honores
Dux bonus, et certare sivit cum laude suorum,
Nec pago implicitos per debita culmina mundi
Ire viros prohibet: quoniam cœlestia nunquam
Terrenis solitum per iter gradientibus obstant.

[4] If the account of Zosimus (l. V. c. 46) is true, the feeble Honorius, unable to dispense with the services of one of his pagan generals, Generid, who would serve only on this condition, was obliged immediately to repeal this law.

[5] The life of Porphyry, bishop of Gaza, from which this story is taken, and which was composed by his disciple, the deacon Marcus, — a work which is important as furnishing many facts illustrative of the history of the church and of manners in this period, — has as yet been published only in a Latin translation, whose author seems not even to have given himself the pains of accurately decyphering the Greek text: see

"I am aware," says he, "that your city is given to idolatry; but it faithfully pays its tributes, and brings a great deal into the public treasury. If we proceed now to disturb it thus suddenly, the inhabitants will fly away in fear, (namely, that the attempt would finally be made to bring them over to Christianity by force,) and we should lose so much in our revenue. But we will rather oppress them by degrees, depriving the idolaters of their dignities and places of trust, and issuing our commands that the temples shall be closed and oracles no longer be delivered; for when they are oppressed on all sides, they will come to the knowledge of the truth," — a fine mode of conversion, to be sure! — "for all sudden and too authoritative measures are hard for the subjects." Yet finally the cunning of the empress Eudoxia prevailed — a woman who perfectly understood how Arcadius was to be managed, by taking advantage of his weaknesses; and who was led to think that her zeal for the destruction of idolatrous temples, and her many gifts to the clergy and the monks, would make atonement for her sins. By her influence, the reasonable hesitation of the weak Arcadius was finally overcome.

It is true, in a law of the year 423, it is expressed as doubtful whether any Pagans still remained:[1] but as it was considered necessary, in confirming the ancient laws against them, to change the punishment of death, which had hitherto been established against those who sacrificed, into the confiscation of goods and banishment; as it was considered necessary to protect the still remaining Pagans, who attempted nothing contrary to the laws, against being abused and plundered by nominal Christians, who used religion as a pretext;[2] it follows from all this, that there still continued to be Pagans, which is proved moreover by the laws issued under this reign against those who apostatized from Christianity to Paganism. Had there been good reason to doubt whether there were any more Pagans, there certainly would have been no occasion for a law of this sort. But undoubtedly the fact, that few remained who openly declared themselves Pagans,

Acta Sanctorum, at the 26th of February, and the Bibliotheca Patrum, Galland, T. IX. From a promising young Danish scholar, Dr. Clausen, we are led to expect the publication of the Greek original work, which is still extant among the treasures of the imperial library at Vienna. Meantime I shall insert here the passage relating to the present subject, as it reads in the original. The words of Arcadius are: *Οἶδα, ὅτι ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη κατείδωλος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐγνώμων ἔστι περὶ τὴν εἰσφόραν τῶν δημοσίων, πόλλα συντελοῦσα. Ἐὰν οὖν ἄφνω διασοβῶμεν αὐτοὺς, τῷ φόβῳ φύγῃ χρησόνται, καὶ ἀπολοῦμεν τοσοῦτον Κάνονα, ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ, κατὰ μέρος θλίβωμεν αὐτούς, περιαιροῦντες τὰς ἀξίας τῶν εἰδωλομένων καὶ τὰ ἀλλὰ πολιτίκα ὀφφίκια, καὶ κελευώμεν τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν κλεισθῆναι καὶ μηκέτι χρηματίζειν. Ἐπὰν γὰρ θλίβωσιν εἰς πάντα στενουμένοι, ἐπιγινωσκοῦσι τὴν ἀληθείαν, τὸ γὰρ ὑπερβόλην ἔχον αἰφνίδιον βαρὺ τοῖς ὑπηκόοις.*

[1] L. 16, Tit. 10, l. 22. Paganos qui supersunt, quanquam jam nullos esse credamus.

[2] L. c. l. 23 et 24. Hoc Christianis, qui vel vere sunt, vel *esse dicuntur*, specialite. demandamus, ut Judæis ac Paganis, in quiete degentibus, nihilque tentantibus turbulentum legibusque contrarium, non audeant manibus inferre, religionis auctoritate abusi. Against those who, under the pretext of religion, robbed the Pagans, Augustin also felt himself called upon to preach: "Perhaps in order that Christ may not say to you, I was clothed, and thou hast robbed me, thou alterest the custom, and thinkest to rob a Pagan and to clothe a Christian. Here also Christ will answer thee; nay, he answers thee even now by his servant, whoever he may be: Here too do me no harm; when, being a Christian, thou robbest the Heathen, thou hinderest him from becoming a Christian." Sermo 179, § 5.

may be reconciled with the other, that it was necessary to devise laws of this sort, if the matter is presented in the following point of light; namely, that many were called apostates from Christianity, who had never seriously passed over to the Christian church — individuals who had submitted to baptism only as an outward form, but had ever continued to practise the pagan rites in secret. Whenever they were discovered, they were called apostates.[1]

The Heathens, then, were compelled, from the present time in the fifth century, to practise and propagate their religion in secret, for the purpose of avoiding persecutions; and by this means their religion was rendered the dearer to them. The holding of the knowledge of divine things as a secret, which could be the property only of the philosophically educated; the engrafting of it upon the mythical representations, beyond which the people knew nothing; this belonged necessarily to the system of the Neo-Platonists, and these principles made it possible for them, with all their enthusiasm for Hellenism, yet to adapt themselves to the character of the times.[2] A remarkable example of this is presented in the life of the pagan philosopher Proclus,[3] which his disciple Marinus has written.[4]

The emperor Justinian, (from the year 527 and onwards,) whose despotism even in spiritual things was the source of so many disorders to the Eastern church, endeavored, soon after the commencement of his reign, to suppress the last remains of Paganism by force, so far as this

[1] Qui nomen Christianitatis induti, sacrificia fecerint. Cod. Theodos. l. 16. Tit. VIII. l. 7.

[2] The art represented in the symbol of Proteus: *Συνεῖναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐ θείως, ἀλλὰ πολιτικῶς.* See Synes. ep. 137 ad Herculian. Of the Pagans who were arrested in the exercise of the cultus forbidden by the laws, Augustin says, (Enarrat. in *ψ.* 140, § 20:) Quis eorum comprehensus est in sacrificio, cum his legibus ista prohiberentur, et non negavit? Quis eorum comprehensus est adorare idolum, et non clamavit: non feci; et timuit ne convinceretur?

[3] Born A.D. 412, died 487.

[4] As a proof of the confidence which Heron the mathematician had in the young Proclus, it is mentioned here, that he communicated to him *the whole method of his worship of God.* When he first visited the heathen Platonic philosopher Syrianus at Athens, the moon having begun to shine, the latter sought to get him out of the way, so that he might perform his devotions unobserved with another Pagan, c. XI. We see from this biographical narrative, that the worship of Isis still prevailed at Philæ in Egypt, (p. 47); that in Athens the worship of Esculapius was secretly practised in the temple, which, however, was soon afterwards destroyed; and that the Pagans prayed there for their sick. Proclus thought himself happy in that he occupied a dwelling near the temple, so as to be able to perform his devotions there without being observed, and invoke the aid of Esculapius in behalf of the sick, p. 73. *Καὶ τοιοῦτον ἔργον διεπράξατο οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ κἂν ταυθα τοὺς πόλλους λανθάνων, καὶ οὐδεμίαν πρόφασιν τοῖς ἐπιβουλεύειν ἐθελοῦσι παρασχεῖν.* Marinus extols it as a proof of the Herculean courage and spirit of Proclus, that under all the storms of this Titanic period, he steadfastly and without once wavering, though not without danger, maintained himself to the end, *τὸ δὲ τῆς πολιτίκης ἀνδρείας εἰδος ἡρακλείον οὑτῶς ἐπεδείξατο, ἐν ζάλῃ γὰρ παρέλθων καὶ τρικυμία πραγμάτων τυφωνείων ἀντὶ πνεόντων τῇ εννομοζώῃ,* (the ancient national cultus,) *ἐμβριθῶς οὐτὸς ἀνηρ καὶ ἀστεμφῶς, εἰ καὶ παρακινδυνευτικῶς, τὸν βίον διενῆξατο.* Once, probably by his over-zealous observance of the pagan rites, he drew on himself a persecution from the Christians, and took refuge for some length of time in Asia Minor, p. 35. At Adrota in Lydia, there was still practised among the Heathens, in an ancient temple, a worship respecting the name of which they were not agreed. According to some, the temple belonged to Esculapius; according to others, to the Dioscuræ. Remedies for the cure of diseases were said to be here suggested by supernatural inspiration, and miraculous cures effected. Many legends were circulated respecting it, c. 32.

could be done in such a way. The persecutions were aimed particularly at men in the civil service. They were deprived of their property, tortured, executed. Many hypocritically assumed the profession of Christianity to escape the persecutions: of course, in such cases they soon took off the mask, and were once more seen attending the performance of sacrifices.[1] The emperor, doubtless having heard that Athens[2] still continued to be a seat of Paganism, and that this religion was propagated by the pagan Platonists who still taught there, forbade the holding of philosophical lectures in that place.[3] These persecutions induced the pagan philosophers, among whom were Damascius and Isidorus and the renowned Simplicius,[4] to take refuge with the Persian king Chosroes, respecting whose love for philosophy they had heard exaggerated accounts. This prince, it is true, received them in a friendly manner; but their expectations were by no means realized. Parsism was as little agreeable to them as Christianity; and they had many a longing wish after the Grecian customs. Chosroes, in the treaty of peace, prevailed upon the emperor Justinian, to allow them the free exercise of their religion in the Roman empire.[5]

B. *Of the Polemical Writings of the Pagans against Christianity; of the Charges which they brought against it generally; and of the manner in which these Charges were answered by the Teachers of the Christian Church.*

In respect to the attacks on Christianity by pagan writers, it may be observed that it was a necessary consequence of the altered circumstances of the times, that few would venture to combat Christianity in works devoted expressly to that object. Julian, who endeavored to supplant Christianity as an emperor, appeared against it also as an author; and his work, of which considerable fragments have been preserved to our times, in the refutation of it by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, is the most important one, in this respect, belonging to the present period.[6] Although, as we have remarked before, much that was bad, and which had been presented to Julian under the Christian name, had, from the

[1] Theophanes Chronograph. ad. A. 522, i. e. according to our reckoning, 531 from the birth of Christ. See Ideler's Manual of Chronology, II. 458. Procop. hist. arcana, p. 90, c. XI. ed. Orelli. The same author (c. 19) relates, that Justinian employed the accusation of Heathenism as a pretext to get into possession of the estates which his cupidity thirsted after. Comp. the chronicle of Johannes Malala, pars II. p. 184, ed. Oxon.

[2] The Athenian schools had sunk so low in the beginning of the fifth century, that Synesius could write: Athens is now famous only for her Hymettian honey, and that he could compare the then Athens in her relation to the ancient, with the hide of a slaughtered victim; so completely was philosophy banished from the place, while only those dead and silent spots, the Academy, the Stoa, the Lyceum, were shown to and wondered at by strangers. See the 136th letter of Synesius to his brother; but, after this time, Athens was somewhat restored to its bloom by the Neo-Platonic philosophy.

[3] Joh. Malala, l. c. p. 187.

[4] Simplicius (in Epictet. Enchiridion, c. 13, ed. Lugd. Batav. 1640, p. 79) probably alludes to the fact, that the Pagans were to be forced to renounce their convictions: Τυραννίκας βίας, μεχρὶ καὶ τοῦ ἀσεβεῖν ἀναγκαζούσας.

[5] See Agathias de rebus Justiniani, l. II. c. 30, p. 69, ed. Paris. L. II. c. 30, p. 131, ed. Niebuhr.

[6] Julian wrote this work in the winter, during his residence at Antioch. Liban. epitaph. Julian. vol. I. p. 581.

first, exerted its influence in giving his mind an impression unfavorable to Christianity, yet it is also true that his hatred was not confined to the corrupt and distorted representations of Christianity prevailing at that period, but was turned against Christianity itself; that Christianity, though presented in all the purity of its essential character, could not have appeared to him, in the temper of mind which he actually cherished, otherwise than hateful. It may, indeed, be said, that many of the foreign elements which had engrafted themselves on Christianity, came nearer to Julian's pagan mode of thinking than the purely Christian doctrine. He was sufficiently well acquainted with the written records of Christianity, to discern the difference between many of the notions which prevailed among Christians at this time and the doctrines of the New Testament; between the life of the Christians of this period and the requisitions of the original doctrine of Christ. Thus, in reference to the honor paid to martyrs, concerning which nothing indeed is to be found in the New Testament, he reproached the Christians with departing from the words of Christ. Yet Julian knew too little of the spirit of Christianity, which, with all his knowledge of the letter of the New Testament, yet could not be understood by him while he cherished such inward opposition to the essence of the gospel, — he knew too little of that spirit to see *wherein* the honor paid to the martyrs conflicted with the primitive religion. To him, looking at the matter from his own pagan position, the Christian element, which lay at the root even of this superstition, was precisely the thing which appeared hateful. It was the importance which the Christian feeling attached to the remains of a body that had once been the temple of the Holy Ghost, and was destined to be so again; the new views of death and of the sanctification and transfiguration of the earthly, of all that is peculiar to humanity which Christianity brought with it. To him, the Pagan, whatever was dead was impure and defiling: hence he tauntingly remarked against the Christians, that they had filled every thing with graves and monuments, and that they rolled themselves upon graves.[1] He accused them of practising magic in this way, and of seeking prophetic dreams by sleeping upon the graves, (incubationes.) The apostles, he said, had from the first instructed the faithful in these things; and among the Jews the art had long been known, for they often had been reproached with it by the prophets (Isaiah 65th.)[2] So again, he rightly perceived that the persecutions against heretics and Pagans, which had hitherto been resorted to, were contrary to the doctrine of Christ and of the apostles.

[1] He also employs arguments wholly irrelevant and out of place, for the purpose of showing them that this was an unchristian thing; as for example, from Matth. chap. 23: "How, then, do you call upon the same God, when Jesus says that the sepulchres are full of all uncleanness?" Again, Christ had said, "Let the dead bury their dead." Though the truth was, those who called on the martyrs looked upon them, not as the dead, but as those who were living with God.

[2] Cyrill. c. Julian. l. X. 335–40. Perhaps the Christians may have themselves given occasion for this charge, by their stories about appearances of the martyrs in visions by night in the chapels of the martyrs, — about cures of diseases, which had been wrought by them; and by their custom of transferring a great deal from the pagan superstition of incubations to the martyrs.

"You destroy temples and altars," says he,[1] "and you have not only murdered those *among us* who persevere in the religion of our fathers, but also those among the heretics who are in the same error with yourselves, but who do not mourn the dead man (so he sarcastically calls the worship of Christ) in the same way that you do. But this is something which must be ascribed to your own invention; for neither Jesus nor Paul invited you to do it." Instead of acknowledging, however, that this was contrary to the spirit of the gospel, or at least to the character of Christ and the apostles, Julian maliciously gives it the following explanation. He says that Christ — which, however, is refuted by Christ's own language — and the apostles did not expect their party would ever acquire such power; and here again he repeats the old objection to Christianity, which in truth redounds to its honor, that it did not first spread among the wise and mighty of the world. "But the reason is," says he, "they never looked forward to such mighty things; for they were satisfied if they could deceive maids and slaves, and through these the women and their husbands, such as Cornelius and Sergius. You may put me down for a liar, if a single author of that period (for these events happened under Tiberius or Claudius) ever mentioned these men." How could he possibly have possessed the least sense for the godlike in the life of Christ, when he was capable of bringing up such a question as the one which follows, where, comparing Christ with great kings,[2] he says: "But Jesus, who has persuaded a few of the worst among you, has been named these three hundred years; yet what remarkable thing had he done, unless you suppose that healing the lame and the blind and exorcising demoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany are to be ranked among the greatest works;" — when he alleges against the sovereignty of Christ, that he was one of the subjects of the emperor; that he who commanded the spirits, *who walked upon the sea*, and ejected evil spirits, could not change the will of his friends and kinsmen so as to secure their own salvation; could not bring them to believe in him? How little did he who could say this, understand the nature of a moral change!

No less characteristic of the man, was the credulity with which, after ridiculing the well-authenticated faith of the Christians, he received one of the absurd tales of Heathenism, objecting to the Christians that they had forsaken the ancilia which had fallen from heaven, and which secured eternal protection to the city of Rome, and the Roman empire; and, instead of these, worshipped the wood of the cross.[3] And equally characteristic is his objection to Christianity, — an objection which contains some truth, but truth which redounds to the honor of Christianity, — when he says that the Christians had let the best things of Judaism and Paganism go, and blended together the worst out of both. They had, for instance, thrown away from Judaism the sacred rites, the various legal prescriptions, which required the holiest life, and from Paganism the devout feeling towards all higher natures; while, on the

[1] L. c. l. VI. p. 206. [2] VI. 491. [3] L. c. VI. 194.

contrary, they had taken from the Jews their intolerant Monotheism, and from the Pagans their freedom and indifference of living;[1] or, as Julian expressed it, their custom of eating everything, like the green herb. The truth here is, that Christianity delivered men from the yoke of the ceremonial law, and from a religion which cleaved to the elements of the world; and that, on other grounds, it gave a freedom of outward life, which, in outward appearance, might seem like the pagan freedom, although it came from an entirely different spirit. The relation here is precisely the same as that between the freedom of the man who has never felt the power and the burden of sin, and the freedom of him who has been actually redeemed from its bondage.

He says the Christians had given to the pagan freedom a still wider scope; — correctly, we must admit, so far as it concerned outward things; — and this they had been compelled to do as a matter of course, "because their religion was to suit all nations, all forms of human life; the innkeeper, the publican, the dancer, &c."[2] Bating the circumstance that Julian carries the case out to the extreme of caricature, there is, undoubtedly, a foundation of truth under-lying even this accusation, conformably to what has just been remarked. It was precisely because Christianity started with this freedom, because it was bound to no particular outward and earthly forms of life, because its transforming influence operated from within, that it was capable of approaching, in like manner, people of all nations, ranks, and relations, so as to diffuse its sanctifying influence over them all. So, too, he glorifies the gospel, which was given to make returning sinners holy and happy, when he reckons it as a reproach to Christianity that it came first of all to sinners; and when, to give the satire more point, he cites the testimony of the apostle Paul himself, 1st Corinthians 6: 11. In this case, however, instead of dreaming of the justifying and sanctifying power of faith in Christ, to which Paul alludes, he perverts the sense of the apostle's language, as if he referred to some magical power of baptism to destroy sin. "Dost thou see," he says, "that these were also such? But they have been sanctified and cleansed, because they have received a water that penetrates to the soul, by which they could be purified. Baptism cannot remove leprosy, gout, warts, and other less or greater bodily defects; but it was able to purge away all the sins of the soul."[3]

As Julian did not recognize the one image of one only God in all humanity, — but imagined that he saw in the different races of men only the impress of the different individualities of their presiding deities; or rather, as he carried out the principle of the deification of nature, and his gods were merely the different human individualities of character, abstracted and deified; — a national character once in existence

[1] Την ἀδιαφορίαν καὶ χυδαιοτήτα. Genesis 9: 3. Rom. 14: 2.

[2] VII. 238.

[3] VII. f. 245. And so indeed it must appear to a man who reads these words with such a temper and habit of mind; because such a temper of mind clings only to the outward. The Christians, moreover, promoted this misapprehension by their own representations of the magical effects of baptism.

appeared to him to be incapable of change. He adduces the Western nations as a proof of this, who, although they had been for so long a time under the Roman dominion, yet continued to remain for the most part uncultivated:[1] but history, to whose testimony he appealed, has confuted what he says; for Christianity has been able, without destroying the more essential national peculiarities, to develope and bring out the spiritual and moral elements which lie at the foundation of the human nature in all.

Julian labors to show, that Christianity generally had taken its shape only by degrees, through the coöperation of various outward causes; as the fact would easily seem to be to the superficial observer, and in general to every man who does not look at it from the very centre of Christian intuition; since he will not know how to distinguish in Christianity itself, the unchangeable essence from the changeable form, nor that which springs out of the essence of Christianity from the foreign elements which have mixed in with it. Now, although Julian undoubtedly perceived the difference between the Christian life and the church doctrines of his time, and that which was contained in the letter of the sacred scriptures; yet he could not separate what was really foreign in the prevailing church doctrines of the Christians of his time, and had been added to the original doctrines of the New Testament, from what was merely the drapery of a particular age in which the essential Christian truth had clothed itself; and thus he might easily be led to suppose that he found contradictions in the doctrines of the New Testament, because he was incapable of recognizing the unity of the essence in the variety of its forms of representation.

Thus, for instance, he imagined that he perceived a contradiction of this sort in the case of the doctrine of Christ's divinity; and in his remarks on this point, he does not even agree with himself. In one passage, he says of Christ to the Christians of his time:[2] "*As you would have it*, he has created heaven and earth; for none of his disciples has said this of him, except John alone, and even he not clearly and explicitly." And in another place, he says,[3] that neither Paul nor any one of the evangelists ventured to call Jesus, God; but that John, on hearing that in the cities of Greece and Italy many had already become infected with this contagion, and that the graves of Peter and Paul were secretly worshipped,[4] had first endeavored, by stealth and artifice, to foist in the doctrine of Christ's divinity.[5] And yet, in another place,[6] where he wishes to point out contradictions between the Old and New Testaments,[7] he finds in the formula of baptism,—which he nowhere attempts to explain away as a foreign addition to the

[1] IV. 131.
[2] VI. 213.
[3] L. X. f. 317.
[4] We see with what assurance Julian here created facts after his own imagination.
[5] L. X. f. 327.
[6] L. IX. f. 291.
[7] In respect to the relation of the Old-Testament idea of the Messiah to that of the New Testament, the Christian teachers here laid themselves open to his attacks, in a way which he well knew how to take advantage of, when they professed to find the whole doctrine concerning Christ, as it was first clearly unfolded in the New Testament, or even as with all the later church definitions, contained already in the Old Testament.

gospels, — a direction to invoke Christ, and the doctrine of three divine essences.[1] He accuses the apostle Paul of self-contradiction, — of a wavering between universalism and particularism in the doctrine concerning God; simply because, while looking himself upon the outside of the matter, and everywhere hunting up contradictions, he was incapable of perceiving the inner connection of the Pauline system. "Paul," says he,[2] "changes his doctrine concerning God, as a polypus changes color on the rocks. At one time he calls the Jews God's only inheritance; at another, he persuades the Gentiles that God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. We might rightly ask Paul, if God was not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles, why did he send Moses, the prophets, and the miracles of the fabulous legends, to the Jews alone?"[3] Yet this question might have been easily answered, by simply unfolding the Pauline doctrines concerning the law of God which is within man; concerning the divine descent of humanity; concerning the God in whom we live, move, and have our being, and who has nowhere left himself without a witness; concerning the revelation of God in the works of creation, and in the conscience; concerning the reaction between moral corruption and spiritual blindness; concerning the object of the Old-Testament theocracy, as a preparatory system to the spread of God's kingdom among all mankind; concerning the fixed time of God's grace to all, after all had been brought to the consciousness of guilt. In like manner, he accuses the apostle Paul, and the Christians of that period, of contradicting the doctrines of Christ himself, when they held that it was not necessary to observe the Mosaic ceremonial law, notwithstanding that Christ, in his sermon on the Mount, had said that he had not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil, and had declared even the least of the commandments to be binding[4] — a difficulty which admitted of being easily resolved, by rightly determining the meaning and the references of our Saviour's remarks.

In the reign of Julian, some one, probably a pagan rhetorician, wrote the dialogue, in imitation of Lucian, called *Philopatris*. This contains a satirical account of the church doctrine of the Trinity, and of the monks, who, as they were the emperor's most violent enemies, predicted nothing but failure of his enterprises. They are represented as men who took pleasure in the public misfortunes, as the enemies of their country; and hence the title of the dialogue.[5] In order to understand

[1] L. VIII. f. 262, he says, that in the Old Testament no such designation of a higher nature belonging to the Messiah, as in the words πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, is to be found; and yet this expression belongs to Paul, whom Julian had placed, on this subject, in such direct opposition to John.

[2] L. III. f. 106.

[3] Thus he speaks who cited the fable of the Ancilia above mentioned as an undoubted fact.

[4] L. X. 351.

[5] The very way in which the doctrine of the Trinity is ridiculed in this dialogue, (§ 12,) favors the supposition that it was composed at some period subsequent to the Nicene council, and this is confirmed by the description of the persons (§ 20 and 26) who are represented altogether after the same manner as the monks were usually depicted by the Pagans of this period. The expression, οἱ κεκαρμένοι τὴν γνώμην, manifestly alludes to the monkish tonsure. The monks say, that when they have fasted ten days, and watched ten nights, singing spiritual songs, they received revelations of future events in dreams. Prophetic dreams often occur in this age, both among Pagans

the nature of the charges which the Pagans brought against Christianity and the Christian church, we must not only look into their polemical works, which, for the reasons already alleged, could in this period be but few in number; but we must also endeavor to find out the current objections brought against Christianity by the Pagans in the ordinary intercourse of life. The sources from which such knowledge may be obtained, are partly such writings of the Pagans in which they occasionally allude to Christianity or the Christians; and partly the apologetical writings of the fathers, and the homilies of Chrysostom and Augustin.

Although *many* of the objections of the Pagans to Christianity, springing out of the natural relation of Paganism, or of man in his corrupt state of nature, to Christianity, must ever be recurring; yet there are many also which were called forth by the particular condition of the Christian church in this period. This is the case with all such objections as arose from the confounding together of church and state, and from the mass of corruption which, under the garb of Christianity, had attached itself to the church. If, in the former period, the extension of the church, in spite of all persecution, witnessed of that which *the divine power of the gospel alone* was able to effect; *now*, on the other hand, the Pagans, looking, as men are wont to do, at the present moment, and forgetting the experience of the preceding centuries, could object against the divine character of the religion, *that Christianity depended for its spread on the favor of princes.*[1] To refute this objection, Theodoretus must appeal to the experience of the past, and to what was transpiring in Persia[2] when he wrote, in the beginning of the fifth century.

In the preceding period, the Christians had been accused of irreverence towards the Cæsars, (irreligiositas in Cæsares,) because they refused to join in those demonstrations of respect which idolatrous pagan flattery paid to the emperors. But when the Christians now reproached

and Christians. Not only what the friend of the emperor says respecting the entire victory over the Persians, but also what he remarks concerning the cessation of the inroads of the Scythians, (*ἐκδρόμαι τῶν Σκυθῶν,*) is in keeping with this period. And this latter passage has been wrongly adduced by Kelle, who attributes the production to Lucian, (see his dissertation on this dialogue in the commentationes theol. of Rosenmueller, Fuldner, and Maurer, Lips. 1826, T. I. P. II. p. 246,) against Gessner's hypothesis, with which we agree; for by the authors of the fourth century, the Goths were assuredly sometimes designated by the general appellation of Scythians, (see for example, Eunapii excerpta, c. 26, in Majus scriptorum veterum nova collectio, Tom. II. p. 272.) But there is one point in which Kelle is unquestionably right, viz. in saying that what is affirmed concerning the subjection of Egypt, a country which had then been so long time already a Roman province, cannot without force be interpreted of this period. Yet it may be questioned, whether all the particular marks denoting the time in this dialogue are to be understood as historically true; whether the author did not purposely intend to transpose the age, and therefore purposely introduce many things which belonged in no respect to the existing period. In Gieseler's Kirchengeschichte, I. Bd. 2te Auflage, S. 131, I see that the Herr Staatsrath Niebuhr makes this dialogue to have been written at Constantinople, under the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, in the year 968. But, as I am ignorant of the reasons which are supposed to recommend this hypothesis above that of Gessner, I can only mention the fact.

[1] *Ἐκ βασιλίκης ηὐξῆσθαι δυνάμεως.* Theodoret. Græc. Affect. curat. Disputat. IX. p. 935, T. IV. ed. Schultz.

[2] See below, persecutions in Persia.

the Pagans with prostrating themselves before the images of the gods, the reply they sometimes received was, that they did not scruple themselves to fall down before the images of the emperor; which was the less excusable in *them*, since, according to their own doctrine, it was an honor due to God alone.[1] The Christian, indeed, had an answer; that this was an abuse which had sprung from Paganism, and, having become deeply rooted by the length of time, could not be extirpated by Christianity; though the church did not cease to condemn it.[2]

Next, while in the earlier times the conduct of the Christians had been the most expressive and convincing proof of the divine power of their faith; now, on the other hand, the enormous corruption which, under the show of Christianity, manifested itself in the public relations and among the great mass of nominal Christians, was seized upon by the Pagans as a testimony against Christianity, and against the Christian period which had led to such results. They did not reflect that the evils which float on the surface are ever easily detected, but that it requires more penetration to discern the truly good, which loves concealment and is less obtrusive. They saw, as Augustin justly expresses himself with regard to such characters, the scum only, which swims above, but did not remark the good oil, which had its secret channels, and, silently passing through them, made increase without notice.[3]

Thus it was urged as an objection to Christianity, which the bishop Augustin was required to answer,[4] how it was that such great and manifest evils had befallen the church under Christian princes, *who for the most part were diligent observers of the Christian religion.*[5] Augustin, it is true, in his answer does not undertake (as would have been best) to dispute the position that such princes had been diligent observers of Christianity; but what he says tacitly supposes that he did not himself concede this position, and in some measure touches the merits of the case, although he does not enter deeply into it. "It were to be wished," he says, "that something, at least, had been said of the conduct of the earlier emperors: thus examples would have been adduced of a similar or even worse character under emperors who were not Christians; and it might be seen that this is the fault of the men, and not of the doctrine; or else, not of the emperors themselves, but

[1] The Pagan Apollonius, in the Consultationes Zachæi Christiani et Apollonii philosophi, l. I. c. 28: Cur imagines hominum, vel ceris pictas, vel metallis depictas, sub regum reverentia, etiam publica adoratione veneramini, et, ut ipsi prædicatis, Deo tantum honorem debitum etiam hominibus datis? D'Achery, spicileg. T. I.

[2] L. c. and cons. the work De promiss. et prædict. Dei, Pars V. De dimidio temporis, where, in c. VII., this transfer of pagan adulation is rebuked: Æterna cum dicitur, quæ temporalis est, utique nomen est blasphemiæ: cum mortales licet reges, in ea dicantur Divi, eisque supplices dicant: numini vestro altaribus vestris, perennitati vestræ, et cætera, quæ vanitas, non veritas tradit, atque exsecrabilia sunt.

[3] Augustin. Sermo XV. § 9. Amurca per publicum currit, oleum autem ad sedem suam occultos transitus habet; et cum occulte transeat, in magnitudine apparet.

[4] See Augustin. ep. 136 ad Marcellin.

[5] Christianam religionem maxima de parte servantes. This was just the evil of it, that the Pagans heard such princes extolled as zealous Christians, that such incorrect, such meagre notions were entertained of what belonged to the observance of Christianity; that zeal for forms of belief, for the external interests of the church, for outward matters of the church, were confounded with vital Christianity.

of others, without whom the emperors could have done nothing."[1] The position itself he disputes in his excellent apologetical work, "*The city of God*," where he says: "If all the kings of the earth, all the nations, all the great, and all judges; if young and old together would hear and obey the doctrines of Christ, such a people would at once participate of all civil prosperity in this present life, and of eternal blessedness in the next. But," he adds, "because one man listens to these doctrines, and another despises them; and because the great mass are more attached to the vices which flatter their corruption, than to the salutary rigor of the virtues; the servants of Christ, whether they be kings or subjects, rich or poor, freemen or slaves, endure, if need be, even the worst of governments; and, by that patient endurance, contribute to prepare for themselves a place in that holiest and most exalted community of angels, in that heavenly city where the will of God is law."[2] Augustin, moreover, very justly remarks, that the fountain of those evils which were improperly charged on Christianity, was to be traced to a far earlier time, — to the corruption of the Roman state, which had been introduced by earthly prosperity, and which had been checked by no earthly counterpoise. He justly appeals here to the testimony of the older Roman authors themselves; and, convinced that the Christian religion furnished the only thorough remedy for the evil, he thanks God that he had bestowed the means of a radical cure precisely at the time of the greatest corruption, whence mankind would have ever sunk lower in ruin. "Thanks be to the Lord our God," he exclaims, "who sent us his own special assistance against those evils."[3]

Another objection was urged against Christianity on political grounds, which sprung, however, not from any confounding of the precepts of Christianity with the behavior of those who called themselves Christians; but partly from a misapprehension of these precepts themselves, and partly from the necessary opposition between the more political way of thinking peculiar to antiquity and the theocratical and moral spirit of Christianity. The Pagans, for instance, supposed that the Christian doctrine was irreconcilable with the fundamental principles of a state, and that no state could subsist in connection with it; since the precepts of the sermon on the Mount forbade war even on the justest occasions, and thus the state must be exposed to every kind of insult and wrong from the barbarians.[4] To this Augustin replies, that these precepts had reference to the disposition of heart, which, in Christians, should always be the same, rather than to the outward actions. They required that the heart should constantly cherish the same disposition of patience and good will, while the outward actions must differ accord-

[1] Ep. 138 ad Marcellin.

[2] De civitate Dei, l. II. c. 19.

[3] Augustin, in the letter above cited, (§ 171,) comparing the effects of Christianity with the civic virtues of the ancient Roman republic, finely remarks: "Thus God showed, in the example of that flourishing empire of the Romans, how much the civil virtues could effect even without the true religion, that it might appear evident that men, when this is also added, become the citizens of another state, whose king is the truth, whose laws are love, and whose duration is eternity."

[4] Augustin. ep. 136.

ing as the best interests of those towards whom we are thus disposed require.[1] To those who maintained that Christianity necessarily conflicted with the welfare of states, he says: "Let them give us such warriors as the Christian doctrine requires they should be; such subjects; such husbands and wives; such fathers, sons, masters, and servants; such kings and judges; such payers and receivers of tribute as they ought to be according to the precepts of the Christian doctrine;—and would they still venture to assert, that this doctrine is opposed to the state? Nay, would they not rather confess without hesitation, that, if it were followed, it would prove the salvation of the state?"

The Pagans also labored to show in the historical way, that it was by forsaking the national gods, to whom the Roman empire owed its increase and prosperity, and by the spread of Christianity, the state had been ruined. Such was the aim of Eunapius and of Zosimus in their historical works, written in the fifth century. The Spanish presbyter, Paulus Orosius of Tarraco, in Spain, at the request of Augustin, wrote, in the year 417,[2] his historical compend, for the purpose of refuting this charge by facts of history; and for the same reason Augustin himself was led to write his profound work concerning the origin, character, progress, and ultimate aim, of the city of God.

C. *Various Obstacles which hindered the Progress of Christianity among the Heathen; various Means and Methods by which it was promoted; and the different Kinds of Conversion.*

The obstacles which, in this particular period, hindered the progress of Christianity among the Heathen, varied among the different classes of the Heathen, according to their different tendencies of mind and feeling. Some to heathen superstition united the consciousness of great crime, and sought in the former an antidote against the stings of the latter. They were unwilling to abandon the superstition in which they had been used to find so convenient a prop; and a religion presenting moral claims had no attractions for them, unless when unworthy priests, who made Christianity itself to be only another Paganism, had either lowered, or concealed from them, these moral claims, for the purpose of converting avowed Pagans into nominal Christians. Others, who, to the eyes of men or in their own superficial view, had led blameless lives, imagined they possessed all they needed in their own religion, and especially that they needed not a Redeemer. In this delusion they were more confirmed, when, instead of examining their hearts by the demands of the holy law in their conscience, or of comparing themselves with real and living Christians, of whom perhaps they never saw an example within the circle of their acquaintance, they contrasted themselves with the vastly greater number of nominal Christians. It is of such Augustin speaks:[4] "You will find," he says,

[1] Augustin. ep. 138. Ista præcepta magis ad præparationem cordis, quæ intus est, pertinere, quam ad opus, quod in aperto fit, ut teneatur in secreto animi patientia cum benevolentia, in manifesto autem id fiat, quod eis videatur prodesse posse, quibus bene velle debemus.

[2] Adversus Paganos historiarum libri VII.

[3] De civitate Dei, libri XXII.

[4] In Ps. 21. Enarrat. II. § 2.

"many Pagans refusing to embrace Christianity, because they are satisfied with their own good lives. One should live, say they, uprightly. What further precept can Christ give us? We lead good lives already: what need have we of Christ? We commit no murder, theft, nor robbery; we covet no man's possessions, we are guilty of no breach of the matrimonial bond. Let something worthy of censure be found in our lives, and whoever can point it out may make us Christians." Comparing himself with the nominal Christians: "Why would you persuade me to become a Christian? I have been defrauded by a Christian; I never defrauded any man; a Christian has broken his oath to me, and I never broke my word to any man."[1] Others, men of profounder feelings, men who were animated by a loftier moral idea, and who perceived the contrast between this and their own life, sought for peace in doctrines which no doubt had sprung from the universal religious sense of mankind,—those doctrines which formed the system of the Neo-Platonists concerning a God who would purify from the stains that adhered to them, and free from their chains, the struggling and suffering souls which, derived from himself, were fettered in the bonds of a sensual nature, and sighed after their original source.[2] With this they united a theory which taught various mysterious outward methods of expiation and cleansing, whereby men could draw down upon themselves the redeeming and sanctifying powers of the deity to purify and preserve both body and soul; where, however, it was doubtless at the same time assumed, that the right disposition existed within.[3] To many this presentiment of a redeeming God became afterwards, when they perceived the insufficiency of those outward means of expiation, a point of transition to Christianity.

Again, from the rude and uncultivated mass who were wholly sunk in blind superstition, we should distinguish the men of education. In particular, there were then among the Pagans in the large cities, multitudes of half-educated men, from the rhetorical schools, with whom certain rhetorical flourishes, a certain round of fine set phrases, which they had learned to repeat, passed for a genuine culture of mind and heart; men whose taste, trained to effeminacy from their youth upwards in those showy and superficial schools, had contracted a disrelish for all vigorous and sound nourishment, both of mind and heart. The difficulty of approaching such persons increased in the same pro-

[1] In Psalm. 25. Enarrat. II. § 14.

[2] Ζεὺς ῥύσιος, καθάρσιος, μειλίχιος. See the Hymns of Synesius.

[3] E. g. Longinianus, a Pagan of North Africa, writes to Augustin, who had questioned him with regard to his own opinion on the right way which leads to God, (ep. 234:) Via est in Deum melior, qua vir bonus piis, justis, veris, castis dictis factisque probatus, et Deorum comitatu vallatus, in Deum intentione animi mentisque ire festinat. Via est, quæ purgati antiquorum sacrorum piis præceptis, expiationibusque purissimis, et abstemiis observationibus decocti, anima et corpore constantes deprope-rant. Also Simplicius holds that, along with the inner spiritual purification of the soul by the rational knowledge of God and a life in harmony with nature, the external means of purification handed down from the gods, by which the body is sanctified as the organ of the soul, are also necessary in order that the whole man may partake of the θεῖα ἐλλάμψις. Simplicii in Epictet. enchiridion, p. 218. It must be confessed, that a great deal may be found here which is analogous to the church doctrine of that period respecting the magical sanctifying effects of the sacraments.

portion with their shallow and superficial way of thinking, and their dulness of sense to all the deeper moral and religious wants of their nature. Such men could put up with nothing but that which came recommended to them in beautiful phrases. The plainness and simplicity of the sacred word was to them reason enough for despising it. And, although they knew very little about philosophy themselves, yet they wanted a philosophical religion, and reproached the Christians on account of their blind credulity. Of such, Theodoretus says: "Some who have read the poets and orators, some who have also had a taste of Plato's eloquence, despise the sacred scriptures, because they are not set out with beautiful phrases; and they are ashamed to learn the truth from fishermen. And this pride is found in men who possess but a superficial knowledge of the Greek philosophy,—who have only scraped together, from one quarter and another, a sort of literary medley.[1] Of such, Augustin, in his beautiful tract, entitled, "A guide to the instruction of the different classes of Pagan catechumens," says that their teachers must accustom them to hear scripture read, without despising it because its language is so simple and free from all rhetorical embellishments.[2] It is to such, Theodoretus says:[3] "It was God's will that all men, Greeks and barbarians, learned and unlearned, shoemakers, weavers, and other mechanics, moreover slaves, beggars, women, both such as live in the abundance of all things, and such as depend on the work of their own hands, should draw from the same fountain of salvation: for this reason he employed fishermen, and one who was a shoemaker, (he should have said a tent-maker, Paul,) as his instruments; *and he let their language remain as it was in the beginning*, but poured through the same the clear streams of heavenly wisdom."

Chrysostom once heard a Christian, in disputing with a rhetorically educated Pagan of this class, contend that, in the elegant and proper use of the Greek language, Paul was superior to Plato. He censured the Christian who so badly understood how to defend his own cause; since the very point he was chiefly concerned to make out, was that the apostles were men destitute of human learning and art, in order to show that it was not human power, but the power of God, which operated through them.[4]

Among the cultivated Pagans, the following view of religion extensively prevailed; that with the diversity of nations and the varieties of the human race was necessarily connected the diversity of religions. There was, indeed, but one original divine Essence; but the union between this highest one and the endlessly diversified forms of humanity, could only be mediated through certain higher natures which had emanated from that original Essence, viz. the gods, under whose dominion the several portions of the earth were distributed. Or again,

[1] Theodoret. Græc. affect. curat. Disputat. I. p. 696, T. IV.

[2] De catechizand. rudib. c. IX. Sunt quidam de scholis usitatissimis grammaticorum oratorumque venientes, quos neque inter idiotas numerare audeas neque inter illos doctissimos. Docendi sint scripturas audire divinas, ne sordeat eis solidum eloquium, quia non est inflatum.

[3] Disputat. VIII. pag. 899.

[4] Chrysostom. ep. ad Corinth. I. H. III.

they conceived all the different religions to be only different forms of the revelation of one and the same divine substance — to be one essence in manifold forms; and it was precisely by this manifoldness, as they supposed, that God was most highly honored. There could not be one single way alone which conducted, exclusive of all others, to the supreme, hidden, original Essence: it was only by different ways that men could attain to the most hidden mystery of the divine Being. Accordingly says Simplicius,[1] God is everywhere present, *with all* his divine powers; but limited men, who are confined to their several determinate spots of the earth, could not grasp the immense whole. The divine powers, like natural gifts, must be variously distributed. Accordingly the Neo-Platonic Pagan philosopher Proclus worshipped Greek and Oriental divinities, according to the peculiar Greek and Oriental modes of worship; it being his wont to say, that the philosopher ought not to bind himself to the observance of this or that national form of worship, but, as the common hierophant for the whole world, be familiar with every form of religion.[2] "The rivalship of the different religions," says Themistius to the emperor Jovian,[3] "directly contributes to stir up zeal in worship. There are different ways — some more difficult, others easier; some rougher, others more plain and even — which lead to the same goal. If you allow but one way to be good, and hedge up the others, emulation is at an end. God desires no such agreement among men. As Heraclitus says, Nature loves to hide herself, and still more than nature, the Creator of it, — whom we reverence particularly on this account, because the knowledge of him does not lie on the surface, and is not to be acquired without toil. As you have various ranks and conditions among your subjects, who all in like manner depend on you, and look up to you — so, be assured, the Lord of the universe also takes pleasure in variety and in the diversities of condition. It is his will, that the Syrians should worship him in one way, the Greeks in another, and the Egyptians in still another. And, again, the Syrians are not agreed among themselves, but are subdivided into different minor sects. None have precisely the same notions with the others. Why, then, should we try to force that which is impossible in the nature of things?" In like manner writes Symmachus, in the above-cited Relatio ad Valentinianum: "It is reasonable that we should hold that Being whom all worship, to be one and the same. We all see the same stars; there is a common cope of heaven; the same universe contains us. What matters it in what way each finds the truth? By one way it is impossible to reach so hidden a matter." If no regard were paid to the essential opposition between Christian Theism and Paganism, it might seem as if Christianity too easily admitted of being taken up into this eclecticism, and might find its place along with the others as one of the manifold forms of religion. But the peculiar essence of Christianity struggled against everything like this; and on this account it was exposed the more to

[1] In Epictet. enchiridion, p. 219, 220. [2] See Marini vita Prœli, p. 74.
[3] See the above-cited discourse, p. 67 and 68.

the reproach of a stiff and uncompromising intolerance. It substituted an objective, firm, and steadfast word of God in place of the impure and barely subjective presentiment, feeling, and opinion of man, which confounded godlike and ungodlike; and it made that divine word a judge of the thoughts and feelings. Ambrosius says rightly to Symmachus, "Come and learn on the earth the walk in heaven. Here we live, and there is our walk. Let God, my Creator, teach me himself the mysteries of heaven. Let not man teach me, who knows not even himself."

It is true, the religious way of thinking we have just described, possessed some truth at bottom; which truth, however, Christianity alone teaches us how to separate from the falsehood with which it is associated. That free development of the individualities of human character in religion is to be found in Christianity, as it had nowhere been seen before: but it is here subordinated to a higher, all-transforming principle; and by this it was to be gradually purged from all intermixture of the ungodlike element. To that equalization of all forms of religion which sprung out of the principle of the deification of nature, an error of the contrary kind did, indeed, oppose itself at that time in the Christian church. This error had its ground, however, not in Christianity itself, but in human inventions, confounded with Christianity — in a narrow dogmatism, which would adhere to one fixed and determinate form of the human apprehension of Christianity, which form could, no more than any thing else human, be exempt from error and adapted to all human minds and all stages of the development of Christian faith and Christian knowledge. Yet this form was to be maintained as complete, eternally valid, the only true way of apprehending Christianity; and all minds forced into this one yoke. As opposed to this *other* extreme, the erroneous, pagan way of thinking might the more easily seem to present a semblance of truth.

As the relation of the different classes of Pagans to Christianity varied, so also the ways were various by which they were led to embrace the gospel; and in the great variety of these leadings was shown the manifold wisdom of God. But we must first distinguish in this period between conversion in the proper and Christian sense — an inward change of disposition wrought by Christianity, and the mere outward adoption of Christianity; that is, of its name and ceremonial observances, — or an exchange of open, undisguised Paganism, for a nominal Christianity covering a pagan way of thinking. It must be evident, from what has already been observed respecting the spread of Christianity under the Christian emperors, that in this period the number of conversions of the latter kind far exceeded those of the former. And this is confirmed by the testimony of those church-teachers who were right earnest in bringing about conversions of the genuine stamp. Thus Augustin, for instance, in remarking on John 6: 26, complains: "How many seek Jesus only that he may benefit them in earthly matters! One man has a lawsuit, — so he seeks the intercession of the clergy; another is oppressed by his superior, — so he takes refuge in the church. Others are seeking, one in this way, and another in that,

to be interceded for in some quarter where they have but little influence themselves. The church is daily full of such persons. Seldom is Jesus sought for Jesus' sake."[1]

Doubtless it might happen, that many, whose sole intention was hypocritically to put on the profession of Christianity, would be led farther than they meant to be, by some bishop or catechist, who understood his calling and its duties. Such an one first took pains to inform himself, in the way prescribed by Augustin in his excellent guide to the catechist, (the tract de catechizandis rudibus,) of the reasons which induced the Pagan to seek baptism. If he showed that he was actuated by impure motives, such an enlightened teacher would gently repel him. Or if, which was most often the case, he answered the inquiries of the catechist in conformity with his own hypocritical disposition, still the catechist endeavored to give his conversation such a turn as to reach the heart of the heathen man. "Often," says the bishop Augustin, — speaking here from the experience which must belong to all men of the like spirit, — "often the mercy of God so comes to the help of the catechist's ministry, that the Pagan, moved by his discourse, resolves to *become that which* he meant to feign."[2] But if Pagans of this character came to one of the great majority of those ecclesiastics, men wholly without experience in the trial of spirits, or who were only interested to multiply the number of nominal Christians, they were received at once into the same number without farther question. Yet even these, after being incorporated with the visible church, might be led by what was there presented to them; by the impressions which they involuntarily received; by the society of Christians; by participating in the acts of worship; by some word of the sermon to which they might be listening with others on some great festival, — by such or other means, — to find in the church a good of a higher kind than any which they had sought for in it. Hence, Augustin remarks: "Many, who presented themselves to the church with such impure motives, were, notwithstanding, reformed after they had once come into it."[3] But, assuredly, no one was warranted for this reason to countenance such hypocrisy, to approve the evil, that good might come out of it. And beyond all doubt, the number was far greater of those who grew hardened in that worldly sense by which, from the first, they had profaned a holy profession, and who were thus the means of introducing into the church a great mass of corruption. Among the fruits of such mere outward conversions were those who were found, soon afterwards, at the altars of the false gods. We have proof of this in the laws

[1] In John. Tract. 25, c. 10. Augustin also notices as outward reasons which led many to adopt Christianity, (p. 47,) Ut majorem amicum conciliet, ut ad concupitam uxorem perveniat, ut aliquam pressuram hujus seculi evadat.

[2] De catechiz. rudib. c. 5. Sæpe adest misericordia Dei, per ministerium catechizantis, ut sermone commotus jam fieri velit, quod decreverat fingere. So also Cyril of Jerusalem, in the prologue to his Catechesis, § 4, remarks: "A man may present himself for baptism to please his wife, a wife to please her husband, a servant to please his master, a friend to please his friend. And now it is incumbent on the catechist, through whatever motives the individual may have come, to lead him to find in the church something higher and better than he was seeking for."

[3] Augustin. S. 47. Multi etiam sic intrantes corriguntur ingressi.

enacted against apostates in the reign of the emperor Theodosius (see above.)[1]

Yet these *gross worldly motives* were not the only ones which led to hypocritical conversions; as, indeed, there were many different stages of hypocrisy in these conversions, according as the consciousness of deception was more or less present; according as intentional fraud or unconscious self-deception more or less predominated. Many were first awakened by outward impressions, which might lead them to a superstition which had simply changed its color, as well as from superstition to the faith. Many supposed they had seen miraculous effects produced by the sign of the cross, similar to what had been witnessed, though under different circumstances, by Constantine; others, who had heard of the divine power of Christ, driven in some strait to seek for assistance from the unknown God, believed they had seen him visibly manifested, and that they were thus delivered.[2] To others, some occurrence of the day, which was afterwards forgotten, but which had made an impression on their souls, of which, however, they were but vaguely conscious, would re-appear in the form of a dream, where they imagined they saw Christ, or some martyr, threatening, warning, admonishing them. In all such cases, however, it might be, that the individual was seeking in Christianity only for some earthly good, although he was not hoping to obtain it from man, like the class of hypocritical professors first mentioned, but from God. Not love, but fear, which easily creates idols, or not the love which is bent on heavenly things, but a material craving after miraculous revelations to the senses, which he hoped to find in Christianity, led him to the church. Much depended also on the circumstance whether he found a teacher who could point him away from sensuous to spiritual things. According to Augustin's directions to the catechist, it was the duty of the latter to take advantage of such communications to impress it on the Heathen's heart, how great was God's care for men; but then he should also aim to divert his mind from such wonders and dreams, and lead it in the more certain way, and to the surer testimonies of holy scripture; — he should inform him, that God would not awaken him by such signs and dreams, if a safer way had not been already prepared for him in holy scripture, where he was not to seek for visible miracles, but accustom himself to wait for invisible ones; — where he would be taught of God not in the *visions of sleep*, but while *awake*.[3] But when such teachers in Christianity were wanting, individuals of this class might easily be so misled, as merely to substitute in place of the pagan superstition, another under the Christian dress.

It so happened, that many had their fears excited by particular outward impressions, or by the inner excitements of conscience.[4] They felt the need of pardon; but they had no right conception of the for-

[1] See the entire Titulus VII. of the l. 16, Cod. Theodos. Comp. the decrees of Siricius ad Himerium, of the year 385, § 4.

[2] See e. g. Paulin. Nolan. ep. 36 ad Macarium.

[3] De catechiz. rudib. c. VI.

[4] Augustin. de catechizand. rudib. c. V. Rarissime quippe accidit, immo vero nunquam, ut quisquam veniat volens fieri Christianus, qui non sit aliquo Dei timore perculsus.

giveness of sins, or of what must be done on man's part in order to obtain it. They dreamed of obtaining at once, by the opus operatum of baptism, the magical extinction of their sins, although they still continued in the practice of them. Now, in case such individuals came to a bishop or catechist, of the character required in the above-cited work of Augustin, such a teacher would avail himself of the disturbed conscience, which had brought them to him, as a favorable opportunity for preaching to them repentance, and of leading them from the way of a hypocritical to an honest conversion. But unhappily, there were bishops whose only wish was to make the conversion to Christianity a right easy thing for the Pagans; and whose instructions, therefore, served much rather to confirm them in this wrong state of mind, than to draw them away from it. They merely told them what they would have to believe in order to be Christians; but they were silent as to the obligations to a holy life which flowed out of this faith, lest they might thus be deterred from baptism. Hence they baptised even those who lived in open sin, and who plainly enough manifested that it was not their purpose to forsake it. They imagined, that when these were once baptised and introduced into the fellowship of the church, it was then time enough to admonish them against sin. These corrupt modes of procedure originated partly in the erroneous notions of worth attached to a barely outward baptism and outward church fellowship; and partly in the false notions of what constituted faith, and of the relation of the doctrines of faith and of morals in Christianity to each other.[1]

Against this mode of procedure, and the errors out of which it sprang, Augustin wrote his excellent work de fide et operibus. He says here, § 9: "What more befitting time can be found for one to hear about the faith which he ought to cherish, and how he ought to live, than that time when, with a soul full of longing desire, he pants after the sacrament of faith that conducts to salvation? What other season can be a more appropriate one, for learning what manner of walk is suited to so great a sacrament, which they are longing to receive? Will it be after they have received it; even though after baptism they should be in the practice of great sins, — even though they have never as yet become new men, but remain in their former guilt? Then, by a strange perversion of language, it would first be said to them: 'Put on the new man;' — and then, after they have done so, — 'Put off the old man;' whereas the apostle, observing the proper order of

[1] They imagined that such persons, by means of that outward baptism and the outward fellowship of the church, by means of that which *they* called faith, had at least a hope of salvation beyond that of the Pagans, although, ere they could attain to it, it would be necessary for them to pass through a refining fire, ignis purgatorius. Against such bishops, animated with this false zeal for multiplying the numbers of the Christians, Chrysostom takes ground in his tract πρὸς τὸν Δημητρίον περὶ κατανύξεως, T. VI. ed. Savil. f. 145. "Our Lord utters it as a precept, Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine. But through foolish vanity and ambition we have subverted this command too, by admitting those corrupt, unbelieving men, who are full of evil, before they have given us any satisfactory evidence of a change of mind, to partake of the sacraments. It is on this account many of those who were thus baptized, have fallen away, and have occasioned much scandal."

things, says: 'Put off the old man, and put on the new,' Coloss. 3: 9, 10; and the Lord himself exclaims: 'No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment; neither do men put new wine into old bottles,' Matth. 9: 16, 17."

The advocates of these measures alleged in their defence, that in the letters of the apostles the doctrines of faith preceded those of morals. To this Augustin replied: "This might have some weight, if it were the fact, that there are particular writings of the apostles addressed to the catechumens, and other particular epistles addressed to the baptised; and in the former nothing but the doctrines of faith were presented; in the latter nothing but the doctrine of morals. But the truth is, all the epistles are addressed to *Christians already baptised.* Why, then, do we find the two things combined? We must grant, both belong to the complete sum of Christian doctrine; but that they have commonly placed the doctrines of faith before the precepts of living, because a holy life presupposes the faith out of which it springs." Next, they defended their mode of proceeding by appealing to the example of the apostle Peter, who preached nothing but faith to the three thousand who were baptized after his first discourse, and who, when they asked him what they should do, simply replied: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Acts 2: 38. To this Augustin replied, that in the requisition of repentance, was in fact implied already the requisition to put off the old man and to put on the new; and the remark in verse 40, that Peter with many other words testified and exhorted, saying: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation," certainly supposes that they were required to renounce every sinful practice which belonged to the character of that sinful generation.

In opposition to the practice of citing exclusively those passages of scripture which speak solely of the preaching of faith in Christ, or of Christ crucified, as Acts 8: 37, and 2 Cor. 2: 2; 3: 10, Augustin very justly remarks: "One important part of preaching faith in Christ is, to teach how the members must be constituted, which he seeks in order to be their head; which he forms, loves, redeems, and conducts to eternal life. An important part of preaching Christ crucified is, to teach how we ought to be crucified with him to the world,—consequently, every thing that relates to the duty of self-denial. By that faith in Christ which Paul makes the foundation of the whole Christian life, he does not understand such faith as wicked spirits also might possess, but that faith by which Christ dwells in the heart,—that living faith which works by love, and comprehends in itself every other grace."

Many educated Pagans were conducted to the faith, not at once, by means of some sudden excitement, but after they had been led by particular providences, by the great multitude of Christians around them, to entertain doubts of the Pagan religion they had received from their ancestors, and to enter upon a serious examination of the several systems of religion within their reach. They read the holy scriptures and the writings of the Christian fathers; they proposed their doubts,

their difficulties to Christian friends,[1] and finally made up their minds to go to the bishop. Many came, by slow degrees, through many intervening steps, to Christianity; and the Neo-Platonic, religious idealism formed one stage in particular by which they were brought nearer to *Christian ideas*, as is seen in the examples of a Synesius and an Augustin. This system made them familiar with the doctrine of a Triad. Although this doctrine, in its speculative matter and its speculative tendency, was altogether different from the Christian doctrine, which is in its essence practical throughout; yet they were thereby made attentive to Christian ideas. They were conducted still nearer to practical Christianity by the doctrine that man needed to be redeemed and purified from the might of the ὕλη, which not only fettered and clogged, but corrupted that element of his soul which stands related to God. It is true, they believed only in a general redeeming power of God, which was imparted to individuals in proportion to their worth; or the communication of which was connected with various religious institutions under different forms. But, notwithstanding, all this was calculated gradually to pave the way both for the speculative mind and for the heart to embrace Christianity; even though Christianity might be regarded at first only as one of the manifold forms of the revelation of the divine, as we see illustrated in the case of Synesius.

In the idea of a divine Logos or Nus, the eternal revealer of God, these Platonicians would perhaps find themselves at home; not so with regard to the faith in the historical Christ crucified. They would have been pleased to place Christ on a level with those enlightened sages by whom the divine Logos had revealed himself under different forms, and who, by the fleshly multitude, too prone to cleave to the personal being, had been misunderstood. But to abide by this historical Christ alone, to seek in him their salvation, this was requiring too much from their speculative idealism.[2] Augustin, in his confessions, (l. vii. § 13,) after having described this state of mind from his own experience, since it was from a position of this sort that he himself passed over to the simple gospel, says: "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes, that so they who feel themselves weary and heavy laden might come unto him, and he might give them rest, because he is meek and lowly of spirit. But those who are inflated with the pride of a doctrine that styles itself sublime, hear not the call of him who says, 'Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of spirit, and ye shall find rest to your souls.' Matth. 11: 29."

Yet when those to whom Christianity appeared at first as one peculiar revelation of the divine, coördinate to other forms of manifestation, and not as the absolute religion of humanity, were induced to

[1] Augustin. de catechizand. rudib. § 12. Tales non eadem hora, qua Christiani fient, sed antea solent omnia diligenter inquirere, et motus animi sui cum quibus possunt communicare atque discutere.

[2] Many of these, had they been as clear to themselves, as honest and humble, as was Jacobi, might have said what that devout and noble spirit, so full of earnest longing after the truth, said in a letter to Lavater, that Christianity met their wants, so far as it was mysticism, but that on that very account it was the more difficult for them to get along with the historical faith. See Jacobi's Auserlesenen Briefwechsel, II. B. S. 55.

read the holy scriptures, and to attend divine worship in Christian churches, so far as this stood free and open to the unbaptized, (i. e. the reading of the scriptures and the sermon,) they might, by their own study of the scriptures, and through numberless immediate impressions derived from the church life, be let more deeply into the Christian truth than they had divined of it, until at last they found the redeeming God only in Christ; and the ideal Christ, by means of their own inward experience, became to them the real one. Thus Synesius, for example, came from the position above described still nearer to Christianity, when, in the year 399, having been sent to Constantinople, as a delegate from his native city Cyrene, driven to a great strait, where he was abandoned of all human help, he visited the church, spent much time in prayer, and in this place felt the near presence of God. Thus he was first led to desire baptism; — and he was doubtless brought to a still more profound acquaintance with the deep things of Christianity by the experiences of the episcopal office, which he had reluctantly been induced to assume. Thus it happened to Augustin, who from this position came to the study of the apostle Paul, in the expectation of finding here the same things that he had found in Platonism, only in a different form; instead of which, he found *such a spirit* as brought about the great ferment and crisis in his inner life.

II. Spread of Christianity beyond the Limits of the Roman Empire.

Among the means which contributed to further the progress of Christianity in nations not subjected to the Roman dominion, may be mentioned first, the commercial intercourse of nations. Along with the goods of the earth, the highest blessings of the Spirit also were thus often transmitted to distant lands. In the next place, many of those monks who lived in the Lybian and the Syrian deserts, on the borders of barbarian tribes, acquired, by the godly character which shone forth in their lives, and which exercised a mighty power even over those rude minds, the respect and confidence of the wandering nomadic hordes; and they would doubtless avail themselves of the opportunity thus afforded, of bringing home the gospel to their hearts. Even that which seemed to threaten destruction to the church, must contribute to its extension. Many Christians who had been driven by the persecution of Dioclesian out of Egypt, Lybia, and Syria, took refuge with the neighboring barbarian tribes,[1] and there enjoyed that freedom in the worship of God which they could not find in the Roman empire. The Pagans murmured, when they saw the idolatrous homage they had been used to pay to the "eternal city" exhibited by history in its nothingness, and the colossal creation which had sprung forth from Rome crumbling daily to ruin. But through Christianity, to which they ascribed all the public misfortunes, a new and more glorious creation was to be called forth out of the ruins of the old one. Both

[1] Euseb. vit. Constant. l. II. c. 53.

the hostile and the peaceful relations of the Romans with the rude tribes, particularly those of German origin, which were the first, after the general migration of races, to take an important part in the grand historical events of the world, contributed to bring these tribes to their first acquaintance with the gospel. A man who lived in the early part of the fifth century, and was an eye-witness of these events, — the author of the work "de vocatione gentium, (probably Leo the Great, afterwards bishop of Rome, but then a deacon,)[1] remarks finely on this point: "The very weapons by which the world is upturned, must serve to promote the ends of Christian grace. Many sons of the church, who had been taken captive by the enemy, made their masters the servants of the gospel of Christ, and were teachers of the faith to those whose slaves they had become by the fortune of war. But other barbarians, who aided the Romans in war, learned among our people what they could not have learned at their own homes, and returned to their native land carrying with them the instruction they had received in Christianity."

We turn first to Asia. In the former period, it was remarked that Christianity had already made progress in Persia. The number of Christians had gone on increasing among all ranks until the beginning of the present period. At the head of the Christian church in Persia, stood the bishop of the royal residence and chief city of the ancient Parthian kingdom, namely, Seleucia Ctesiphon. But the Magians, the Persian sacerdotal caste, applied every means to counteract the spread of Christianity; and the Jews, who were thickly scattered over the Persian empire, joined also in these hostile machinations.

The emperor Constantine recommended the Christians to the protection of the Persian emperor, Shapur (Sapor) II., taking occasion of an embassy which the latter prince sent to him.[2] His letter contains nothing which alludes to the existence as yet of any persecution against the Christians in the Persian empire. At all events, it is certain, according to the more accurate chronology of the oriental accounts, that the beginning of the most violent and harassing persecution must not be placed, as the Greek writers on church history assert, under the reign of Constantine, but under that of his successor. But, if some oriental notices[3] are entitled to credit, this persecution was preceded by two others of shorter duration, in which many Christians suffered martyrdom — one in the year 330,[4] the other in the year 342.[5] Still it may be a question, whether those documents are worthy of entire confidence, and whether their narratives are chronologically accurate.

[1] L. II. c. 32.

[2] Euseb. IV. 9.

[3] See the two Chaldee documents extracted from the history of the Persian martyrs, in Stephan. Euod. Assemani acta martyrum orientalium et occidentalium appendix. p. 215.

[4] In the 18th year of the reign of Shapur, the beginning of which should be placed, according to Ideler's chronology, (see B. II. S. 558,) in the year 312.

[5] In the 30th year of his reign. The passage in the Acts of the second persecution, (Assemani, l. c. 227,) where Sapor, addressing the Christians, says: "What God is better than Hormuzd, or mightier than the terrible Ahriman," is hardly in agreement with the Persian religious ideas; for, according to these, Ahriman, the object of abhorrence, would scarcely be mentioned in such connection with Ormuzd.

The credible records of the principal persecution above mentioned, contain not a hint that others had preceded it. Moreover, the Greek church historians, notwithstanding the anachronism just mentioned, speak of but one persecution, and make no mention of any before this. They state, that at the time of the commencement of that principal persecution the Christian church was in a flourishing condition.

Now, with regard to the main persecution, which broke out in the year 343,[1] it is manifest that the hostile relations existing between the Roman and the Persian empires were the immediate occasion of it. It was attempted to excite the suspicions of the emperor against the Christians on political grounds, because of the correspondence which they maintained with their brethren of the same faith in the Roman empire. For this purpose, advantage was taken of the respect usually paid by the emperors at Constantinople to the chief of the Persian bishops. Thus, for example, the Persian Jews represented to the emperor Sapor, that, when the Roman emperor received from him magnificent epistles and costly presents, they were scarcely noticed, in comparison with a miserable note from the bishop of Seleucia Ctesiphon, to which the emperor paid every mark of respect.[2] So also Christian ecclesiastics were accused of harboring in their houses Roman spies; of betraying to them the secrets of the empire; of writing letters themselves to the Roman emperor, informing him of everything that transpired in the East.[3]

The objections brought against Christianity by the Persian civil authorities, mark the peculiar relation in which Parsism stood, both to Christianity generally, and to that prevailing tendency of the religious and moral spirit which obtained particularly among the Persian Christians. To those who held to the principles of the Parsic Dualism, in which the opposition between Ormuzd and Ahriman, and their respective creations, a pure and an impure one, was uniformly adhered to, the Christian monotheistic view of the universe must have appeared as a confounding of good and evil, of the godlike and the ungodlike, as a profanation of the holy essence of God; since God was made to be the creator of that which could proceed only from the evil principle. Accordingly, in the proclamation issued by the Persian commander and governor, Mihr-Nerseh, to the Christians in Armenia, about the middle of the fifth century, it is said:[4] "All that is good in heaven, Ormuzd created, and all that is evil was produced by Ahriman. Hatred, calamity, unhappy wars, all these things are the working of the evil principle; but, on the other hand, good fortune, dominion, glory, health of body, beauty of person, truthfulness in language, length of years, all these things proceed from the good principle. Evil, however, is mixed

[1] The most important records of its history, of which we shall say more hereafter, may be found in the collection of the acta martyrum, made under the direction of the Bishop Marathas, (see Assimani bibliotheca oriental. T. III. P. I. p. 73,) from which were derived also those narratives already made use of by the Greek historians of the church. These acta were published by Stephan. Euod. Assemani, in the work already cited.

[2] Acta martyrum, l. c. p. 20.

[3] L. c. f. 152.

[4] In the French version, in the Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie par St. Martin. T. II. Paris, 1819, p. 472.

with all. They who affirm that God created death, and that evil and good proceed from him, are in error: for instance, the Christians, who say that God, being angry with his servant because he had eaten a fig,[1] created death, and thereby punished men." In like manner, it was objected to the Christians, that they taught that insects, serpents, scorpions, were created by God, and not by the devil.[2] Although the Parsic religion acknowledged the being of one primal Essence, under the name of Zervan, (Κρόνος = the *αἰών*, *βυθός* of the Gnostics,) from whom all existence flowed; yet this idea of the one hidden, primal Essence, from the very nature of the case, retreated into the obscure; and the idea constantly predominant was that of Ormuzd, the revealer of this hidden, divine, primal Essence; the creator, the victorious antagonist of Ahriman; and, although *he* was the object of all prayer and adoration, yet various genii and powers of a pure, holy nature, which were supposed to have emanated from Ormuzd, received also a certain share of worship, so far as they represented him. The sun, fire, water, earth, as elements of a pure nature, working with the energy of Ormuzd, were objects of worship with the Persians; and hence it was objected to the Christians, that they worshipped only one God, but did not pay due honor to the sun, the fire, the water; especially, that they profaned the water by using it for improper lustrations. In the ritual of the Parsic religion, however, lustrations by water were frequently used. In the case last cited, either Christian baptism itself is represented as a profanation of the holy element, or else it is meant that the Christians paid no regard to the sacredness of water in their daily use of it.[3] As to the holy earth, the Persians believed, doubtless, that they saw it profaned by the burial of the dead; for this practice, too, was urged as an objection against the Christians.[4] It constituted, again, a part of the nature-worship of the Persians, that they looked upon many of the brute animals as being specially consecrated to Ormuzd, and sacred; while others were consecrated to Ahriman; — and hence the Christians were censured for slaughtering brute animals indiscriminately. Necessarily connected with the nature-worship of the Persians, with the idea, pervading the whole life of the Persians, that every man should be a servant of Ormuzd in the struggle to defend his holy creation against the destructive powers of Ahriman, was the precept of their religion, which required a life of activity and industry,

[1] The reason why the fig in particular comes to be mentioned here is, that many of the fathers of the oriental church, as for instance, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, (see his observations on the first chapters of Genesis, in the catena of Nicephorus, on the Octoteuch. Lips. 1770,) supposed it might be inferred from Genesis 3: 7, that this was the forbidden fruit.

[2] Assemani, l. c. fol. 181.

[3] See Herodot. l. I. c. 138.

[4] The custom of burying the dead contrasted strongly with the usage of the Persians at that period. The dead body was cast into the open field, as a prey for dogs and ravenous birds. They regarded it as a bad token, a sign that the deceased was an abandoned wretch and his soul belonged to the Dews, if the body was left untouched by the beasts of prey. The bones that were left, were allowed to moulder away on the ground. See Agathias, II. 22 and 23, pag. 113, ed. Niebuhr. This historian says expressly of the Persians: *Θήκῃ τὴν ἐμβάλειν ἢ λαρνάκι τοῦς τεθνεῶτας, ἢ καὶ τῇ γῇ καταχωννῦναι ἥκιστα ἐθέμις αὐτοῖς.* The former practice is noticed already by Herodotus, I. 140. He says, however, that the bones left behind were besmeared with wax, and buried.

devoted to the culture of nature. All employments, even that of war against the enemies of the servants of Ormuzd, were reckoned as belonging alike to the contest for Ormuzd against Ahriman. The gifts of nature were to be enjoyed as holy gifts of Ormuzd; every fortunate event was thus made holy; riches, and especially a numerous progeny,[1] were considered as blessings conferred by Ormuzd. But at this time an ascetic spirit had become diffused among the Christians of the East; and it is easy to imagine what a contrast this must have presented to the Persian view of life. Hence it was affirmed of the Christians, that they forbade men to marry and beget children; to do military service for the king; to strike any one.[2] And, in the above-cited proclamation of Mihr-Nerseh, it is said: "Believe not your leaders, whom you call Nazarenes;[3] they are deceitful knaves, teaching one thing and doing the contrary. They say, it is no sin to eat flesh; and yet they eat none. They say, it is right and befitting to take a wife; and yet they refuse even to look upon a woman. According to them, whoever accumulates riches is guilty of a great sin. They place poverty far above wealth; they praise poverty, and they defame the rich. They scorn the name of good fortune, and ridicule those who stand on the pinnacle of glory. They affect coarse garments, and they prefer common things to the costly. They praise death, and they have a contempt for life. They hold it an unworthy thing to beget men, and they praise barrenness. Follow their example, and the world would soon come to an end."

A Persian governor asks the Christians, Which is the true religion, that which was professed by the kings, the lords of the world, the nobles of the empire, the men of rank and of wealth; or that which they, poor people, had preferred to it? He reproached them as a people too indolent to apply themselves to those useful occupations by which men obtain wealth, and therefore so fond of praising poverty.[4] The doctrine, too, of the crucified Redeemer of mankind, appeared to the Persians preëminently foolish. Thus, in the proclamation above cited, it is said: "But what they have written, still more detestable than anything mentioned as yet, is this: that God was crucified for men; that he died, was buried, rose again, and finally ascended to heaven. Do such detestable opinions really deserve an answer? Even the *Dews*, (the demons of the Persians, the creatures of Ahriman,) who are bad, cannot be imprisoned and tortured by men; and it is pretended that this could be done to God, the Creator of all things!"

[1] See Herod. I. 136.

[2] Assemani, l. c. 181. Thus it was required of a Christian priest, if he would save his life, to worship the sun, to partake of blood, (the oriental Christians holding the ordinance mentioned in Acts 15: 29, to be still binding,) and to marry. Ass. l. c. 188.

[3] St. Martin is of opinion, that this name is used here as a general appellation of the Christians: but this will not do; for the subject of discourse here is the heads and teachers of the communities; and, moreover, the other remarks here cannot be referred to all Christians. We are to conceive rather, that this name (the monks being compared with the Nazarenes of the Old Testament) was in the East a common designation of the monks; and the clergy in these districts were then chosen, for the most part, from among the monks. Comp. e. g. *Gregor. Nazianz.* orat. p. 527, concerning the monks: Ναζαραίων χοροστασίαι, and οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς Ναζαραῖοι, orat. 19, p. 310.

[4] Assemani, l. c. 186.

The first ordinance of the emperor probably ran as follows: — *The Christians, unless they would consent to worship the Persian deities, should be required to pay an inordinate tax, levied on each individual.* This law may have been directed, perhaps, to the bishop of Seleucia, who was expected to collect the required sum from all the Christians, and pay it over. Simeon,[1] the venerable old man who then held this office, gave a high-hearted answer, which stood out in bold and striking contrast with the servile spirit of the Orientals; though it is wanting in the temper of Christian humility, and fails to mark the distinction between spiritual and political freedom. Yet it should be borne in mind, that the emperor probably demanded of the Christians an amount of money which they could not possibly raise, thinking to compel them in this manner to abjure their religion. The Christians, Simeon declares, whom their Saviour had emancipated by his blood from the most shameful yoke, and whom he had delivered from the most oppressive of burthens, could not submit to have such a yoke imposed on them. Far was it from them to be so foolish and sinful as to exchange the liberty which Christ had bestowed on them for slavery to men. "The Lord, whom we are resolved to obey, is the upholder and director of your government. We cannot subject ourselves to an unrighteous command of our fellow-servant." — "As God is the Creator of your divinity, (the sun,) so they held it to be a reckless thing to place God's creature on a level with himself. They had neither gold nor silver, as the Lord had forbidden them to heap up such treasures; and Paul had said to them, 'Ye are bought with a price; be no man's servants.'"[2] The emperor interpreted this letter as if Simeon invited the Christians to insurrection, and commanded that he and his people should be threatened with severe punishment. To this Simeon replied, that it was far from any thought of his to betray his flock for the purpose of saving his life and purchasing peace. He was ready, following the example of his Saviour, to give up his life for his flock. Sapor then declared: "Whereas Simeon scorns my authority, and obeys the Roman emperor, whose God alone he worships, but utterly despises my God, he must present himself before me and be executed." And he immediately issued another decree against the Christians: — *The clergy of the three first grades were to be immediately executed; the churches of the Christians demolished; their church utensils devoted to profane uses.*

Simeon, with two presbyters of his church, was conveyed in chains to Ledan, a city in the province of Huzitis, where the emperor then resided. Before this, he had never hesitated to prostrate himself, after the oriental manner, in the king's presence, — this being a custom of the country, which, in itself, contained nothing idolatrous. But now, when he was called upon to renounce the sole worship of his God, he declined doing this; since it behooved him at present to avoid every act which could be interpreted as if he gave to a creature the honor due to God alone. The emperor then required him to do homage to the sun, — assuring him that he might thus deliver himself and his

[1] Barsaboe, son of the leather-dresser. His father was the king's purple-dyer.
[2] L. c. IV.

people. To this Simeon replied, that he could still less pay to the sun, a lifeless being, that homage which he had declined showing to the king, who was a rational being, and therefore far more than the sun. As neither promises nor threats had any power to move him, the emperor ordered him to be thrown in prison till the next day, to see if he would not come to his senses.

To the Christians belonged at that time the head of the imperial household, and most considerable of the eunuchs, to whose care Sapor had been entrusted when a child, — the venerable Guhsciatazades. This person had been prevailed upon to do homage to the sun. When Simeon was conducted by him in chains, he fell on his knee, after the oriental manner, and saluted him. But Simeon turned away his head; for he had denied the faith. His conscience was awakened by this silent reproof: he witnessed a bold confession before the emperor, and was sentenced to lose his head. When brought already to the place of execution, he begged of the emperor, as a reward for the services he had rendered to his whole family, that it might be publicly made known how Guhsciatazades died, not because he had betrayed the secrets of the empire, or committed any other crime; but simply because, as a Christian, he refused to deny the God whom he professed to worship. He hoped that the example of his death in behalf of the faith which he had once denied, would have the more powerful effect on others. Sapor consented; not knowing the power of faith, and expecting that the terrible example would prove a warning to many: but he soon learned the contrary.

The aged Simeon, in his dungeon, had thanked God for the repentance and martyrdom of this brother in the faith. He rejoiced to learn that his own death would probably take place on the very day which the Persian Christians had consecrated to the memory of Christ's passion. So it happened. The next day after his arrest, and after the martyrdom of Guhsciatazades, he appeared before the emperor; and, showing that he was firm in his confession, he likewise was condemned to die. A hundred others of the clerical order, who had been condemned at the same time, were led out with him to the place of execution. Simeon and his two companions were to be reserved till the last. The whole design of the emperor was to shake his constancy, so that, through his example, he might work on the great mass of the Christians; and he hoped that the blood of so many shed before his eyes would make him waver; but he was mistaken. Simeon confirmed the band of confessors by his exhortations, and at last died himself with his two companions. It happened that one of these latter, Ananias, when it was his turn to strip himself and be bound, in order to receive the stroke of the axe, suddenly seized by the natural fear of death, trembled through his whole frame; the flesh only being weak, while the spirit was strong as before. When this was observed by Phusik, an officer of some rank, superintendent of all the workmen in the palace, who was himself a Christian, said he to him: "Never mind; shut your eyes but a moment, and partake of the light of Christ." This was immediately communicated to the king. Sapor was the more incensed at

the disobedience of Phusik, because but a short time had elapsed since he had conferred on him his new honors. Phusik declared that he would gladly exchange these poor honors for the crown of martyrdom. His tongue was torn out in the most cruel manner, and thus he died.[1]

Still more violent was the persecution in the following year, 344. An edict appeared, which commanded that all Christians should be thrown into chains, and executed. Many, belonging to every rank, died as martyrs. Among these was a eunuch of the palace, named Azades, a man greatly prized by the king. So much was the latter affected by his death, that he commanded the punishment of death should be inflicted from thenceforth only on the leaders of the Christian sect; that is, only on persons of the clerical order. Of these, a great number suffered martyrdom. Yet, within the space of the forty years during which this persecution lasted, it became occasionally more general and violent again, — which was especially the case towards its close.

The treaty of peace which terminated the unfortunate war of the Romans with the Persians under the emperor Jovian, was unfavorable to the interests of the Christians; the ancient Christian city Nisibis, on the border of Mesopotamia, being given up to the Persians. Yet the Christian inhabitants had permission to leave the country.

In the early part of the fifth century, by the wise and prudent conduct of a man zealously engaged in promoting the spread of the gospel, a very favorable change was brought about in the situation of the Christians, which might have been attended with important consequences for a long time in the future, if his labors had not been defeated by the imprudent zeal of another bishop. The bishop Maruthas, of Tagrit in Mesopotamia,[2] consented to serve as an agent in the negotiations between the emperors Arcadius and Theodosius II., and the Persian emperor Jezdegerdes II.; and, in these negotiations, he gained the esteem and confidence of the Persian emperor. The intrigues of the Magians to effect his downfall, he was enabled to defeat by his sagacity, and his reputation only rose higher. He obtained permission for the Christians to rebuild their churches, and to hold their meetings for divine worship; but the whole was made naught by the imprudent behavior of Abdas, bishop of Susa. The latter caused one of the Persian temples, (a πυρεῖον,) in which fire, the symbol of Ormuzd, was worshipped, to be demolished. Owing, perhaps, to the still remaining influence of the bishop Maruthas, Jezdegerdes at first showed a moderation seldom witnessed among oriental princes under the like circumstances. He summoned Abdas into his presence, mildly upbraided him for this act of violence, and simply required him to rebuild the temple. As the latter thought, however, that he could not conscientiously do this, and resolutely declined to do it, the king was greatly exasperated. He ordered the Christian churches to be destroyed, and Abdas to be executed (about the year 418.[3]) This was the commencement of a thirty years' persecution of the Christians in Persia, which, under the reign of Varanes,

[1] Assemani, Tom. I. 35. Sozom. l. II. c. 11.

[2] Maipheracta, Martyropolis.

[3] The judgment which the mild Theodo-

the successor of Jezdegerdes, from the year 421 and onward, became far more violent. Oriental cruelty invented against the Christians the most painful modes of death; and men of all ranks, even the highest, suffered martyrdom. Jacobus, a man belonging to one of the most distinguished families, had already been moved by his benefactor, the king Jezdegerdes, to deny the faith. But through the remonstrances of his mother and his wife, filled with remorse, he repented, and after this remained stedfast under protracted tortures, one limb being severed from his body after another. Once only, when his thigh was dismembered, a cry of anguish was heard from him: "Lord Jesus, help and deliver me, for the bands of death are about me."[1] Another noble Persian, Hormisdas, who was ordered by the king to deny his faith, answered: "You bid me do what is in itself a sin, and what you yourself cannot approve; for he who can consent to deny the Almighty God, will still more easily deny his king, who is a mortal man." The king thereupon deprived him of all his honors, confiscated his estate, and condemned him, naked, with only a girdle about his loins, to drive the camels in the rear of the army. But some days after, observing him, from his palace windows, in this pitiable condition, scorched by the sun, and covered with dust, he was seized with compunction. Summoning him to his presence, he ordered him to be clothed in a linen robe, and called on him anew to renounce his faith. But Hormisdas rent the linen robe in twain, saying: "If you suppose I shall renounce my faith for this, keep the gift by which you would bribe me to deny God. Of another Christian, by the name of Suenes, the master of a thousand slaves, Jezdegerdes demanded, after he had refused to deny his faith, which was the worst of his slaves, and immediately made the latter lord over the whole, including his old master.

Among other incidents, it so happened that a certain deacon, named Benjamin, was cast into prison. He pined away two years in his dungeon, until the arrival of an ambassador sent on other business from the Roman empire. The latter petitioned the king for the release of Benjamin; and it was accorded to him, on condition that he would never preach Christianity to any adherent of the Persian system of religion. The ambassador assented to this condition, without consulting with Benjamin. But, on communicating it to the latter, he declined it altogether, saying: "It is impossible for me not to impart to others the light that I have received myself; for the gospel history teaches us to what sorer punishment he justly exposes himself, who hides his talent." Notwithstanding, he obtained his freedom, under the presumption that after all he would comply with the condition. He continued to preach the gospel; and, having labored a year in this way, he was

retus, who relates this, passes on the bishop's conduct, is worthy of notice, (h. eccles. l. V. c. 39:) "I affirm, indeed, that the wrong time was chosen for the destruction of the fire-temple; for the apostle Paul himself, when he came to Athens and found the whole city given to idolatry, destroyed none of the altars which they reverenced, but by instruction refuted their ignorance, and showed them the truth. But that the bishop preferred rather to die than to rebuild the temple, commands my admiration; for to me it seems the same thing to worship fire, and to rebuild the temple for such worship."

[1] See Assemani acta Martyrum, l. c. p. 243.

accused before the king, who required him to deny the faith. Upon this, he asked the king to what punishment he would sentence the man who deserted his government, and swore allegiance to another. The king replied that he should sentence him to death. "Then," said Benjamin, "what punishment might not that person justly suffer, who should disown his Creator, and give the honor due to God alone to one of his fellow-servants?" He was executed with cruel torments.[1] The bishop Theodoretus of Cyros, on the Euphrates, wrote on this occasion to Eusebius, bishop of Persian Armenia, a letter of exhortation, breathing the genuine Christian spirit, in which he admonishes him to be not only steadfast in maintaining his own conflict, but forbearing and kindly provident towards the weak, — an exhortation which perhaps was not unnecessary to the Persian Christians, who were somewhat inclined, as it would seem, to a fanatical pride. "Let us be watchful," he writes,[2] "and fight for the sheep of our Lord. Their Master is at hand; he will surely appear, will scatter the wolves, and bestow honor on the shepherds. 'For the Lord is good unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him.' Lament. 3: 25. Let us not murmur at this storm which has arisen; for the Lord knows what is best. On this account, he did not grant the request even of his apostle, who besought him to deliver him from his trials; but said to him: 'My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness.' But I beseech you, let not our only care be for ourselves; but let us bestow still greater care on the others; for the precept has come down to us from the apostles, to 'comfort the feeble-minded, and support the weak.' 1 Thess. 5: 14. Let us reach forth our hand also to the fallen; let us heal their wounds, that we may put them also in battle-array against the wicked spirit. The Lord loves men; he receives the sinner's repentance; — let us hear his own words: 'As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live.' Ezek. 33: 11. For this reason, he has even confirmed his words by an oath, although he forbids the oath to others, in order to convince us that he longs after our repentance and our salvation. But the God of peace will shortly cause Satan to be trodden under your feet, and rejoice your ears with the tidings of your peace, when he shall say to the raging sea, 'Peace, be still.'"[3]

As many were inclined to save themselves by fleeing from the Persian dominion into the Roman empire, command was given to all the garrisons on the frontiers, and to the chiefs of the nomadic hordes in the Persian service who kept watch over the boundaries of the empire, to arrest all Christians who might attempt to leave the kingdom.[4] Many, nevertheless, succeeded in effecting their escape; and sought aid through Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, from the Roman emperor. On the

[1] Theodoret. V. c. 39. The same Theodoretus speaks of the steadfastness of the Persian Christians under all their tortures, de Græc. affect. curat. Disput. IX. pag. 935, T. IV. He finely remarks: "They mutilate and destroy the body, but cannot get at the treasury of faith."

[2] Epist. 78.

[3] Ep. 78.

[4] Vit. Euthym. c. 18. Coteler. Ecclesiæ Græcæ Monumenta, T. II. If this account is quite accurate, the order was issued already under the reign of Jezdegerdes, — unless he is confounded with Varanes.

other hand, the Persian king demanded the surrender of the fugitives. This being refused, led, in conjunction with various other difficulties, to the war between the two empires, which again operated unfavorably on the situation of the Persian Christians. But with the restoration of peace their prospects once more grew better. In particular, the charitable and Christian conduct of a pious bishop could not fail to make a favorable impression on the Persians. The Roman soldiers had carried off seven thousand Persian prisoners, whom nothing would prevail upon them to release, and who, deprived of all the necessary means of subsistence, were in the most pitiable condition. Then Acacius, bishop of Amida in Mesopotamia, called together his clergy, and said to them: "Our God needs neither dishes nor drinking-vessels, since he is all-sufficient in himself. Now as the church, through the love of its children, possesses many utensils of gold and silver, we must dispose of these to ransom and to refresh the prisoners." No sooner said than done: the prisoners were not only redeemed, but, after being provided with the means of subsistence, and with money to defray their travelling expenses, were sent back to their homes. This work of charity is said to have affected so deeply the heart of the emperor, embittered as it was against the Christians, that he desired an interview with the bishop.[1]

As doctrinal controversies in the Roman church, in the course of the fifth century, led to a schism between the Christian church of the Persian and that of the Roman empire, (concerning which we shall speak in the fourth section,) the political cause of the persecutions in Persia would thus be removed, and this circumstance would operate favorably on the situation of the Persian Christians.

By means of Persia, Syria, and other bordering provinces of the Roman empire, many seeds of Christianity would early find their way to *Armenia;* but the fanatical spirit of the Persico-Parthian religion was here for a long time an insurmountable obstacle to the spread of the gospel. The Armenian *Gregory*, who, on account of his apostolical activity, obtained the cognomen of "the Enlightener," (ὁ φωτιστής,) first led the way, by his active zeal, to a more general diffusion of Christianity in his native country, from the commencement of the fourth century and onwards; and it was by his means also that the Armenian king Tiridates was converted.[2] The old religion, notwithstanding this event, still continued to maintain itself in many of the Armenian provinces. In the beginning of the fifth century, Miesrob, who had once been the royal secretary, having devoted himself wholly to the service of religion, disseminated Christianity still more widely in countries to which it had not yet penetrated, by taking up his abode in those regions as a hermit. Up to this time, the Syrian version of the Bible, the authority of which was recognized in the Persian church, had been used in Armenia; and hence an interpreter was always needed to translate into the vernacular tongue the portions of scripture read at the public worship. Miesrob first gave his people an alphabet, and trans-

[1] Sozom. l. VII. c. 21, 22.

[2] See Moses Chorenens. hist. Armen. l. II. c. 77 and c. 88.

lated the Bible into their language.[1] Thus was the preservation of Christianity among this people made sure, even while the country was subjected to such dynasties as were devoted to the Zoroastrian or to the Mohammedan religion, and sought to supplant Christianity; — and a Christian literature proceeded from this time forward to form itself in Armenia. Miesrob was a successful and well-deserving laborer also among the neighboring kindred populations.

A party devoted to the ancient cultus, who continued to maintain themselves in some districts of Armenia, were encouraged and supported by those who held the same faith in Persia. The Persian kings were striving continually to extend their dominion over Armenia. Where they were victorious, they persecuted Christianity, and sought to restore the old religion. The Persian commander and governor, Mihr-Nerseh, about the middle of the fifth century, addressed a proclamation to all the Armenians, in which he affirmed that all who did not adopt the religion of Mazdejesnan (the Zoroastrian faith) must be mentally blind, and deceived by the wicked spirits, (the *Dews.*)[2] The Armenian governors and chiefs are said either to have answered in a written document the objections here made to Christianity, or to have appeared before a great tribunal, which was to decide the question on the affairs of religion. On this occasion, the Armenian nobles, whom the patriarch Joseph had assembled, A.D. 450, in the city of Ardaschad, declared that they preferred to die as martyrs rather than to deny their faith. After the Persian king, however, had summoned them to his court, and threatened them with a cruel death, they were prevailed upon to give in their denial. But the attempt of the Persians to extirpate Christianity by force, and to introduce the Zorastrian religion, brought about a universal popular movement, and a religious war, a thing of frequent occurrence in those regions.[3] It was amidst the distractions in which the Persian church, as well as the whole country, was then involved, that the Armenian *Moses* of *Chorene* wrote the history of his native land, which he concludes with sorrow and complaint.

The conversion of the race of *Iberians*, bordering on the North, (within the present *Georgia* and *Grusinia*,) proceeded from a very remarkable, insignificant beginning.[4]

Under the reign of the emperor Constantine, a Christian female, perhaps a nun, was carried off captive by the Iberians, and became the slave of one of the natives of the country. Here her rigidly ascetic and devotional life attracted the attention of the people, and she acquired their confidence and respect. It happened that a child who had fallen sick, was, after the manner of the tribe, conveyed from house to house, that any person who knew of a remedy against the disease

[1] Moses Chorenens. l. III. c. 47 and 52.

[2] See the proclamation, which has been already cited, in the Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie par St. Martin. Paris, 1819. T. II. p. 472.

[3] See the Mémoires sur l'Arménie, cited above. T. I. p. 323.

[4] Among this people, too, the prevailing religion was probably some modification of the Persian cultus, adapted to their rude manners. They worshipped an image of Ormuzd, notwithstanding that the genuine Zoroastrian religion allowed of no images. See Moses Chorenens. l. II. c. 83.

might prescribe for it. The child, whom no one could help, having been brought to the Christian woman, she said that *she* knew of no remedy; but that Christ, her God, could help even where *human* help was found to be unavailing. She prayed for the child, and it recovered. The recovery was ascribed to the prayer: this made a great impression, and the matter finally reached the ear of the queen. The latter afterwards fell severely sick, and sent for this Christian female. Having no wish to be considered a worker of miracles, she declined the call. Upon this, the queen caused herself to be conveyed to her; and *she* also recovered from her sickness through prayers of this female. The king, on hearing of the fact, was about to send her a rich present; but his wife informed him that the Christian woman despised all earthly goods, and that the only thing she would consider as her reward was when others joined her in worshipping her God. This, at the moment, made no farther impression on him. But sometime afterwards, being overtaken, while hunting, with gloomy weather, by which he was separated from his companions, and finally lost his way, he called to mind what had been told him concerning the almighty power of the God of the Christians, and addressed him with a vow, that, if he found his way out of the desert, he would devote himself entirely to his worship. Soon after, the sky cleared up, and the king safely found his way back. His mind was now well disposed to be affected by the preaching of the Christian female. Afterwards he himself engaged in instructing the men, while his queen instructed the women of his people. Next they sent in quest of teachers of the gospel and clergymen from the Roman empire; and this was the beginning of Christianity among a people [1] where it has been preserved, though mixed with superstition, down to the present times.[2]

From this tribe, the knowledge of Christianity may have been extended also to the neighboring populations. About the year 520,[3] Tzathus, prince of the Lazians, one of the tribes of this country, came on a visit to the emperor Justin. He received baptism, and Justin stood as his godfather. He returned back to his people, with a noble

[1] Betwixt the years 320 and 330.

[2] One of the original sources of this story is Rufinus, from whom the Greek church-historians have borrowed it. Rufinus had it from the mouth of the Iberian chieftain Bacurius, who had risen to the dignity of a Comes Domesticorum in the Roman empire, and, at the time Rufinus knew him, had become Dux over the borders of Palestine, (see Rufin. h. e. c. 10.) The simple tale bears within itself the marks of truth; and, indeed, the spread of Christianity has often received an impulse from similar occurrences. The second, perhaps independent, channel is the History of Moses of Chorene, (l. II. c. 83.) It is possible, indeed, that this historian took his account indirectly from the Greek writers, who were indebted for it to Rufinus. But, considering the vicinity of the country, it may be conceived, too, that he derived his account immediately from the spot. In favor of this latter supposition would be the slight discrepancies in the two several accounts, though these, too, might be accounted for by the story's being given in an Armenian dress. According to this writer, the name of the Christian woman was Nunia, and that of the prince, Miraus. The Christian woman was an Armenian; and the application for teachers of Christianity was made, not to the church of the Roman empire, but to the Armenian bishop, Gregory, who has been already mentioned. It may be a question, however, whether this modification of the story was not invented in favor of the Armenian church, to which the Iberian became subsequently united.

[3] 512, according to the era of Theophanes.

Greek lady, whom he had married, richly loaded with presents from the emperor, who acknowledged him as a king. In the time of the emperor Justinian, the assassination of a prince of this tribe, by a Roman general, produced among them a great excitement; and some individuals took advantage of this state of feeling to persuade them to drop their connection with the Roman people, and attach themselves to the Persian empire. But the fear lest a connection with the Persians would endanger their Christian faith, is said to have contributed especially to deter them from following this advice.[1] Another tribe also, belonging to this district, bordering on Mount Caucasus, namely, the *Abasgians*, were converted under the reign of the emperor Justinian. Until this time, groves and lofty trees (after the manner of the ancient Germans) had been the objects of their worship. The emperor Justinian sent them ecclesiastics, and founded among them a church. He produced a favorable disposition towards Christianity among the people, by forbidding their rulers to engage in the scandalous traffic in castrated slaves, to which many of the male children of the people were sacrificed.[2]

What we had to say respecting the vagueness of the accounts relative to the spread of Christianity in the earliest times in India, applies also to many of the accounts belonging to the earlier times of *this* period. The same cause of the obscurity still continued to exist; namely, the unsettled use of the name India, by which was understood sometimes Ethiopia, sometimes Arabia, and sometimes East India proper. At the same time, however, it should be borne in mind, that there was at this time a constant intercourse between all these countries by commercial connections and colonies, which also might serve as a channel for communicating Christianity from one of these districts to the other. The various passages, therefore, in which Chrysostom names the *Indian* among the different languages into which the holy scriptures had been translated, can settle nothing definitely; and even if it could be made probable, by the accompanying descriptions, that Chrysostom had really East India proper before his mind, still such rhetorical representations could not properly be considered as evidence to be relied upon, especially as he himself might possibly have been deceived by the vague meaning of the name. Of more importance, on this point, is what the Arian historian Philostorgius relates concerning the missionary Theophilus, who bore the cognomen of Indicus, (ὁ Ἰνδός.) This Theophilus had been sent by his countrymen, the inhabitants of the island Diu,[3] in the reign of the emperor Constantine, as a hostage to Constantinople. He was there educated, and trained for the spiritual office; afterwards consecrated as deacon, and still later made a bishop, that he might be prepared to preach the gospel to his countrymen, and to the Arabians. According to the representation of Philostorgius, in the extracts made by Photius, we should conceive, it is true, no other country to be meant here than Arabia. But the name *Diu* reminds us rather of East India proper, and, in particular, of the place by this name near the entrance of

[1] See Agathias III. 12, p. 165, ed. Niebuhr. [2] See Procop. de bello Gothico, l. IV. c. 3.
[3] Διβοῦς.

the Persian Gulf; the situation of which harmonizes, moreover, with Theophilus' journey from Arabia. Theophilus, it is said, went from Arabia to Diu, his native land; and from thence visited the other countries of India. Here he found still existing the Christianity which had been already planted in that region at an earlier period.[1] Perfectly certain and distinct accounts of the diffusion of Christianity in India we meet with first in Cosmas, who, on account of his travels in India, received the name *Indicopleustes*.[2] He found Christians in three different places in India; first, on the island *Taprobane*, called by the inhabitants Sieledibu, (the present Ceylon.) Here he found a church, which had been planted by Persian merchants residing on the spot, and which was presided over by a presbyter who had been ordained in Persia. This island carried on a brisk commerce with Persia and Ethiopia. Maritime commerce was the channel by which Christianity had reached this spot from Persia. Again, he met with Christians, and an ordained clergy, at *Male*, "where the pepper grows," (perhaps the present Malabar;) next, at Calliana, (perhaps Calcutta,) where there was a Persian bishop.[3] From the accounts of Cosmas, it is by no means to be gathered that Christianity had spread among the native population of these countries: it is only clear that commercial colonies of the Persians here practised the rites of Christian worship. These Persian Christians are the progenitors of the Christian colonies still existing on the coast of Malabar.[4]

We observed, it is true, that, perhaps already in the previous period, isolated attempts had been made to disseminate Christianity even in those parts of *Arabia* which were not subject to the Roman dominion; but concerning the success and issue of those attempts we have no accurate information. The nomadic life which prevailed over the largest portion of Arabia, ever presented a powerful hindrance to the spread of Christianity. For it is certain, that Christianity could strike its root deeply and firmly, only where it entered as a forming power into the whole life of the people. The extensive commercial intercourse between a part of Arabia and the Roman empire, induced the emperor Constantine to send an embassy, with numerous presents, to one of the powerful Arabian chiefs, the king of the ancient and mighty nation of the *Hamyares*, (Homerites,) or Sabæans, in Yemen, Arabia Felix. He was at pains to select for this mission the above-mentioned Theophi-

[1] When the Arian Philostorgius says: the inhabitants of this country needed no correction of their doctrine, i. e. their doctrine did not at all coincide with the Nicene creed, — they had preserved the ἑτεροούσιον unaltered from the beginning, this can only be understood to mean, that they had the older, more simple form of church doctrine, the subordination system, before it had undergone any further change by the dialectic process, — that form which would have satisfied the Arians. See Philostorg. III. 14.

[2] He had made these journeys first as a merchant, and afterwards communicated the geographical and ethnographical facts which he had collected in the τοπογραφία χριστιανική, which he wrote when a monk, in the year 585, published by Montfaucon in the collectio nova patrum et scriptorum Græc. Tom. II.

[3] See Cosmas. l. III. p. 178, in Montfaucon, and l. XI. pag. 336.

[4] The decyphering of the ancient documents of these Christians will perhaps throw more light on the subject of the spread of Christianity in India. See Tychsen's Dissertation de inscriptionibus Indicis in the Commentationes Soc. Reg. Gotting. recentiores Tom. V.

lus of Diu, who, by reason of the old commercial connections between his country and Arabia, and perhaps of his descent from some ancient Arabian colony,[1] might claim affinity with the race with whose language he was acquainted. This Theophilus, it is said, obtained permission from the Arabian chieftain to found a church, at the emperor's expense, in which Christian worship might be held for the benefit of the Roman merchants. The labors of Theophilus were attended with the happiest effects. He converted the prince of the country, who founded, at his own cost, three churches; one in the principal town of the nation, which was called *Zaphar;* another at the Roman port and commercial depot, *Aden;* and the third at *Hormuz*, the Persian place of trade on the Persian Gulf.[2] Theophilus, from the first, encountered the fiercest opposition from the Jews, whose influence in this country was great. The same party succeeded afterwards to supplant the Christian communities which had been able to maintain themselves here. See below.

Monks who lived in the deserts bordering on Arabia, and who came in contact with the wandering hordes of nomadic Arabians, acquired the respect and confidence of these rude men, and could take advantage of it to preach the gospel to them. Eusebius of Cæsarea relates that, in his time, Christian churches were planted in the deserts of the Saracens.[3] Bands of Saracens came, with their wives and children, to the monk Hilarion, and besought his blessing. He availed himself of these opportunities of exhorting them to the worship of the true God, and to faith in Christ.[4] Still later, about the year 372, it happened, that a Saracenian queen, Mavia or Mauvia, who was at war with the Romans, heard much of a Saracenian monk in the neighboring desert, by the name of *Moses*. She made it one of the conditions of peace, that this Moses should be given to her people as their bishop, which was granted.[5]

In the first half of the fifth century, Simeon the Syrian monk, (and Stylite,) who spent several years standing on a pillar thirty-six ells in height, by this extraordinary spectacle, and the complete subjection which he seemed to exercise over his body, drew upon himself, as might have been expected, the attention of the nomadic Saracens. They looked upon him as a super-earthly being, and placed great confidence in blessings which they obtained from him, as well as in his prayers. Hundreds and thousands came to him, and were moved by his exhortations to receive baptism. Theodoretus relates this as an eye-witness.[6]

Among the examples of conversion most deserving of notice, belongs the following: — The chief of a Saracenic tribe, whose name, according to the Greeks, was *Aspebethos*, was, at the beginning of the fifth

[1] See Arabia in Ritter's Geography; and in particular, B. II. p. 292; and Hartmann's Aufklärungen über Asien, B. II. S. 125, u. d. f.

[2] See Philostorg. II. § 6; III. § 4. As Theophilus was an Arian, we cannot think it strange that the other Greek writers of church history, who belong to the orthodox party, make no mention of these meritorious labors of an Arian.

[3] Commentar. in Jesaiam, in Montfaucon's collectio nova patrum, Tom. II. f. 521. Ἐκκλησίων Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις τῶν Σαρακήνων, καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἱδρυμένων.

[4] See Hieronymi vita Hilarionis, T. IV. ed. Martianay, p. II. f. 82.

[5] Socrat. IV. 36. Sozom. VI. 38. Rufin. II. VI. Theodoret. IV. 23.

[6] Hist. religios. c. 26, T. III. p. 1274.

century, attached to the service of the Persian empire; and the business assigned him was to watch over the boundaries. Now, the Christians in the Persian empire were at this time suffering persecution, and the Saracenic commander was ordered to seize and confine every Christian fugitive who attempted to pass the limits. But he was touched with pity towards them, and allowed them to pass free. Thus having brought persecution on himself, he fled to the Romans. He became head of an Arabian tribe in alliance with the latter. Sometime afterwards, believing himself indebted for the cure of his son, *Terebon*, to the prayer of the venerable monk Euthymius, he caused himself and his son to be baptized by the latter; and many of his tribe followed his example. He encamped in the neighborhood of Euthymius, and many other Saracens also pitched their tents near by. Euthymius had great influence over their minds. Finally, Terebon, having now arrived at mature age, became the chief of his tribe, and Ashebethos, who had taken the baptismal name of Peter, was made bishop of the several Saracenic bands. He was called the first Saracenic camp-bishop[1] in Palestine.[2] Somewhat later, in the beginning of the *sixth* century, occurred the conversion of a Saracenic sheikh, (φύλαρχος,) *Almundar;* perhaps not without some connection with the facts above related.[3]

We pass from Asia to Africa. The most important event in the present period, connected with the conversion of this quarter of the world, was the founding of the Christian church among the Abyssinians, in a population among whom it has preserved itself, down to the present time, as the dominant religion, amidst surrounding pagan and Mohammedan tribes, and which is perhaps destined to be an instrument, in the hands of Providence, for the benefit of this entire quarter of the world. In this case, also, the great work proceeded from an inconsiderable beginning. A learned Greek of Tyre, named Meropius, had, in the reign of the emperor Constantine, undertaken a voyage of scientific discovery. Already on the point of returning, he landed on the coast of Ethiopia or Abyssinia, to procure fresh water, where he was attacked, robbed, and himself and crew murdered, by the warlike natives, who were at that time in a state of hostility with the Roman empire. Two young men, his companions, Frumentius and Ædesius, alone were spared, out of pity for their tender age. These two youths were taken into the service of the prince of the tribe, and made themselves beloved. Ædesius became his cup-bearer; Frumentius, who was distinguished for intelligence and sagacity, was appointed his secretary and accountant. After the death of the prince, the education of *Æizanes*, the young heir, was entrusted to them; and Frumentius obtained great influence as administrator of the government. He made use of this influence already in behalf of Christianity. He sought the acquaintance of the Roman merchants visiting those parts, who were Christians; assisted them in founding a church, and united with them in the Christian worship of God. Finally, they obtained liberty to return home to

[1] Ἐπίσκοπος τῶν παρεμβολῶν.

[2] See Vita Euthymii in Cotelerii monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, T. II. c. 18, 19, 38, 39.

[3] See Theodoret. lector. l. II. fol. 564, ed. Mogunt. 1679.

their country. Ædesius repaired to Tyre, where he was made a presbyter. Here Rufinus became acquainted with him, and learned all the particulars of the story from his own mouth.[1] But Frumentius felt himself called to a higher work. He felt bound to see to it that the people with whom he had spent the greater part of his youth, and from whom he had received so many favors, should be made to share in the highest blessing of mankind. He travelled, therefore, to Alexandria, where the great Athanasius had recently been made bishop, (A.D. 326.) Athanasius entered at once, with ready sympathy, into the plan of Frumentius. But he found, very justly, that no one could be a more suitable agent for the prosecution of this work than Frumentius himself; and he consecrated him bishop of Auxuma, (Axum,) the chief city of the Abyssinians, and a famous commercial town. Frumentius returned back to this place, and labored there with great success. Subsequently, Theophilus of Arabia, who has already been mentioned, visited the same country, and repaired to the principal town, Auxuma, (Axum.) Theophilus being an Arian, and Frumentius, the friend of Athanasius, professing in all probability the doctrines of the council of Nice, it is possible a dispute may have arisen in their announcement here of their respective doctrines, which would necessarily be attended with unfavorable effects on the nascent church; but perhaps, too, Frumentius, who had not received a theological education, did not enter so deeply into theological questions. Still the emperor Constantius considered it necessary to persecute the disciples of the hated Athanasius, even in these remote regions. After Athanasius had been banished from Alexandria, in the year 356, Constantius required the princes of the Abyssinian people to send Frumentius to Alexandria, in order that the Arian bishop Georgius, who had been set up in place of Athanasius, might inquire into his orthodoxy, and into the regularity of his ordination.[2]

The fate of the Christian church among the Homerites, in Arabia Felix, afforded an opportunity for the Abyssinians, under the reign of the emperor Justin and Justinian, to show their zeal in behalf of the cause of the Christians. The prince of that Arabian population, Dunaan, or Dsunovas, was a zealous adherent of Judaism; and, under pretext of avenging the oppressions which his fellow-believers were obliged to suffer in the Roman empire, he caused the Christian merchants who came from that quarter and visited Arabia for the purposes of trade, or passed through the country to Abyssinia, to be murdered. Eles-

[1] Rufin. hist. eccles. I. c. 9.

[2] See the letter of Constantius, in the Apologia Athanasii ad Constantium, § 31. The princes of the Abyssinians are here called Αιζανας and Σαζανας. A Greek inscription, which proceeded from the former of these while he was still a Pagan, (he is here called Ἀειζανας,) has recently been discovered by the English in Abyssinia, and is given in Salt's Voyage to Abyssinia, p. 411. In this inscription, Ἀειζανας alone is called *king*. Σαιαζανας, on the other hand, together with Δηφας, is named his brother. But the fact may have been, that, when Constantius wrote his letter, the first of these had become co-regent. It is singular, however, that Constantius expresses himself as if Frumentius had then visited Auxuma for the first time. This might lead us to infer that there is some chronological inaccuracy in the narrative of Rufinus; as he places the ordination of Frumentius in the beginning of the episcopal presidency of Athanasius.

baan,[1] the Christian king of Abyssinia, made this a cause for declaring war on the Arabian prince. He conquered Dsunovas, deprived him of the government, and set up a Christian, by the name of Abraham, as king in his stead. But at the death of the latter, which happened soon after, Dsunovas again made himself master of the throne; and it was a natural consequence of what he had suffered, that he now became a fiercer and more cruel persecutor than he was before. Against the native Christians he raged with fire and sword. Many died as martyrs, especially in a town called Negran, inhabited for the most part by Christians. Upon this, Elesbaan interfered once more, under the reign of the emperor Justinian, who stimulated him to the undertaking. He made a second expedition to Arabia Felix, and was again victorious. Dsunovas lost his life in this war; the Abyssinian prince put an end to the ancient, independent empire of the Homerites, and established a new government favorable to the Christians.[2]

The Cosmas already mentioned, who composed his description of the earth in the time of the emperor Justinian, was aware that Christian churches, bishops, and monks, were then existing in Homeria, and the country of the Auxumites, or Ethiopia.[3] We learn also from him that many Christians, and persons of the clerical order, resided in the island of Socotora (*νῆσος Διοσκορίδους.*) The latter had been ordained in Persia, and it seems that Christianity had been conveyed there by means of the commercial connections with Persia.[4]

We now return to *Europe*. But we shall reserve many of the most important facts of this section, — the greatest part of that which relates to the diffusion of Christianity and the planting of the Christian church among the populations of *German* descent, who established themselves, after the migration of the nations, on the ruins of the Roman empire, — to the following period, so as not to separate what strictly belongs together, and that we may be enabled to survey at a single glance the whole missionary work among these populations. We shall notice here, therefore, only those matters which may be separately considered, and which may most easily be connected with the history of the church in the Roman empire.

[1] Theophanes is certainly mistaken, when, at the year 524, he relates that these events first led the Jewish king of Ethiopia to embrace Christianity, and to obtain a bishop from the emperor Justinian. Nor have we any good reason to presume, on the authority of this historian, that Christianity in Abyssinia had become extinct again, and was restored in consequence of these events. Much rather, the zeal of the Abyssinian monarch in the cause of the Christians, together with his own commercial interests and his connection with the Roman empire, was a sufficient reason why he should espouse the cause of the persecuted Christians in the neighboring country. Nor would it be difficult to show, that it was the effort to ascribe great effects to the zeal of the emperor Justinian in behalf of the Christian church, which led to this false report; as it was moreover ignorance respecting the precise time of the Abyssinian conversions, which led to the natural effort at explaining what was unknown by the method of combination. Procopius, a contemporary, calls the Ethiopian king, whose name with him is Ἑλλισθεαιος, a zealous Christian, de bello Pers. l. I. c. 20.

[2] F. Walch has undertaken to collect and compare all the conflicting oriental and Grecian notices of these events, — respecting which every particular fact cannot be certainly determined — in the two dissertations on this subject, in the IV. vol. of the novi commentarii soc. reg. Gotting. 1774.

[3] L. III. f. 179, l. c.

[4] See l. c.

Christianity had long since extended itself, as we remarked already in the previous period, among the Britons, the ancient inhabitants of England; while as yet the natives of Scotland and Ireland, the Picts and Scots, had heard nothing of the gospel. The incursions of these tribes into the province of the Britons often spread terror and devastation; and in these forages they frequently carried away with them, as slaves, large numbers of prisoners.

It was by an altogether peculiar combination of circumstances that, in the first half of the fifth century, the man was trained and prepared for his work who was the means of first planting the Christian church in Ireland. This was Patricius (or, as he was called in his native country, *Succath.*) The place of his birth was *Bonnaven*, which lay between the Scottish towns Dumbarton and Glasgow, and was then reckoned to the province of Britain. This village, in memory of Patricius, received the name of Kil-Patrick or Kirk-Patrick.[1] His father, a deacon in the village church, gave him a careful education. He was instructed, indeed, in the doctrines of Christianity; but he did not come to know what he possessed in this knowledge, until the experience of great trials brought him to the consciousness of it. At the age of sixteen, he, with many others of his countrymen, was carried off by Scottish pirates to the northern part of the island *Hibernia* (Ireland.) He was sold to a chieftain of the people, who made him the overseer of his flocks. This employment compelled him to spend much time in the open air; and solitude became pleasant to him. Abandoned of all human aid, he found protection, help, and solace in God, and found his chief delight in prayer and pious meditation. He speaks of all this himself, in his confessions:[2] "I was sixteen years old, and I knew not the true God; but, in a strange land, the Lord brought me to the sense of my unbelief, so that, although late, I minded me of my sins, and turned with my whole heart to the Lord my God; who looked down on my lowliness, had pity on my youth and my ignorance, who preserved me ere I knew him, and who protected and comforted me as a father does his son, ere I knew how to distinguish between good and evil."

He had spent six years in this bondage, when twice in dreams he thought he heard a voice bidding him fly in a certain direction to the sea-coast, where he would find a ship ready to take him, and convey him back to his country. He obeyed; and, after various remarkable experiences of a guiding Providence, he found his way back to his friends.

Ten years afterwards, he was a second time taken captive by Scottish freebooters, and conveyed to Gaul, where, by means of Christian merchants, he obtained his freedom. He then returned back to his country, and his friends were greatly rejoiced to have him once more among them. He might now have lived quietly with his friends; but he felt within him an irrepressible desire to carry the blessing of the

[1] The collection of old traditions in Usser. Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates, f. 429.

[2] This work bears in its simple, rude style, an impress that corresponds entirely to Patricius' stage of culture. There are to be found in it none of the traditions which perhaps proceeded only from English monks, — nothing wonderful, except what may be very easily explained on psychological principles. All this vouches for the authenticity of the piece.

gospel to those Pagans with whom he had spent a great part of his youth. He thought he was called upon, by nightly visions, to visit Ireland, and there consecrate his life to Him who had given his own life for his ransom. The remonstrances and entreaties of kindred and friends could not prevent him from obeying this call. "It was not in my own power," says Patricius, "but it was God who conquered in me, and withstood them all." It seems that he now betook himself first to France,[1] for the purpose of fitting himself still better for his work, in the society of pious monks and clergymen.

As the old legends relate, he next made a journey to Rome, in order to receive full powers and consecration to his office from the Roman bishop. The news of the death of the archdeacon Palladius,[2] who had been sent from Rome as a missionary to Ireland, but had accomplished very little on account of his ignorance of the language, having just arrived there, (in the year 432,) the Roman bishop, Sixtus III., did not hesitate to appoint Patrick in his place. We cannot, it is true, pronounce this tradition at once to be false; yet we shall be struck with many difficulties upon examining it. If Patrick came to Ireland as a deputy from Rome, it might naturally be expected that in the Irish church a certain sense of dependence would always have been preserved towards the mother church at Rome. But we find, on the contrary, in the Irish church afterwards, a spirit of church freedom similar to that shown by the ancient British church, which struggled against the yoke of Roman ordinances. We find subsequently among the Irish a much greater agreement with the ancient British than with Roman ecclesiastical usages. This goes to prove that the origin of this church was independent of Rome, and must be traced solely to the people of Britain. Moreover, Patrick could not have held it so necessary as this tradition supposes he did, either as a Briton or according to the principles of the Gallic church, to obtain first from the Roman bishop full powers and consecration for such a work. Again, no indication of his connection with the Roman church is to be found in his confession; rather everything seems to favor the supposition, that he was ordained bishop in Britain itself, and in his forty-fifth year.[3] And it

[1] His biographer, Jocelin, a writer in the 12th century, makes his journey to France follow after his return to Ireland; and this harmonizes, moreover, with the confessions of Patrick; although it is possible that, immediately after his release, since this took place in France itself, he entered on his travels to visit the more celebrated cloisters of this country. That he maintained an intimate correspondence with the pious men of southern France, may be gathered from his confessions, where he says that he would be glad to visit once more, not only his native country, but also Gaul: Eram usque Gallias, visitare fratres, et ut viderem faciem sanctorum Domini mei.

[2] From the notices of Prosper Aquitanicus, it appears that the bishop Cœlestinus of Rome had ordained Palladius as a bishop for the Scots, by whom perhaps may have been intended the Irish; and, according to these accounts, he must have accomplished a good deal. But Prosper may perhaps have received, at his distance from Rome, exaggerated stories. He says in his Chronicle, under the year 431: Ad Scotos *in Christum credentes* ordinatus a Papa Cœlestino Palladius, et primus episcopus mittitur; and in the liber contra Collatorem, c. 21, § 2: Ordinato Scotis episcopo, fecit etiam barbaram (insulam) Christianam. The tradition of the mission of Palladius to Ireland seems, according to the citations of Jocelin, to have been preserved in that country for a long period; but also the tradition that the conversion of the nation was not due to his labors, but was reserved for those of Patrick.

[3] Patrick intimates in his confession, c. 3, that some respectable clergymen in

may be easily explained, how the tendency of later monks, to trace the founding of new churches to Rome, might, among so many other fabulous legends, give rise also to this.

Arrived in Ireland, he possessed a great advantage in prosecuting his work, from his knowledge of the customs and the language of the country. He assembled around him in the open fields, at the beat of a drum, a concourse of people; where he related to them the story of Christ, which relation manifested its divine power on their rude minds. It is true, the people were excited against them by those powerful priests, the Druids; but he did not allow himself to be frightened on this account. As the chief men had it in their power to do him the most injury, while they remained under the dominion of these Druids, he labored especially to gain access to them. Perhaps numbers were already prepared for the faith in the gospel, like that Cormac, an Irish prince, belonging to the last times of the fourth century, who, after having abdicated his government and given himself up to silent reflection and religious contemplation in solitude, is said to have come to the conviction of the vanity of the Druidical doctrines concerning the gods.[1]

A proof of the power exercised by Patrick over the youthful mind is seen in the way in which he is said to have drawn to him those who were to be his successors in the guidance of the Irish church. He came into the house of a person of rank, taught there, and baptized the family. The young son of the house was so attracted by the impression of the looks and words of Patrick, that he could never afterwards be separated from him. He followed him and kept close to him amid all his dangers and sufferings. Patrick is said to have named him Benignus, on account of his kindly nature. He is said also to have converted one of the chief bards, called Dubrach MacValubair; and the minstrel who had been used to rehearse the Druidical doctrine of the gods, now composed songs in praise of Christianity[2] — a circumstance which would have no inconsiderable influence on a people naturally inclined to poetry and music.

The lands which he received as presents from converted chieftains, Patrick applied to the founding of cloisters, having contracted in France a predilection for the monastic life. The cloisters were designed to serve as nursing schools for teachers of the people, and from them was to proceed the civilization of the country. Although Patrick was qualified himself to impart but little scientific instruction to his monks, yet

Britain opposed his consecration to the episcopal office. He intimates that his enemies turned against him the confession of a sin, committed thirty years before, which confession he had made before he was chosen deacon. And from what follows, it is quite evident that this has reference to something he had done when a boy of *fifteen*. It would follow from this, then, that he was ordained bishop in his forty-fifth year, and so probably commenced his labors in Ireland in the same year of his life. Now if we could also determine with accuracy the year of his birth, we might fix precisely the year of his episcopal ordination and his missionary journey. But this is a point with regard to which nothing can be considered as settled; the chronological data of the traditions, both in Usher and in Jocelin, being, to say the least, extremely uncertain.

[1] See the History of Ireland, by F. Warner, vol. I. p. 247.

[2] Jocelin. c. V. § 38. Mensis Mart. d. XVII.

he infused into them the love of learning, which impelled them subsequently to seek for more information, and for books, in Britain and France. Yet he gave them the first means of all culture, in inventing an alphabet for the Irish language.[1] He had much to bear continually from the opposition of the pagan chiefs. He was once, with his attendants, fallen upon by one of these chiefs, robbed, and detained fourteen days in captivity.[2] Often he sought to purchase quiet for himself and his friends by presents. And it was not with Irish Pagans alone that he had to contend. A piratical British chieftain, named Corotic, from the district of Wallia, (Wales,) fell upon a number who had been recently baptized by Patrick, carried off a part of them captives, and sold them as slaves to heathen Picts and Scots. To this man, who professed outwardly to be a Christian, Patrick wrote an emphatically threatening letter, which has been preserved, and excommunicated him from the church. Glad as he would have been to visit his old friends in Britain and in France, yet he could not think it right to leave the new church. "I pray God," he said, after a long residence among this people, "that he would grant me perseverance to enable me to approve myself a faithful witness, for the sake of my God, to the end. And if I have ever labored to accomplish anything good for the sake of my God, whom I love, may he grant that, with those converts and captives of mine, I may pour out my blood for his name!"

The *Goths* belonging to the stocks of *Germanic* descent, first had opportunity of coming to the knowledge of Christianity by means of their wars with the Roman empire, probably as early as the second half of the preceding period. During those incursions which, in the time of the emperor Valerian, they made into Cappadocia and the bordering countries, they are said to have carried away captive many Christians, and, among the rest, persons of the clerical order. These remained with the Goths, propagated themselves among them, and labored for the diffusion of Christianity.[3] Accordingly we find already among the bishops who subscribed their names to the decisions of the Nicene council, a certain *Theophilus*, who is called bishop of the Goths.[4]

From one of these Christian families of Roman origin, which had thus continued to propagate itself among the Goths, *Ulphilas*, who is entitled to the credit of having done most for the spread of Christianity and Christian culture among the Goths, is said to have sprung.[5] Ulphilas did the Goths important service in their negotiations with the Roman emperors, a business for which he was eminently fitted on account of his relationship with both nations. He thus won their love and confidence,

[1] Of the zeal for the monastic life which he inspired, Patrick speaks himself in his confessions: Filii Scotorum et filiæ regulorum monachi et virgines Christi esse videntur. Opuscula Patricii, ed. J. Waræi, pag. 16.

[2] L. c. Waræus, p. 20.

[3] Philostorg. II. 5.

[4] Socrat. hist. eccles. l. II. c. 41.

[5] As Philostorgius, himself a Cappadocian, distinctly mentions the village to which the family of Ulphilas originally belonged, we have the less right to call in question his statement. The manifestly German name Wolf, Wölfel, furnishes no proof to the contrary; for their residence among the Goths might unquestionably have induced the members of this family to give themselves German names. Moreover, Basil of Cæsarea (ep. 165) says that the Goths received the first seeds of Christianity from Cappadocia.

of which he could avail himself to promote the spread of Christianity. He was consecrated bishop of the Goths, and secured the means for a permanent propagation of Christianity among them, particularly by inventing an alphabet for them, and by translating the holy scriptures into their language. He is said, however, to have omitted in this translation the books of the Kings, to which the books of Samuel, also, were then reckoned, that nothing might be presented which was calculated to foster the warlike spirit of the Goths.[1]

Certain as these facts are in general, yet it is difficult to fix with precision the time when Ulphilas first made his appearance as a teacher amongst his people, and when he was employed in the negotiations with the Roman empire; for on these points there are many contradictory statements in the historians of the church.[2] These, however, admit of

[1] Philostorg. II. 5.

[2] According to Philostorgius, Ulphilas was employed in negotiations with the emperor Constantine, who had a high respect for him, and was used to call him the *Moses* of his time. Constantine permitted the Goths to settle down in the district of Mœsia. At this time Ulphilas was consecrated bishop of the Goths by Eusebius of Nicomedia. According to Socrates, II. 41, Ulphilas subscribed, in the first place, the Arian creed, drawn up at Constantinople, in the year 360, under the emperor Constantius. Before this, he was an adherent of the Nicene doctrine; for he followed the teaching of the Gothic bishop Theophilus, who had been one of the signers of the Nicene creed. Next, the same church-historian relates, IV. 33 that the assistance and support which the emperor Valens afforded to that portion of the Goths to which Ulphilas belonged, induced many of them at that time to embrace Christianity, but at the same time also to espouse the Arian doctrine then prevailing in the Roman empire. He places the origin of Ulphilas' version of the scriptures as late as the time just referred to. Sozomen (IV. 24 and VI. 37) agrees in the main with Socrates, and only adds that Ulphilas was at first a follower of the doctrines of the Nicene council; that, in the time of the emperor Constantius, he had, indeed, imprudently become intimate with certain bishops of the Roman empire who professed Arianism, yet continued to maintain his fellowship with the orthodox bishops according to the Nicene council. But, having come to Constantinople on occasion of certain negotiations with the emperor Valens, he was moved by the persuasions of the dominant Arian bishops, and by their promises to give him their support with the emperor, to embrace Arianism. Theodoretus, IV. 37, reports that the Goths were devoted to the true faith until the time of the emperor Valens; but that, under this emperor, the Arian dominant bishop at court, Eudoxius, represented to them that agreement in religious doctrine would render the union between them and the Romans more secure. But he was able to effect nothing with them until he applied himself to their influential bishop, Ulphilas, and succeeded, by persuasive speeches and by money, to win him over. He so represented the matter as if the dispute between the two parties related only to unimportant differences, and was made so important merely through their obstinacy and love of dispute.

If we compare together these accounts, we find that Philostorgius departs from all the other church-historians in placing the whole period of Ulphilas' labors within the reign of the emperor Constantine, and making no mention whatever of the negotiations in the time of Valens, which were the most important. But as the accounts of the others presuppose also that the Goths had long been Christians; as Socrates and Sozomen assume that Ulphilas was already bishop in the reign of Constantius, the account of Philostorgius may certainly be brought into agreement with these reports. If it may only be supposed — against which supposition there is no reasonable ground of objection — that Ulphilas lived to a very old age, it may be assumed, that he began his labors as a bishop among the Goths as early as the time of Constantine; for it is very possible, certainly, that he may have exercised the functions of the episcopal office through a period of *fifty* years.

In the next place, it must be remarked, that Philostorgius, being an Arian, had an interest in making it appear that Ulphilas was an Arian from the first; while, on the other hand, the other church-historians, as opponents of Arianism, were interested to represent the fact as if Ulphilas was in the first place orthodox, and to trace his defection from the orthodox doctrines to outward influences and causes, and hence to fix the time of this defection under the reign of an emperor who was zealously devoted to Arianism. It is very possible that Ulphi-

being reconciled with each other by supposing that Ulphilas first began his labors, as a bishop among the Goths, in the time of Constantine; and that he continued to prosecute them until near the close of the reign of the emperor Valens; that he repeatedly conducted the negotiations between the Goths and the Roman empire, and in this way ever rose higher in the confidence of the former.

Athanasius, in a work which he wrote while a deacon, previous to the time of the Nicene council, speaks of the diffusion of Christianity among the Goths, and alludes to the fact that the ameliorating influence of this religion had already begun to manifest itself on that people.[1] He says, with regard to the effects of Christianity among these rude tribes: "Who is it that has wrought this; that has united in the bonds of peace those who once hated one another; — who else than the beloved Son of the Father, the common Saviour of all, Jesus Christ, who, through love to us, suffered everything for our salvation? For already of old the *peace* that should go out from him had been the subject of prophecy, since the holy scriptures say, Isa. 2: 4: 'Then they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' And this is nothing incredible; since even now the barbarians, to whom savagery of manners is a nature so long as they worship dumb idols, rage against each other, and cannot remain one moment without the sword; but, when they hear the doctrine of Christ, immediately they turn away from war to agriculture; — instead of arming their hands with the sword, they lift them up in prayer; and, in a word, from henceforth, instead of carrying on war with each other, arm themselves against Satan, striving to conquer him by the bravery of the soul. And the wonder is, that even they despise death, and become martyrs, for the sake of Christ."

The division of the Goths among whom Ulphilas appeared, were the Thervingians, under king Fritiger — the West-Goths; and these were at war with the Greuthingians, whose king was Athanarich — the East-Goths.[2] When, therefore, Ulphilas labored to diffuse Christianity also among the Greuthingians, his efforts met with opposition; Christianity was persecuted by them, and many died as martyrs.[3] The martyrs certainly contributed greatly among the Goths also to the spread of the gospel.[4]

The historian Eunapius relates that the Goths, in the time of the

las had received the simple form of the doctrine of Christ's divinity from the older Roman church; that in the beginning he held simply to this, without taking any part in the dialectic doctrinal controversies, until, by coming in contact, in various ways, with the Arian bishops, he was led to embrace the Arian system.

[1] Athanas. de incarnatione verbi, § 51 et 52.

[2] See the passages above cited, from Socrates and Sozomen, and Ammian. Marcellin. 31, 4, etc.

[3] It is interesting to observe that Socrates, IV. 33, recognized even among the Goths, although they were Arians, the genuine spirit of martyrdom. For he says, although the barbarians erred through their simplicity, yet they despised the earthly life for the sake of the faith in Christ: Ἁπλότητι τὸν χριστιανισμὸν δεξάμενοι, ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως τῆς ἐνταῦθα ζωῆς κατεφρόνησαν.

[4] Comp. Basil. Cæsareens. ep. 155, 164, 165, in which letters of about the year 374, mention is made of the martyrs among the Goths. Basil procured relics of the martyrs who died there.

emperor Valens, while they contrived to maintain in great secrecy the ancient rites of their national religion, often assumed the outward show of Christianity, and carried about with them pretended bishops in their wagons, for the purpose of gaining thereby the favor and confidence of the Byzantine court; which they could the more easily deceive, as they had among them people who wore the monkish dress, and whom they pretended to call monks, because they understood in what high esteem this class of men stood among the Christians.[1] It is true, the mere assertion of this violent enemy of the Christians is no sufficient authority for a fact of this sort. At all events, he expresses himself in too general terms. Yet very possibly the Goths were shrewd enough to discern that, in this way, they could most easily deceive the Byzantine court; and it may be that, in some particular cases, they resorted to this means of deception; although, in the main, there can be no question with regard to the reality of the conversion of the Goths to Christianity.

The great Chrysostom, while patriarch of Constantinople, and during his exile after he was expelled from Constantinople, labored earnestly for the establishment of missions among the Goths. He set apart a particular church at Constantinople for the religious worship of the Goths; where the Bible was read in the Gothic translation, and discourses were preached by Gothic clergymen in the language of their country. He adopted the wise plan of here training up missionaries for the people from among the people themselves. On a certain Sunday, in the year 398 or 399, after causing divine worship to be celebrated, the Bible to be read, and a discourse to be preached, by Gothic ecclesiastics in the Gothic tongue, to the great surprise no doubt of the refined Byzantians in the assembly, who looked down upon the Goths as barbarians, he took advantage of this remarkable scene, to point out to them, in the example before their own eyes, the transforming and plastic power of Christianity over the entire human nature, and to enlist their sympathies in the cause of the mission. He delivered a discourse, which has come down to us, full of a divine eloquence, on the might of the gospel, and the plan of God in the education of mankind.[2] Among other things he remarks, quoting the passage in Isa. 65: 25: "'The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock.' The prophet is not speaking here of lions and lambs, but predicting to us that, subdued by the power of the divine doctrine, the brutal sense of rude men should be transformed to such gentleness of spirit, that they should unite together in one and the same community with the mildest. And this have you witnessed to-day — the most savage race of men standing together with the lambs of the church — one pasture, one fold for all — one table set before all." Which may refer

[1] See Eunapii Excerpta, in Maii scriptorum veterum nova collectio, Tom. II. Romæ, 1827, p. 277 and 78. Ἦν δὲ καὶ τῶν καλουμένων μονάχων παρ' αὐτοῖς, γένος κατὰ μιμήσιν τῶν παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐπιτετηδευμένων, οὐδὲν ἐχούσης τῆς μιμησέως πραγματῶδες καὶ δύσκολον, ἀλλ' ἐξηρκεῖ φαία ἱματία συροῦσι χιτώνια, πονήροις τὲ εἶναι καὶ πιτυέσθαι, which the fierce enemy of Christian monasticism could not deny himself the gratification of adding.

[2] The VIII. Homily, among those first published by Montfaucon, Tom. XII. opp. Chrysostom.

either to the common participation in the sacred word, which had been presented first in the Gothic and then in the Greek language, or to the common participation in the communion.

The Gothic clergy began already to busy themselves with the study of the Bible. The learned Jerome was surprised, while residing at Bethlehem, (in 403,) by receiving a letter from two Goths, Sunnia and Fretela, making inquiries about several discrepancies which they had observed between the vulgar Latin and the Alexandrian version of the Psalms; and Jerome begins his answer[1] in the following words: "Who would have believed, that the barbarian tongue of the Goths would inquire respecting the pure sense of the Hebrew original; and that, while the Greeks were sleeping, or rather disputing with each other," (according to another reading — "despising it,") "Germany itself would be investigating the divine word?"[2] Jerome could say, that the red and yellow-haired Goths carried the church about with them in tents; and perhaps, for this reason, battled with equal fortune against the Romans, because they trusted in the same religion.[3]

The influence of Christianity was, perhaps, seen also in those who as yet made no profession of it, when Alaric, the leader of the West-Gothic army, captured Rome, and spread consternation all around. The churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the chapels of the martyrs, became the universal places of refuge; and they remained, with all their treasures, and all the men who had fled to them, respected and spared amid all the havoc of devastation. Not a man of the barbarians touched these spots; nay, they conveyed thither themselves many unhappy individuals who had excited their pity, as to a place of safety. Pagans, who had ascribed to Christianity all the calamities of the period, and Christians, united here in giving thanks to God. "He who does not see," exclaims Augustin, speaking of this fact,[4] "that the thanks for this are due to the name of Christ, to the Christian period, must be blind; he who does see it, and praises not God, is an ingrate; he who would hinder them that praise God, is a madman. Far be it from any intelligent man to ascribe this to the rudeness of barbarians. He bridled and tempered the savage nature of the barbarians in a miraculous manner who had said long before: 'Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless, my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from them.'" Ps. 89: 32, 33.

[1] Ep. 106, in the edition of Vallarsi; — in other editions, ep. 98.

[2] Quis hoc crederet, ut barbara Getarum lingua Hebraicam quæreret veritatem; et dormitantibus, immo contendentibus (or contemnentibus) Græcis, ipsa Germania Spiritus Sancti eloquia scrutaretur?

[3] Ep. 107 ad Letam, § 2. Getarum rutilus et flavus exercitus ecclesiarum circumfert tentoria.

[4] De civitate Dei, l. I. c. 7.

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION. CHURCH DISCIPLINE. SCHISMS OF THE CHURCH.

I. History of the Church Constitution.

1. *Relation of Church to State.*

In the relation of the church to the state, there occurred, with the commencement of this period, a most important change, the consequences of which extended to all parts of the church constitution, and which had an influence, in various ways, on the whole course and shaping of the church development. In the preceding period, the church stood to the state in the relation of an independent, self-included whole, and was to the state, for the most part, an object of hostility. At all events, the utmost which she could expect from the state was bare *toleration*. The important consequence of this was, that the church was left *free* to develope itself outwardly from its own inward principle; — that no foreign might could introduce its disturbing influence; and that the church itself could not be exposed to the temptation of employing an alien power for the prosecution of its ends, and of thus entering into a province that did not belong to it. But, on the other hand, the church had no immediate influence on civil society and its different relations. In this there was much which stood in contradiction with the spirit that animated the church; the transforming influence which Christianity necessarily exercises on all with which it comes in contact, could not as yet here manifest itself. Only in an indirect manner — and, in this respect, we must allow, although in a very slow, yet in the safest and purest way — could the church exert an influence on the state, by ever drawing over more of its members into itself, and communicating to them the spirit by whose influence everything must be made better. Yet this, however, could not take place in all the members of the church at once; but only in those who, while they belonged to the visible church, belonged at the same time also, by the disposition of their minds, to the invisible church. From such only could proceed the new creation which the spirit of Christianity produces, as they alone had experienced this creation in their own hearts. But, with the commencement of this period, the church entered into an entirely different relation to the state. It did not merely become a whole, recognized as legal, and tolerated by the state, — which it had been already from the reign of Gallien down to the Dioclesian persecution, — but the state itself declared its principles to be those to which everything must be subordinated. Christianity became, by degrees, the dominant state religion, though not entirely in the same sense as Paganism had been before. Church and state constituted, henceforth, two wholes, one

interpenetrating the other, and standing in a relation of mutual action and reaction. The advantageous influence of this was, that the church could now exert its transforming power also on the relations of the state; but the measure and the character of this power depended on the state of the inner life in the church itself. The healthful influence of the church is indeed to be perceived in many particular cases; though it was very far from being so mighty as it must have been, had everything proceeded from the spirit of genuine Christianity, and had the state *actually* subordinated itself to this spirit. But, on the other hand, the church had now to struggle under a great disadvantage; for, instead of being left *free*, as it was before, to pursue its own course of development, it was subjected to the influence of a foreign, secular power, which, in various ways, would operate to check and disturb it; and the danger, in this case, increased in the same proportion as the political life with which the church came in contact was corrupt, and a lawless, despotic will ruled supreme, — a will which acknowledged no restraints, and which, therefore, whenever it intermeddled with the church development, was prone to act after the same arbitrary manner as it did elsewhere. So it actually happened in the East Roman empire. Without doubt, it belongs to the essential character of Christianity, that it can propagate itself even under the most depressing of earthly relations, and, by the surpassing energy of its spirit, break through every species of temporal bondage. This was seen under the empire of Pagan Rome, and in the Persian empire. Despotism, arrayed in open hostility to Christianity, only served to call forth, in still greater strength, the Christian sense of freedom rising superior to all earthly constraint. But despotism in outward alliance with the church, proved a more dangerous enemy. It was now necessary that one of two things should happen; — either the spirit of Christianity, as it became more widely diffused, must — not by a sudden and glaring revolution, but by its power in the heart, which is far mightier than any arm of flesh — gradually introduce the order of law in the place of arbitrary despotism; or the corruption of the state would introduce itself into the church, as it actually did in the Byzantine empire. Furthermore, the church was now exposed to the temptation of appropriating a foreign might for the prosecution of its ends; a temptation ever ready to assail man, the moment the spirit is no longer sovereign alone, but the flesh intermeddles with its proper work. Looking only at the holy end which he fancies himself in pursuit of, any means that can subserve it seem good to him. He does not consider that the *truth itself*, forced on man otherwise than by its own inward power, *becomes falsehood*. How easily might the bishops, in their zeal, — more or less unwise, more or less directed by selfish views, — be tempted to invite those emperors who professed to belong to the Catholic church, to assist in securing the victory for that which *they* deemed the pure doctrine, and in crushing its adversaries; — when, in fact, the Syrian bishops, in the previous period, had already sought after the aid of a pagan emperor, Aurelian, in a similar case![1] And in cases of this sort, how invariably

[1] See above, vol. I. sect. III. p. 1014.

did the wrong proceeding bring along its own punishment! In forgetting and denying its own essential character, on the simple preservation of which its true power depends, — in consenting to make use of a foreign might for the furtherance of its ends, the church succumbed to that might. Such is the lesson taught by the history of the church of the Roman empire in the East.

The great change of which we speak, in the relation of the church to the state, must be ascribed to the *transition of the Roman emperors to the side of Christianity*. The supreme magistrates now considered themselves as members of the church, and took a personal share in its concerns; but it was no easy matter for them to fix the proper limits to this participation, and, by so doing, to give up their relation as emperors to subjects. They would be strongly inclined to transfer the relation they had stood in as Pagans to the pagan state-religion, over to their relation to the Christian church. Yet they were here met by that independent spirit of the church, which, in the course of three centuries, had been developing itself, and acquiring a determinate shape; and which would make them see that Christianity could not, like Paganism, be subordinated to the political interest. There had in fact arisen in the church, as we observed in the previous period, a false, theocratical theory, originating, not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testament, which, grounding itself on the idea of a visible priesthood belonging to the essence of the church and governing the church, brought along with it an unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal state, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way. The emperors did in fact entertain precisely that view of the church which was presented to them by tradition; or rather, since — if we except Valentinian II., who seems to have consistently carried through one determinate theory — they had no judgment of their own, they were involuntarily borne along by the dominant spirit. The entire church constitution, as it then stood, appeared to them, equally with Christianity, a divine institution, built on the foundation of Christ and the apostles, in which nothing could be altered by arbitrary human will. Add to this, that the same church constitution had acquired its form in a time when the church was an independent society by itself, under the government of the bishops.

This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and, had not the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the state for the furtherance of their aims, it lay in their power, by consistently and uniformly availing themselves of this theory, to obtain a great deal from him. Thus, for example, in a rescript of the year 314, when an appeal was made from an episcopal tribunal to the imperial decision, he declared: "The sentence of the bishops must be regarded as the sentence of Christ himself."[1] But, on

[1] Sacerdotum judicium ita debet haberi, ut si ipse Dominus residens judicet. Optav. Milev. de schismate Donatistar. See f. 184.

the other hand, it flattered Constantine so to regard the matter, as if God had made *him* master of the whole Roman empire, to the end that, through his instrumentality, the worship of the true God might be everywhere extended and promoted. When, in a jesting tone, he once observed to the bishops, at a banquet, that he too was a bishop in his own way, — namely, a bishop over whatever lay without the church, — he meant by this, that God had made him overseer of that which was without the church, i.e., the political relations, for the purpose of ordering these according to the will of God; of giving the whole such a direction, as that his subjects might be led to pious living.[1] The disputes among the bishops on doctrinal matters led him, on the matter of his relation to the church, to derive from this, his supposed vocation, many consequences which, at the beginning, had never entered into his thoughts. He exhorted them to unanimity; and, when his exhortations were unheeded, he resorted to such means for uniting the opposite parties, as his sovereignty over the whole Roman state put into his hands. He convoked an assembly of bishops from all parts of the empire, in order to give a decision for all the Christians under his government.[2] The decrees of these synods were published under the imperial authority, and thus obtained a political importance. Those only who adopted them could enjoy all the privileges of catholic Christians favored by the state; and, in the end, civil penalties were threatened against those who refused to acknowledge them.

The coöperation of the emperors having once become so necessary, in order to the assembling of these councils and the carrying-out of their decisions, it could, of course, no longer remain a matter of indifference to them which of the contending parties they should sustain with their power. However emphatically they might declare in theory that the bishops alone were entitled to decide in matters of doctrine, still *human passions proved mightier than theoretical forms*. Although these councils were to serve as organs to express the decision of the divine Spirit, yet the Byzantine court had already prejudged the question, as to which party ought to be considered pious and which impious, wherever it could be contrived to gain over the court in favor of any

[1] This remark of Constantine, which Eusebius quotes, (de vita Constantini, IV. 24,) as he heard it at table from the emperor's lips, has not so great importance in itself considered; for in truth it was a mere pun, from which no theory about church rights could be drawn, — a sportive allusion to the ambiguity of the Greek word *ἐπίσκοπος*, which may be used to denote either a particular ecclesiastical officer, or an overseer generally: *Ὡς ἄρα εἴη καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος, ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεστάμενος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην.* Eusebius, who could best know in what sense Constantine meant this to be taken, understands by *ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, simply the state, so far as Constantine exercised such oversight over his subjects as to lead them, to the best of his ability, in the way of pious living: *Ἀκόλουθα δ' οὖν τῷ λόγῳ διανοούμενος, τοὺς ἀρχομένους ἁπάντας ἐπεσκόπει, προὔτρεπέ τε ὅση πὲρ ἂν δύναμις τὸν εὐσεβῆ μεταδιώκειν βίον.* And, in fact, he expresses himself in precisely the same way in other public declarations respecting the office entrusted to him by God. See the first section.

[2] Eusebius of Cæsarea, the court bishop, — whose views of the case cannot be considered, however, as the prevailing one at that time, — derives this authority from the fact, that God had entrusted the general oversight of the whole church to the emperor, just as the oversight of their particular dioceses belonged to the bishops, — a sort of universal episcopate in relation to the several individual bishoprics: *Οἷα τὶς κοίνος ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θέου καθεστάμενος, συνόδους τῶν τοῦ θέου λειτουργῶν συνεκρότει.* De vita Constantini, l. I. c. 44.

particular doctrinal interest;[1] — or in case the court persecuted *one* of the contending doctrinal parties merely out of dislike to the man who stood at the head of it, then the doctrinal question must be turned into a means of gratifying personal grudges.[2] The emperors were under no necessity of employing force against the bishops: by indirect means, they could sufficiently influence the minds of all those with whom worldly interests stood for more than the cause of truth, or who were not yet superior to the fear of man. It was nothing but the influence of the emperor Constantine which induced the Eastern bishops, at the council of Nice, to suffer the imposition of a doctrinal formula which they detested, and from which, indeed, they sought immediately to rid themselves. The emperor Theodosius II. declared to the first council of Ephesus, that no person who was not a bishop should interfere with the ecclesiastical proceedings;[3] and in this declaration he himself may have been in earnest: but he was borne along by the current of a powerful court party, which itself had combined with a party of the bishops, and to this party he must serve as the instrument. The pious and free-hearted abbot, Isidore of Pelusium, wrote to the emperor, that no remedy existed for the evil in the church, unless he placed some check *on the dogmatizing spirit of his courtiers;*[4] — and the sequel proved how entirely he was in the right.

It is true, powerful voices were heard simply protesting against this confusion of political and spiritual interests;[5] as, for example, Hilary of Poitiers, who remarked well and beautifully to the emperor Constantius: "It is for this purpose you govern and watch, that all may enjoy sweet liberty. The peace of the church can no otherwise be restored, its distractions can in no other way be healed, than by permitting every man to live wholly according to his own convictions, free from all slavery of opinion. Even though such force should be employed for the support of the true faith, yet the bishops would come before you and say: God is the Lord of the universe; he requires not an obedience which is constrained, a profession which is forced. He does not want hypocrisy, but sincere worship."[6] But these isolated voices could accomplish nothing in opposition to the great mass; and they proceeded mainly from those who were themselves made sore by oppression. Now, as so much depended on the fact whether a party had the emperor's vote on its side, consequently every art was employed to secure this; all that was corrupt in the Byzantine court found its way into the bosom of the church, — court parties became doctrinal parties, and the re-

[1] As it had been contrived, before the assembling of the council of Nice, to persuade the emperor Constantine that the Arian doctrine contained a blasphemy against the divinity of Christ, and that the *ὁμοούσιον* was absolutely required in order to maintain the dignity of Christ's person.

[2] As at the first council of Ephesus, where the revenge of Pulcheria, who governed the imperial court, turned the doctrinal controversy into a means of removing the patriarch Nestorius from Constantinople.

[3] *Ἀθέμιτον, τὸν μὴ τοῦ κατάλογον τῶν ἁγιώτατων ἐπισκόπων τυγχανόντα τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστίκοις σκέμμασιν ἐπιμιγνύσθαι.* See the Sacra Theodos. II. in the acts of this council.

[4] Isidor. Pelusiot. l. I. ep. 311. *Παρεξείας τούτοις θεραπείαν, εἰ πανσείας τῶν δογματίσμων τοῦς σοὺς διακόνους.*

[5] Comp. the examples cited in the first section, p. 33, 34.

[6] Ad Constantium, l. I.

verse. Imperial chamberlains, (cubicularii,) eunuchs, directors of the princes' kitchen,[1] disputed on formulas of faith, and affected to set themselves up as judges in theological disputes. That which must pass current for sound doctrine in the church was subjected to the same fluctuations with the parties at court. At length, in 476, the usurper Basiliscus, who enjoyed a brief authority, set an example wholly in accordance with the spirit of the Byzantine court, of effecting changes in the ruling doctrines of the church by imperial decrees, and of settling dogmatic controversies by a resort to the same expedient; — and this example was soon after but too eagerly followed by other emperors, such as Zeno and Justinian. These attempts to rule over the conscience by imperial mandates, opened a new source of disturbances and disorders in the Greek church. It is true, that which had been obtruded upon it from without, and which was alien from the whole course of the development of the church at that time, could gain no substantial existence within it; but then a violent crisis was always necessary to throw it off again. The proof of what has been asserted will be furnished in the history of the disputes on doctrine. The Greek church presents here a warning example for all ages. The church of the West developed itself, in the main, with more independence; because the theocratic principle, of which we have spoken, obtained more power in it; because the predominant authority of the Roman bishops formed a certain counterpoise to the interference of the state; and because the more rigid and less versatile spirit of the Western church gave less frequent occasion for the interposition of a foreign power.

We shall now proceed to consider the relations of the church to the state more in detail.

The state at present took some part in providing for the support of the churches. More was effected in this respect by one law of Constantine, than by all other means put together. This was a law which expressly secured to the churches a right which, perhaps, they had already now and then tacitly exercised,[2] namely, the right of receiving legacies; which, in the Roman empire, no corporation whatever was entitled to exercise, unless it had been expressly authorized to do so by the state. Such a law Constantine enacted in 321, assigning as the reason for it, not the interests of the church, but the *inviolable sacredness of the last will.*[3]

In part, zeal for the cause of the church, but partly also the delusive notion that such gifts, as meritorious works, were particularly acceptable in the sight of God, and that it was possible thereby to atone for a multitude of sins, *or both together*, procured for the churches, especially in large towns,[4] very considerable and very numerous donations. But

[1] As for example, that chief cook who was sent as a deputy from the court of the emperor Valens to persuade Basil of Cæsarea not to show any opposition to doctrines of the court. See Gregor. Naz. orat. XX. f. 348. Theodoret. hist. eccles. IV. c. 19.

[2] For, during the persecutions in the third century, we find it intimated that attempts were made to deprive the churches of their estates, which evidently they could have come in possession of in no other way. Consult the edict of Gallien. And Alexander Severus had already conceded to the Christians a public place as legally belonging to them. See Ælii Lampridii vita, c. 49.

[3] Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. II. § 4.

[4] Ammianus Marcellinus (l. XXVII. c. 3) speaks of the great wealth which the Ro-

it was undoubtedly the case, too, that the wealth of the church often led the bishops of the large towns to forget the nature of their calling; and dishonorable means were not seldom employed by worldly-minded ecclesiastics, to increase the bequests in favor of the churches. It was on this account the emperor Valentinian I. restricted this right by various limitations; and distinguished church-teachers complained, not so much of these limitations, as of the fact that the clergy had rendered them necessary.[1]

But in this case, too, as in all the appearances of the church at this period, the lights and shades should be compared together. We see, on the other hand, pious bishops giving up, from Christian motives, their title to bequests which, according to the civil law, they might have received. A citizen of Carthage made over all his property, in the expectation that he should have no children, to the church, reserving to himself only the use of it while he lived. But afterwards, when he had children, Aurelius, contrary to the legator's expectations, gave back the whole: "For according to the *civil law*," says Augustin, who relates the case,[2] "he might have retained it, but not according to the *law of heaven*." And Augustin himself, who, indeed, was found fault with by many because he had done so little to enrich the church, declared: "That he who would disinherit his son to make the church his legatee, might look for some other one to receive the inheritance besides Augustin; nay, he hoped and prayed that he might look in vain for any one."[3]

man bishops owed to the donations of the matrons. His description shows to what an extent the bishops of the great capital of the world had, amidst the wealth and in the splendor of their church, forgotten or forfeited their spiritual character. He says, it ought not to be wondered at, that the candidates for the Roman episcopate were ready to sacrifice everything to obtain it: Cum, id adepti, futuri sint ita securi, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspecte vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia regales superent mensas. He says, it had been happy for them, if they had followed the example of many of the provincial bishops, who, by their frugal and simple mode of life, commended themselves in the sight of God and all his true worshippers as pure men. So speaks the Pagan. In like manner Gregory of Nazianzen describes the state which the bishops of Constantinople were used to affect, — how, at their tables and in the pomp and train of their attendants with which they appeared in public, they vied with the first men of the state, (orat. XXXII. f. 526.) Hence it was too, that men who were disposed to live as it became bishops, such for example as Gregory of Nazianzen and Chrysostom, were far from being agreeable to the taste of many in Constantinople.

[1] See Hieronym. in the celebrated letter to Nepotianus, ep. 52, in which he places the corruption of the clergy in contrast with the end of their calling: Nec de lege conqueror; sed doleo cur meruerimus hanc legem. Jerome doubtless had floating before his mind, when he spoke of the corruption of the clergy, what he had seen particularly at Rome, (see ep. 22 ad Eustochium, § 28,) where he presents a sad picture of the clergy, running about to the houses of the rich matrons, and seeking only to press donations out of them. Si pulvillum viderit, si mantile elegans, si aliquid domesticæ suppellectilis, laudat, miratur, attrectat, et se his indigere conquerens, non tam impetrat quam extorquet, quia singulæ metuunt veredarium urbis offendere.

[2] Sermo 356, § 5.

[3] So a certain Bonifacius, belonging to the guild of the navicularii, whose employment was to convey grain in their vessels to Rome, Constantinople, or Alexandria, made the church at Hippo his legatee; but Augustin declined the bequest, because, in case of shipwreck, the church would either be obliged, by a judicial process and the application of torture against the crew, to prove that the mishap was unavoidable, or to make good the loss to the state exchequer. In respect to the first alternative, it did not befit the church, in the opinion of Augustin, to subject mariners who had been rescued from the waves, to the pains of torture. As

And if it was often the case, especially in the larger towns, that bishops might be found who applied the great incomes of their churches to diffuse around them an air of state and splendor, there were, on the other hand, shining examples of other bishops, who, living frugally themselves, applied all they had to spare for the support of charitable institutions. Beyond question, it lay in the power of the bishops to make use of the largest revenues for good and benevolent purposes; for they not only had to provide for the expense of preserving the churches, of maintaining divine service, of supporting the clergy, of supplying the means of subsistence for the poor, who, in the great cities, such as Constantinople, were very numerous and but too often suffered to live in indolence; but also, as a general thing, the establishments for the reception of strangers, (*ξενῶνες*,[1]) the alms-houses, (*πτωχοτροφεῖα*,[2]) the institutions for the support of helpless aged persons, (*γηροκομεῖα*,) the hospitals and orphan-houses, (the *νοσοκομεῖα* and *ὀρφανοτροφεῖα*,) originated in the churches, and the churches had to provide the means for their support. A celebrated establishment of this kind was the one founded by Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, and which existed in the third and fourth century — the *Basilias*, — an institution designed for the reception of strangers, and to provide medical attendance and nursing for the sick of whatever disease. Here everything was brought together that could contribute to the welfare and comfort of the patients. The physicians of the establishment resided within its walls, and workshops were provided for all the artizans and laborers whose services were needed;[3] so that Gregory of Nazianzen, in his funeral discourse at the death of Basil,[4] could call this institution a city in miniature. Basil had also caused similar alms-houses to be established in the country; one in each provincial diocese, (*συμμορία*,) placed under the care of a country bishop, who had the supervision of its concerns.[5] Theodoret, bishop of Cyros, who had a diocese which was poor on account of its location, was, notwithstanding, able to save enough to erect porticos for the use of the city, to build two large bridges, to construct a canal from the Euphrates to the town, which had before suffered for the want of water, and to repair and improve the public bath, which was so important a means of health to the inhabitants of those hot districts.[6]

to the second, the church might not be possessed of the means. "For," says Augustin, "it is not befitting the bishop to be amassing money, and to push back the hand of the beggar." Possidius states, in the life of Augustin, c. 24, that the latter would never receive a bequest which injured in any way the relations of the individual by whom the gift was made. A respectable citizen of Hippo had made over to the church an estate, merely reserving to himself the use of it while he lived. Afterwards he repented of what he had done, and requested that the papers might be returned to him, sending in lieu of them a sum of money. But Augustin sent back both, declaring that the church would not receive forced gifts, but those only which were made with a free will.

[1] With regard to the *ξενών*: Ἐστι κοίνον οἴκημα, *ὑπο τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀφωρίσμενον*. Chrysostom, in act. ap. hom. 45, near the end. Of this institution, as an ancient one in the church, though the name was new, see Augustin. Tractat. 97, in Joh. § 4. *Xenodochia* postea sunt appellata novis nominibus, res tamen ipsæ et ante nomina sua erant, et religionis veritate firmantur.

[2] These institutions for the poor were under the supervision of clergymen, also of monks, *οἱ κλήρικοι τῶν πτοχείων*. Conc. Chalc. canon. 8.

[3] See Basil. Cæsareens. ep. 94, and Sozomen. VI. 34.

[4] See his orat. 30 and 27.

[5] Basil. ep. 142, 143.

[6] See Theodoret. ep. 81.

Among the favors bestowed by the state to further the ends of the church, belonged the exemption of the clerical order from certain public services (munera publica, λειτουργίαι.) Such pertained partly to certain classes of citizens, and in part they were attached to the possession of a certain amount of property. Now, with these state burdens stood connected, for the most part, the undertaking of certain kinds of business and employments which were incompatible with the nature of the spiritual calling. For this reason, in the previous period, when no calculation could be made on the disposition of the state to accommodate the clerical order, a law had been passed that no person who was liable to any civil imposition (seculo obstrictus) should be ordained to the spiritual office.[1] But the church having now been freed by Constantine from these restrictions, it might be hoped that the like privileges would be accorded to the clergy as were allowed to pagan priests, physicians, and rhetoricians. In fact, Constantine ordered by a law of the year 319, after having already conceded to the clergy previous to 313 a certain degree of exemption, that they should be freed from all *burdens of the state.*[2] This unconditional exemption of the clergy from those civil duties was destined to prove, however, the source of many evils both to church and to state; since it was the natural consequence that numbers, without any inward call to the spiritual office, and without any fitness for it whatever, now got themselves ordained as ecclesiastics for the sake of enjoying this exemption; — whereby many of the worst class came to the administration of the most sacred calling,[3] — while, at the same time, the state was deprived of much useful service. The emperor Constantine, in this collision of interests, sought to secure only those of the state. That the true interests of the church could not have been foremost in his thoughts is the more evident, since he shows, by this law itself, how imperfectly he understood them. By a law of the year 320, which presupposes the existence of a still earlier one, he ordered that for the future no person belong to the *families of Decurions*, no one provided with sufficient means of living, no one who was fitted for the performance of those civil duties, should take refuge in the spiritual order; that, as a general thing, new clergymen should be chosen only to supply the places of those who had deceased,[4] and these should be persons of small means, and such as were not bound to

[1] When for instance, Tertullian alleges against the heretics, (præscript. c. 41,) that they ordained seculo obstrictos, it may be gathered from this, that the practice was forbidden in the dominant church.

[2] Cod. Theodos. l. 16, Tit. II. l. 2.

[3] Comp. what Athanasius (hist. Arianorum ad Monachos, § 78) says of the Pagans, who passed over from the senatorial families to Christianity, for the purpose of obtaining as ecclesiastics the *ταλαίπωρος ἀλειτουργησία*. Basil. Cæsar. ep. 54, respecting such as got themselves ordained to the inferior ecclesiastical offices in the country, merely for the sake of eluding the obligation to do military service: *Τῶν πλείστων φόβῳ τῆς στρατολογίας εἰσποιούντων ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ*. Comp. also the acts of the process against the bishop Antoninus of Ephesus, in Palladius' life of Chrysostom, opp. ed. Montfauc. T. XIII., where it comes out that that metropolitan bishop sold episcopal dignities to such as were merely seeking by episcopal ordination to be released from the burdensome curial duties.

[4] But what had promoted this certainly excessive multiplication of ecclesiastics was partly the number and magnitude of the external advantages, whereby the spiritual order now became attractive to so many who were not spiritually minded, and in part the existence of so many church offices which required for their discharge merely outward liturgical services.

take upon them any of those burdens of the state. They who were obligated to any of those duties, if they had crept into the clerical order, were to be forcibly thrust back to their former condition, — for which regulation Constantine gave this singular reason: "The rich must bear the burdens of the world, the poor must be maintained by the wealth of the church;" [1] as if this were the object of church property and of the church offices! But this restriction was not less unjust, than the reason alleged for it was false; for it well might be that the very men who felt the inward call, and possessed the best qualifications for the spiritual office, were to be found among the higher ranks in the provinces; while by such a law these were excluded. Yet with the powerful influence of the spiritual order at court, under the Christian emperors, it must often happen, as a matter of course, that such laws would be evaded, and not unfrequently to the injury of the church. Some wavering and uncertainty, too, soon began to show itself in the execution of the law; expedients were devised to avoid injuring the interests either of the state or of the church; and, finally, the law was enacted that those who were under obligation to render such civil services should, upon entering the ecclesiastical order, give up their property to others who could discharge those services in their stead. It was very justly given as a reason for this regulation, that, if they were really in earnest in what they proposed, they must despise earthly things. But it was certainly far from being the case that this law could be strictly kept.[2]

The state allowed to the church a particular jurisdiction, when it recognized, in a legal form, what had already obtained in the church before. It was the rule, from the first, in the Christian communities, that disputes between their members should not be brought before heathen tribunals, but settled within their own body. This was befitting the mutual brotherly relation subsisting between Christians; and it had been the course adopted already in the Jewish synagogues. Paul had, in fact, expressly required this method of procedure, while he regretted that such differences should exist at all among Christians. When the episcopal form of church government became matured, it was made a part of the function of the episcopal office to decide these disputes. Yet, hitherto, the sentence of the bishop stood valid only so far as both parties had voluntarily agreed to submit to it. Constantine made the sentence of the bishops legally binding, whenever the two parties had once agreed to repair to their tribunal, so that no farther appeal could be made from it.[3] Thus a great deal of business of a foreign nature came upon the episcopal office. Bishops more spiritually disposed made it a matter of complaint, that so much of the time which they were prompted, by the inclination of their hearts, to bestow on the things of God, must be employed for the purpose of immersing themselves in the investigation of secular affairs.[4] At the same time they

[1] See Cod. Theodos. l. 16, Tit. II. l. 6. Opulentos enim sæculi subire necessitates oportet, pauperes ecclesiarum divitiis sustentari.

[2] See the laws of the year 383, in the Titulus de Decurionibus.

[3] Sozomen. l. I. c. 9.

[4] When certain theological labors had been committed by two African councils to

had to suffer no little vexation; for, however impartially they might decide, they still exposed themselves to many an accusation on the part of those who were looking merely at their *own* advantage, and who, when the decision of the bishop was adverse to their interests, could not pardon it in them that they must submit without any right of appeal from an unfavorable sentence.[1] Yet, from love to their communities, they bore this burthen attached to their calling, grievous as it was to them, with the self-denial which an Augustin evinces, when from a full heart he exclaims in the language of the 119th Psalm, ver. 115, (as it is found in the Alexandrian version,) "Depart from me, ye evil-doers, for I would study the commandments of my God;" and when he proceeds to say: "Wicked men exercise us *in observing the commandments of God;* but they call us away *from exploring them*, (from the study of holy scripture,) not only when they would persecute us or contend with us, but even when they obey us and honor us, and yet compel us to busy ourselves in lending support to their sinful and contentious desires; and when they require of us that we should sacrifice our time to them; or when, at least, they oppress the weak, and force them to bring their affairs before us. To these we dare not say, Man, who has made me a judge or a divider of inheritance over you? For the apostle has instituted ecclesiastical judges for such affairs, in forbidding Christians to bring suits before the civil tribunals." Such bishops might undoubtedly avail themselves also of this opportunity of becoming better acquainted with the members of their flock, of diffusing among them the spirit of unanimity, and of opportunely dropping many a practical admonition. But to worldly-minded bishops, it furnished a welcome occasion for devoting themselves to any foreign and secular affairs, rather than to the appropriate business of their spiritual calling; and the same class might also allow themselves to be governed by impure motives in the settlement of these disputes.

In many cases, it was apparent that the gradually forming hierarchy furnished a salutary counterpoise against political despotism. The bishops acquired a great deal of influence in this respect, owing to the point of view in which the external church and its representatives ap-

the care of the bishop Augustin, who was now advanced in years, he agreed with his community, that, for the purpose of executing these, he should be spared from attending to their business during five days in the week. A formal protocol or bill (gesta ecclesiastica) was drawn up, specifying what the church had conceded to him; but he was soon besieged again, so that he was compelled to say: Ante meridiem et post meridiem occupationibus hominum implicor. (See the gesta ecclesiastica Augusti. ep. 213.) In the Greek church, the case may have been, however, that bishops, whether for the purpose of devoting themselves with greater blessing to other kinds of labor, or whether it was simply out of indolence, turned over these matters of business to certain members of their clergy, whom they invested with full powers for transacting them. At least, Socrates incidentally relates this of a certain Silvanus, bishop of Troas, a man inclined to ascetic retirement, belonging to the first times of the fifth century, without remarking that it was anything unusual. But when this good bishop observed that the clergy to whom he had entrusted this business were endeavoring to make gain of it without regard to right, he committed the investigation to a justice-loving layman. Socrat. VII. 37.

[1] See Augustin. in ψ. 25, § 13, T. IV. f. 115. Etsi jam effringi non potest, quia tenetur jure forte non ecclesiastico, sed principum seculi, qui tantum detulerunt ecclesiæ, ut quidquid in ea judicatum fuerit, dissolvi non possit.

peared to the men of this period, and gradually also through the habits and customs of the people; since the prevailing ideas passed over into life, before anything came to be determined by the laws.

To this kind of influence belongs that which the bishops obtained by their intercessions (intercessiones.) It was then not unusual for persons who enjoyed some reputation as men of learning, as rhetoricians, to avail themselves of this for the purpose of interceding with the great, who affected to patronize science, in behalf of the unfortunate. But that this custom should pass over especially to the bishops, was a natural consequence of the new direction which Christianity gave to the mode of contemplating the forms of social life. New ideas of the equality of all men in the sight of God; of the equal accountableness of all; of mercy, love, and compassion, were diffused abroad by Christianity. Christian judges and magistrates were uncertain how they should unite the discharge of their official duties with what was required of them by the precepts of Christ. In the previous period, *one* party of Christians, in fact, held the administration of such offices to be incompatible with the nature of the Christian calling. The council of Elvira (in 305) directed that the supreme magistrates in the municipal towns, the *Duumviri*, (though these were not called upon to pronounce sentence of death,) should not enter the church during the year of their office.[1] The council of Arles, in 314, directed indeed that the *presidents* in the provinces, and others who were incumbents of any civil office, should continue to remain in the communion of the church,[2] yet charged the bishops in the places where they exercised their civil functions, with a special oversight of them; and, when they began to act inconsistently with their Christian duties,[3] they were then to be cut off from the church fellowship. Thus, then, it came about that conscientious Christians who occupied official stations, whenever they were beset with doubts from the above-mentioned causes, had recourse to the bishops for instruction and for the quieting of their scruples. For example, a certain functionary, by the name of Studius, betook himself, in a case of this sort, to Ambrosius, bishop of Milan. The latter told him that according to Romans 13, he was authorized to employ the sword for the punishment of crime, yet proposed for his imitation the pattern of Christ in his conduct towards the woman taken in adultery (John, c. 8.)[4] If the transgressor had never been baptized, he might still be converted, and obtain the forgiveness of sin: if he had been already baptized, he could yet repent and reform. Ambrosius says on this occasion that those who pass sentence of death would not, indeed, be excluded from the communion of the church, since they are justified, by the above-cited declaration of the apostle, to pass such a sentence;

[1] C. 56. Magistratum uno anno, quo agit duumviratum, prohibendum placuit, ut se ab ecclesia cohibeat.

[2] Litteras accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias, c. 7.

[3] Cum cœperint contra disciplinam agere.

[4] An example, indeed, which did not wholly apply in the present case; for it was one where the question was not a juridical, but a religious and moral one. But Ambrose was for ennobling the juridical position by that of morality and religion.

but that the majority, however, did abstain from the communion, and that their conduct in this respect was to be approved.[1]

In this way it came about that the bishops gradually obtained the right of exercising a sort of moral superintendence over the discharge of their official duties by the governors, the judges, the proprietors, who belonged to their communities;[2] — an authority which was not always, indeed, alike respected; — that they were empowered, in the name of religion, to intercede with governors, with the nobles of the empire, and even with the emperors, in behalf of the unfortunate, the persecuted, the oppressed; in behalf of individuals, entire cities and provinces, who sighed under grievous burdens, laid on them by reckless, arbitrary caprice, or who trembled in fear of heavy punishments amidst civil disturbances. Where the fear of man made all others mute, it was not seldom they alone who spoke out in the name of religion and of the church, who ventured to utter themselves with freedom; and their voice might sometimes penetrate to the consciences of those who were intoxicated by the feeling of their absolute power, and surrounded by servile flatterers.

Some examples will render this clear. When the separation of the province of Cappadocia into two provinces, (Cappadocia prima et secunda,) under the emperor Valens, in the year 371, had reduced the inhabitants, who thus lost much of their gain and were oppressed by a double weight of civil burdens, to great distress, it was the bishop Basil of Cæsarea who interceded — to no purpose indeed — with the great, and, through them, with the emperor, in behalf of the whole province. Among other things, he thus wrote to one of the nobles:[3] "He could boldly tell the court that they were not to imagine they should have two provinces instead of one; for they would not have secured another province from some other world, but have done just the same as if the owner of a horse or of an ox should cut him in halves, and suppose that by so doing he obtained two instead of one." When, in the year 387, a popular movement at Antioch, which had been brought about by the oppression of excessive taxes, gave reason to fear a severe retribution from the emperor Theodosius, who might easily be hurried, in a momentary paroxysm of passion, to the extremest measures, and all was in a state of the utmost confusion, the aged and sick bishop Flavianus proceeded himself to Constantinople. Said he to the emperor: "I am come, as the deputy of our common Master, to ad-

[1] According to the old editions, ep. ad Studium, l. VII. ep. 58.

[2] By a law of the year 409, which directed the judges on all Sundays to interrogate prisoners, whether they had experienced humane treatment, it was at the same time presupposed, that the bishops felt it incumbent on them to exhort the judges to humane treatment of their prisoners: Nec deerit antistitum Christianæ religionis cura laudabilis, quæ ad observationem constituti judicis hanc ingerat monitionem. Cod. Theodos. l. XI. Tit. III. l. 7. By a law of the emperor Justinian, of the year 529, it was devolved on the bishop, on Thursday and Friday, (probably on these days in particular on account of the memory of Christ's passion,) to visit the prisons, to inquire into the crimes for which each person was confined, and accurately inform himself with regard to the treatment he met with, and point out to the higher authorities everything that was done contrary to good order. They were also to see to it, that no one should be held in confinement elsewhere than in the public prisons. See Codex Justinian. l. I. Tit. IV. l. 22 and 23.

[3] Ep. 74 ad Martinian.

dress this word to your heart: 'If ye forgive men their trespasses, then will your heavenly Father also forgive you your trespasses.'" These words, to which he gave a still more pointed emphasis by alluding to the import of the approaching festival of Easter, so profoundly affected the heart of an emperor easily susceptible of religious impressions, that he exclaimed: "How could it be a great thing for me, who am but a man, to remit my anger towards men, when the Lord of the world himself, who for our sakes took the form of a servant, and was crucified by those to whom he was doing good, interceded with his Father in behalf of his crucifiers, saying: 'Forgive them, since they know not what they do'?" All that had been done, he promised should be forgotten, and Flavian should hasten back to convey the glad tidings to his community before the commencement of the Easter.[1]

It cannot be denied, indeed, that while pious and prudent bishops effected much good by a discreet resort to these intercessions; others, by a haughty abuse of them, by hierarchical arrogance, by a confusion of the Christian and the juridical point of view, to which they obstinately clung, might seriously interfere with the civil order.[2] Yet the injury which thence resulted in the case of particular individuals, is certainly not to be compared with the benefits which accrued, in various ways, from the intercessions of the bishops in behalf of the innocent who were oppressed, and of the weak who were abandoned to the caprices of passion and arbitrary power.[3] The bishops were considered particularly as the protectors of widows and orphans. The dying, who left orphan children behind them, commended them, in that period of despotic authority, to the protection of the bishops. The property of widows and orphans, which there was cause to fear might fall a prey to the rapacity of the powerful, was placed under the guardianship of the

[1] See Chrysostom. orat. 20, de statuis, near the end. In the same manner Theodoret interceded with great men and with the imperial princess Pulcheria, in behalf of the inhabitants of his poor church diocese, who were calumniated at the court, and oppressed by heavy tributes. (See ep. 42, and the following.) So Augustin used the most earnest remonstrances with a rich landholder, by the name of *Romulus*, who was in the practice of unjustly oppressing the poor people of the country, and who had avoided speaking with Augustin himself; and he closed with these words: "Fear God, unless you wish to deceive yourself: I call him to witness on your soul, that, while saying this, I fear more for you than for those in behalf of whom I may seem to intercede. If you believe, let God be thanked. If you do not believe, I comfort myself in what the Lord says, Matth. 10: 13." Augustin. ep. 247.

[2] Respecting such haughtiness of the bishops, a certain judge, by the name of Macedonius, complains in a letter to Augustin, (ep. 152,) to whom he states his doubts about the reasonableness of intercessions. He denounces those who complained of wrong, when their intercessions, however unreasonable, met with no hearing; from whom, however, he altogether distinguishes such men as Augustin. The latter, in reply, explains at large his deliberate judgment respecting the end, the right and the wrong use of the episcopal *intercessiones*, ep. 153. To guard against such abuses, it was ordered by a law of the year 398, that the monks and the clergy should not be permitted to snatch condemned malefactors from their merited punishment; yet they were allowed, even by this law, to resort to a legal intercession, as a sort of reparation for this infringment on their rights. Cod. Theodos. l. IX. Tit. 40, l. 16.

[3] How common it was for those whose life or freedom was suddenly endangered by powerful enemies, or for their relatives and friends, to enter the church and apply to the bishop for his speedy assistance, is seen from Augustin. p. 161, § 4, p. 368, § 3. Videtis, si cujus vita præsentis seculi periclitetur, quomodo amici ejus currunt pro eo, quomodo curritur ad ecclesiam, rogatur episcopus, ut intermittat, si quas habet actiones, currat, festinet.

churches and the bishops.[1] Ambrosius, bishop of Milan, reminds his clergy of the fact, how often he had withstood the attacks of the imperial power in defending the property of the widow; nay, of all;—and he says to those clergy that they would thereby magnify their office, if the attacks of the powerful, under which the widow and the orphan must succumb, were warded off by the protection of the church; if they showed that the precept of the Lord had more weight with them than the favor of the rich.[2]

It was the same with another right which the churches gradually obtained by traditional usage. As the pagan temples had been already considered asylums for such as fled to them for refuge, and as the images of the emperor served the same purpose, so now this use passed over to the Christian churches. It is evident, from what has been said, how salutary a thing this might prove under the circumstances of those times; since taking refuge in the asylum of the church, particularly at the altar, afforded time for the bishops to intercede for the unfortunate, before any injury could be done them. They who were persecuted by a victorious party, in times of civil disturbance, could, in the first instance, here find protection against the sword; and the bishops, meanwhile, gain time to apply to the powerful for their pardon. Many examples of this kind are furnished in the labors of Ambrose, during the Western revolutions of his period. Slaves could here find protection, for the first moment, against the cruel rage of their masters, and subsequently, by the interposition of the bishops, appease their anger. Such as were by misfortune involved in debt, and persecuted by their creditors, could here gain shelter for the first moment; and pious bishops could, in the mean time, find means, either by a collection in their communities, or by an advance of money from the church funds, of cancelling their debt, or of effecting a compromise between them and their creditors.[3] It is true, this right of the churches, which, under the circumstances of those times, could be applied to such salutary purposes, might also be abused by the hierarchical arrogance of some bishops.[4] This right was at first not conceded to the churches by a law, but had its ground simply in the universal belief; and hence it happened, too, that it was often violated by rude, tyrannical men. Pious bishops here had an opportunity of evincing their steadfast courage in protecting the unfortunate who had taken refuge with them, against the rage of powerful enemies who would not suffer themselves to be re-

[1] See Augustin. ep. 252; according to other editions, 217. Sermo 176, § 2.

[2] Ambrosius de officiis, l. II. c. 29.

[3] See Augustin. ep. 268 ad plebem; according to other editions, 215.

[4] An example in Augustin. ep. 250. Certain individuals guilty of perjury having taken refuge in the church, the Comes Classicianus, accompanied by a few men, went to Auxilius the bishop, for the purpose of making such representations to him as would prevent him from receiving them. But though the guilty persons voluntarily left the church, the haughty bishop, notwithstanding, pronounced *excommunication* on the entire family of the Comes. Augustin, on the other hand, received the Comes into his own communion, telling him that he had nothing to fear from an unjust excommunication; and he wrote to the bishop: "Believe not that we may not be hurried on by an unjust anger, because we are bishops; but let us rather think, that we live in the greatest danger of being caught in the snares of temptation, because we are men."

strained by any respect for the asylum.[1] The first imperial law which appeared with reference to the asylum, was in fact directed against it. The case happened thus: — Chrysostom, the venerable bishop of Constantinople, had defended a number of unfortunate individuals against the arbitrary violence of the unprincipled, but for a time powerful, Eutropius; in consequence of which, the latter procured the enactment of an express law, in 398, restricting this right of the church, which had grown out of common usage and custom.[2] So much the stronger, therefore, must have been the impression made on the popular mind, when, in the following year, Eutropius himself, having fallen from the summit of earthly fortune to the lowest infamy, was obliged to seek shelter, at the altar of the church, from the fury of the exasperated Gothic troops to which the weak Arcadius was willing to abandon him; and it was Chrysostom who defended him there. A great effect was also produced by an incident which occurred in Constantinople itself, under the reign of Theodosius II. Certain slaves of one of the chief men of the city took refuge, from the harsh treatment of their cruel master, in the sanctuary of the principal church. There, for several days in succession, they disturbed the divine service; and when at length resort was had to force against them, they killed one of the ecclesiastics, wounded another, and then put an end to their own lives.[3] This and similar occurrences led finally to the enactment of the *first law* for the asylum of the church, in the year 431. It was here settled that not only the altar, but whatever formed any part of the church buildings, should be an inviolable place of refuge.[4] It was forbidden, on pain of death, forcibly to remove those who had fled thither unarmed. Resort

[1] Here follow two examples. A man of some consequence and influence, owing to his connection with the vicar-general of Pontus, with whom he acted as assessor judge, wished to compel a noble widow to marry him. She fled to the asylum of the church at Cæsarea. That governor, who was besides an enemy of the bishop Basil, gladly availed himself of this opportunity to make him feel his power. But Basil refused to deliver up the widow. The vicar caused him to be arraigned before his tribunal; but the people were excited, by this course of proceeding, to such violent agitation, that the governor, struck with fear, finally himself implored Basil to use his influence in soothing them. See Gregor. Naz. orat. 20, p. 353. In like manner, the bishop Synesius of Ptolemais, in the early part of the fifth century, had to contend with a governor, Andronicus, who dealt in an arbitrary manner with the lives and property of the citizens, sacrificing everything to his avarice and his passions. He caused an edict to be posted up on the doors of the church, in which he threatened every ecclesiastic who should give protection to his unhappy victims. He declared that not one should escape his hand, even though he clasped the feet of Christ. No asylum could afford shelter against such a man. The only course that was left for Synesius was to pronounce on him the sentence of excommunication, ep. 58. Yet Andronicus, who fell into disgrace with the court, and was plunged in misfortune, was forced himself to seek protection from the church, and Synesius received him. Ep. 90 ad Theophilum.

[2] See Cod. Theodos. l. 9, Tit. 45, l. 3; which law, to be sure, is not expressed in general terms, but is properly directed only against those who were bound under some obligation to the state or to private persons, which they were wishing to evade. Yet the law, in the form in which it stood, might easily be farther made use of also against the asylum.

[3] Socrates, VII. 33.

[4] The reason alleged probably had some reference to the fact that those cases in which the violators of the asylum were subsequently visited by some great calamity, which was generally regarded as a divine punishment, particularly contributed to promote the feeling of reverence for the asylum: Ne in detrahendos eos conetur quisquam sacrilegas manus immittere; ne, qui hoc ausus sit, cum discrimen suum videat, ad expetendam opem ipse quoque confugiat.

might be had to force only against such as took refuge to those places with weapons in their hands, and who refused to give them up at the repeated solicitations of the clergy.[1] In a law, passed in the following year, it was ordered that whenever a servant fled unarmed to the church, the clergy should delay giving information of it to the master, or to the person whose vengeance he was endeavoring to escape, no longer than a day; and that the latter, out of regard to him to whom the fugitive had fled for refuge, should grant him full forgiveness, and receive him back without the infliction of any further punishment.

2. *Internal Organization of the Church.*

Two things had a special influence in modifying the development of the church constitution in this period; first, that confounding of the Old and the New-Testament view of the theocracy which had prevailed and proved so influential in the previous period; secondly, — what became accessory to this in the period before us, — the union of the church with the state; which union, although really in conflict with the theocratic principle above mentioned, was, notwithstanding, indirectly promoted by it. For the more the church strove after outward dominion, the more was she liable to go astray, and to forget, in this outward power, her own intrinsic essence as a church of the spirit, and the more easy it became for outward power to obtain dominion over her; as it was true, on the other hand, that the more clearly she retained the consciousness of her own intrinsic essence as a church of the spirit, and the less she was tempted to strive after dominion otherwise than through the spirit, through the power of the gospel, the purer she was enabled to maintain herself from all corrupt intermixture of the worldly principle.

The central point of the theocratic church system was the idea of a visible, outward priesthood, serving as the medium of connection between Christ and the church; of a sacerdotal caste distinctively consecrated to God, and requisite for the life of the church, — through which order alone the influences of the Holy Spirit could be diffused among the laity. This idea had, in the previous period, become already a dominant idea in the church, and had exerted the greatest influence in changing and modifying all ecclesiastical relations. Though this idea was employed by such church-teachers as Chrysostom and Augustin only for the purpose of setting in its true light the religious and moral dignity of the spiritual order, and of bringing it home to the hearts of such as were intending to form themselves for this order; and though such men meant by no means to disparage thereby the dignity of the universal Christian calling, yet thus the germ of many other errors came to be once introduced. Hence the false antithesis now set up between spiritual and secular, which had so injurious an influence on the whole Christian life, and by which the lofty character of the universal Christian calling was so much lowered. Hence the delusive notion that the clergy, as super-earthly beings, must withdraw themselves from all con-

[1] Cod. Theodos. l. 9. Tit. 45, l. 4.

tact with the things of sense; and hence the erroneous notion that the priestly dignity was desecrated, was too much drawn down to the earth, by the married life. It would be doing wrong to this period to assert that such an opinion was purposely invented, or set afloat, with a view to enhance thereby the dignity of the spiritual order. Ideas of this sort, which reign supreme over an age, are, in general, not the contrivance of a few; and what has been thus purposely contrived can never acquire such vast influence in shaping human relations. As that idea of the priesthood had originated, as we have seen, in a declension from the primitive Christian mode of thinking; the same was true also of this opinion, which naturally grew out of the idea of the priesthood,— the opinion that the clergy, as mediators between God and men, as the channels through whom alone the influences of the Holy Spirit must flow to the rest of mankind, enchained to the world of sense, must hence, in their whole life, be elevated above that world, — must keep themselves free from all earthly ties and family relations. It is plain, indeed, that in many nations not Christian, the idea of such a priesthood led to the same conclusion of the necessity of celibacy in the priests; and already, in the previous period, we observed a tendency of the same kind among the Montanists.

This idea could not penetrate at once everywhere alike; the primitive Christian spirit still offered considerable resistance to it. The council of Elvira in Spain, which met in the year 305, and was governed by the ascetic and hierarchical spirit that prevailed particularly in the Spanish and North-African churches, was the first to announce the law, that the clergy of the three first grades should abstain from all marriage intercourse, or be deposed.[1] Men of the same bent of spirit were for making this a general law of the church at the council of Nice; but a bishop, whose opinion may have had the more weight because it was unbiased, as he had himself led a strictly ascetic life from his youth upward,— the bishop and confessor Paphnutius, — opposed this motion, declaring that wedlock was also a holy estate, as Paul affirmed; and that the clergy who held that relation might lead, notwithstanding, a holy life. No yoke ought to be imposed on men which the weakness of human nature could not bear; and it would be well to use caution, lest the church might be injured by excessive severity.[2] Yet even Paphnutius, plainly as he saw the mischief which must accrue from such an ordinance universally imposed, was too much governed by the spirit of his time to speak generally against the practice of binding the spiritual order to celibacy. The old order of things was simply retained, that ecclesiastics of the three first grades, when once ordained, should no longer be permitted to marry; and the rest was left to the free choice of each individual. And this was not a thing altogether new: the council of Neocæsarea, in the year 314,[3] had already decreed that the presbyter who married should forfeit his standing; and

[1] Placuit in totum prohiberi episcopis, presbyteris et diaconibus, vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere a conjugibus suis.

[2] Socrat. I. II.

[3] Canon 1.

the council of Ancyra, in the same year,[1] that the deacons who, at the time of their ordination, should declare that they could not tolerate the life of celibacy, might subsequently be allowed to marry; while those who said nothing on this point at their ordination, yet afterwards married, should be deposed from their office. How much the ascetic spirit of the moral system which prevailed in many portions of the Eastern church, first giving rise to monasticism, and then receiving support from the same system, contributed to spread the erroneous notion of the necessity of celibacy to the sacred character of the priesthood, is made evident by the decisions of the council of Gangra in Paphlagonia, somewhere about the middle of the fourth century; which council, at the same time, deserves notice, as being opposed to this spiritual tendency and to this delusion. Its fourth canon pronounces sentence of condemnation *on those who would not hold communion with married ecclesiastics*. The practice became continually more prevalent, it is true, in the Eastern church, for the bishops at least, if they were married, to abandon the marriage relation: yet we still find exceptions, even in the fifth century; as in the case of Synesius, who, when about to be made bishop of Ptolemais in Pentapolis, signified to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, his intention of living in the same relations with the wife to whom he himself had joined him; and yet he was ordained bishop.[2] It was different with the Western church, where the law which Paphnutius had turned aside, at the council of Nice, succeeded, nevertheless, to establish itself. It had hitherto been nothing more than a fundamental principle in the usages of the church, when the Roman bishop Siricius decreed the first ecclesiastical law on the subject. The occasion of it was this: — Spanish presbyters and deacons resisted the unmarried life; and, as the whole idea of the church priests and sacrifices was derived from the Old Testament, they appealed in their defence to the fact that the Old-Testament priests lived in the state of wedlock. Himerius, bishop of Taraco, in a letter to the Roman bishop Damasus, which treated of various other ecclesiastical affairs, had also mentioned this circumstance, and asked for advice. Siricius, who in the mean time had succeeded Damasus in the episcopal office, replied in a letter of the year 385, in which, by a singular perversion of holy writ, he endeavored to prove the necessity of celibacy in priests; and in which letter, moreover, the connection of this error with the unevangelical idea of the priesthood, and the unevangelical idea of what constitutes holiness, is very clearly brought to view. The requisition to be holy (Levit. 20: 7) is here confined solely to the priests, and referred simply to abstinence from marriage intercourse; and the bishop appeals for proof to the fact that the priests of the Old Testament, during the period of their service in the temple, were obliged to dwell there, and to abstain from all marriage intercourse; — that Paul (Rom. 8: 8, 9) says, they that are in the flesh cannot please God. And he adds:

[1] Canon 10.

[2] Jerome may perhaps have expressed himself, in his zeal, too generally, when he says, in the beginning of his book against Vigilantius: Quid facient orientis ecclesiæ, quid Ægypti et sedis apostolicæ, quæ aut virgines Clericos accipiunt, aut continentes, aut si uxores habuerint, mariti esse desistunt.

"Could the Spirit of God dwell, indeed, in any other than holy bodies?" as though true holiness accordingly were incompatible with the marriage estate, and the clergy were the only ones in whom the Spirit of God resided. It was indeed true, that a considerable time elapsed before the principle, established in theory, could be generally adopted also in practice. There arose, even in the last times of the fourth century, many men, superior to the prejudices of their age, such as Jovinian, and perhaps also Vigilantius, who combated the doctrine of celibacy in the spiritual order. Jovinian rightly appeals to the fact that the apostle Paul allowed one to be chosen a bishop who had a wife and children. And Jerome names bishops among the friends of Vigilantius, who, because they feared the pernicious consequences to morals of a constrained celibacy, *would ordain no others as deacons but those who were married.*[1]

This idea of the priesthood was bad, also, in its influence on the prevailing notions with regard to the training necessary for those who were preparing for the spiritual order. As many placed implicit confidence in the magical effects of the priestly ordination, whereby the supernatural powers, of which the priest was to be the channel, were communicated at once; as they held the outward acts of the church, by which the priest was supposed to set in motion the higher energies communicated to him, to be the principal thing in the administration of his office; they were, for this very reason, led to suppose that no special previous culture was necessary for this office.[2] It is true, the more eminent teachers of the church — such men as Gregory of Nazianzus, Chrysostom,[3] and Augustin[4] — combated this delusion, and laid down many wholesome and judicious rules for the education of the spiritual order; yet these injunctions, proceeding from individuals, could produce no adequate effects, as they were not sufficiently sanctioned and upheld by the decrees of councils.[5] There was, moreover, a great want of institutions for the theological education of the spiritual order. The school at Alexandria was at first the only one. This became distinguished under the superintendence of the learned Didymus, who, although blind from his youth, was one of the most accomplished church-teachers of his time. Then arose, at the end of the fourth century, the theological school of Antioch, the formation of which had been already prepared, a century earlier, by the learned presbyters of that church.

[1] See Hieronym. adv. Vigilant. at the beginning. The frequent complaints about the συνείσακτοι of the clergy,—against whom canon 3 of the Nicene council is directed, (vol. I. § 2, p. 467,) — prove the bad effects which the rules of celibacy had on *morals*.

[2] Gregory of Nazianz sarcastically denounces this erroneous notion in his satirical poem against the bishops, v. 503: Εἶποι τάχ' ἀν τις ὡς ἐπισκόπων χεῖρες | τότ' ἐν μέσῳ κήρυγμα (the public proclamation of the choice made in the church;) λούτρου τὶς χάρις (the ordination, a second baptism) ἂς τ' ἐκβοῶμεν, ὡς ἀν ἀξίοι μέσας | φωνάς, διδόντες τὴν καθάρσιν τῇ κλίσει (prayer over the candidate who was kneeling) | καὶ τῷ τυραννήσαντι δῆθεν πνεύματι (as if the Holy Ghost at the ordination wrought with irresistible power) | κρίσει δικαίων καὶ σόφων ἐπισκόπων.

[3] In his work, περὶ ἱερωσύνης.

[4] In his work, de doctrina Christiana.

[5] In an old collection of ecclesiastical laws, belonging to the fifth century, falsely called the decisions of the fourth synod at Carthage, c. 1, we find the only decree of this sort, which is itself, however, very generally expressed: Qui episcopus ordinandus est, antea examinetur, si sit literatus, si in lege Domini instructus, si in scripturarum sensibus cautus, si in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus. See Mansi Concil. III. 949

This school rendered itself particularly distinguished by diffusing a taste among the clergy for the thorough study of the scriptures. From this, as the mother, several others sprung up in the Syrian church, whose salutary influence on that church continued long to be felt.[1] In the Greek church, it was the practice, as we may see in the examples of Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzus, for such young men as were destined, by the wish of their families, to consecrate themselves to the service of the church, to visit the schools of general education, then flourishing at Athens, Alexandria, Constantinople, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Cæsarea in Palestine. Next, they passed some time in pursuing the study of the ancient literature, either with particular reference to their own improvement, or as rhetorical teachers in their native towns; until, by the course of their own meditations, or by some impression from without, a new direction, of more decided Christian seriousness, was given to their life. In this case, it now became their settled plan to consecrate their entire life to the service of the faith, and of the church; whether it was that they entered immediately into some one of the subordinate grades of the spiritual order, or that they preferred, in the first place, in silent retirement, by sober collection of thought, by the study of the holy scriptures, and of the older church-fathers, either in solitude or in some society of monks, to prepare themselves for the spiritual office. That previous discipline in general literature had, in one respect, a beneficial influence; inasmuch as it gave a scientific direction to their minds in theology, and thus fitted them also for more eminent usefulness as church-teachers; as becomes evident when we compare the bishops so educated with others. But, on the other hand, the habits of style thus contracted, the vanity and fondness for display which were nourished in those rhetorical schools, had on many an influence unfavorable to the simplicity of the gospel, as may be seen, for example, after a manner not to be mistaken, in the case of Gregory of Nazianzus.

The cloisters, moreover, are to be reckoned, in the Greek church, among the seminaries for educating the clergy; and, indeed, among those of a healthful influence; in so far as a practical Christian bent, a rich fund of Christian experience, and an intimate acquaintance with holy scripture, was to be acquired in them: but, on the other hand, it is true, also, that a certain narrowness of theological spirit was engendered in the cloisters, injurious in its influence on the education of

[1] Hence the Nestorian seminaries for the clergy were at the beginning particularly distinguished; as, for example, their school at Nisibis in Mesopotamia, which had a settled course of studies, and was divided into several classes. The teachers and students enjoyed special privileges in the Nestorian churches (see Assemani Bibl. Vat. T. III. P. 2, f. 927.) The North-African bishop Junilius, about the middle of the sixth century, describes this school, in the preface to his work de partibus divinæ legis, as one "where the holy scriptures were expounded by teachers publicly appointed, in the same manner as grammar and rhetoric were among the Romans." The well-known East-Gothic statesman and scholar Cassiodorus, who was troubled to find that in the West there were no public teachers of the right method of scriptural exposition, as there were of the right method of understanding the ancient authors, entered into an understanding with the Roman bishop Agapetus, that such a school should be founded at Rome; but the stormy times prevented the execution of that plan. See præfat. l. I. de institutione div. Script.

church-teachers, as may be perceived in the case of an Epiphanius; and those that received their education there were often at a loss how to adapt themselves to wider spheres of spiritual activity, especially when they were transferred at once to the great capital towns, as the example of Nestorius shows. The awkwardness of their movements, amid the intricate relations into which they were thrown, operated not seldom to hinder and disturb them in their labors.

An excellent seminary for the ecclesiastics, not merely of a single church, but of an entire province, was often the *clerus* of a pious and well-informed bishop. Young men, in this case, were first admitted into the body as church readers or copyists (lectores or excerptores;) they were trained up under his eye, formed after his example, his counsels, his guidance; they availed themselves of his experience, and were thus introduced, under the most favorable auspices, into the field of practical labor. Many pious bishops, such as Augustin and Eusebius of Vercelli, endeavored, by drawing still closer the bond of union among their clergy, and inducing them to live together in common, to carry still farther this disciplinary influence of theirs on the younger members of their order — the first germ of the *canonical* life, afterwards so called.

We have already observed that, by the temporal advantages connected with the spiritual profession, many who had neither the inward call nor any other qualifications for this order, were led to aspire after church offices; so that, in fact, numbers became Christians solely with a view of obtaining some post in the church, and enjoying the emoluments therewith connected. Several synods of these times endeavored to suppress this abuse. Already the Nicene council, in its second canon, ordered that no one, after being instructed for a short time, and then baptized, should for the future, as had been done before, be ordained a presbyter or a bishop; for some time was necessary for the probation of a catechumen, and a still longer trial was requisite after baptism; and the council of Sardica, in its tenth canon, directed that if a person of wealth, or from the arena of the forum, wished to become a bishop, he should not attain to that office until he had gone through the functions of a reader, deacon and presbyter, and spent sufficient time in each of these offices to make proof of his faith and temper. Yet these and similar laws availed but little to diminish the evil; as it ever proves true that abuses, grounded in the wrong character of general relations, are not to be fundamentally cured by single prohibitory laws, but only by the improvement of these general relations themselves. The confounding of spiritual and worldly things was the source of these abuses. Hence it happened that the spiritual offices presented so many attractions to those who would have been the last men to be drawn by the essential character of the spiritual calling itself; and hence, in the choice of candidates to spiritual offices, especially the most elevated, more attention was paid to every one of the others than to the spiritual qualifications. Men considered what they had to expect, not so much from the spiritual qualifications of the candidate to care for the good of souls, as from his political influence to promote the external splendor

of the church, the temporal well-being of the community.[1] As the source of these abuses continued ever to remain the same, these ecclesiastical laws were often enough violated; and, in the Eastern church, the evil was increased by the disorders growing out of disputes on matters of doctrine. Greater strictness on this point prevailed, in the main, with individual exceptions, in the church of the West, where the Roman bishops took ground decidedly against the practice by which laymen were elevated at once from worldly professions of an altogether different character to the highest stations in the church.[2]

This method of appointment to spiritual offices was not only attended with the mischievous consequence that, by these means, when such offices came thus to be filled by men altogether unworthy of them, every sort of corruption was introduced into the church; but also, in the most favorable cases, when men having the inward call for the spiritual standing were chosen at once, from some entirely foreign circle of action, to spiritual offices, without any preparatory training, it was natural that such persons, owing to their want of an independent theological education, instead of guiding, by a clear theological consciousness, the existing ecclesiastical spirit of their time, instead of separating the true from the false in the existing church tradition, rather suffered themselves to be unconsciously borne along by the spirit of the church for the time being; and thus contributed, by their instruction and by their course of procedure, to confirm and give wider spread to those errors which had been transmitted from earlier times.

As regards the participation of the laity in the election to church offices, traces are still to be found in this period of the share which the communities had once taken in this proceeding. It continued to be the prevailing form, that the bishop in the first place named to the community the persons whom he proposed as candidates to fill the vacant offices, and demanded if any one had aught to object to the choice; and, the acquiescence of the church being publicly expressed, an official instrument (gesta ecclesiastica) was drawn up accordingly. Through the preponderating influence of the bishops, this, it is true, might often be no more than a mere formality; but it was precisely in the case of appointments to the highest offices of the church that this influence still often proved to be greatest. Before the provincial bishops could introduce a regular choice according to the ecclesiastical laws, it sometimes happened that by the voice of the whole community, or of a power-

[1] The abuses in the appointment to episcopal offices, the methods by which men of the most alien occupations and modes of life found their way into them, are set forth by Gregory of Nazianzus in the caricature description of his carmen de episcopis, v. 150. He names *collectors of the tribute*, seamen, people who came from the plough and from the army. Although it is his object in this poem to expose the faults of the Eastern church in the most vivid light, yet his picture is assuredly not without truth. And the same writer says, in his remarkable farewell discourse before the church assembly at Constantinople, in the year 381 (orat. 32, f. 526:) "People at present are on the look-out, not for priests, but for rhetoricians; not for those who understand the cure of souls, but for those who are skilled in the management of funds; not for those who offer with a pure heart, but for powerful intercessors."

[2] Thus the Roman bishop Siricius, in his letter ad Gallos episcopos, declares himself very emphatically against the practice of elevating to episcopal offices, by the favor popularis, those qui, secularem adepti potestatem, jus seculi exercuerunt.

ful party in it, some individual, standing high in their confidence, was proclaimed bishop. But as, in the then existing state of the church, the most pious, and they who had a right conception of the essence of the spiritual office, and who had at heart the spiritual interests of the community, did not constitute the majority and the most powerful party; but rather, particularly in the more considerable towns, it was often those very persons with whom impure motives and a worldly interest mainly predominated, who, as the most reputable of the citizens, possessed the greatest influence; the elections, accordingly, which were made after this manner, were not always the best; and cases are to be met with in which bishops and ecclesiastics, who had at heart the true interests of the church, were brought into conflict with the boisterous demands of some popular party, governed by a bad influence.[1] This abuse of the influence of the communities in the choice of church officers furnished some good reason for restricting it.

Worldly interest, ambition, and the love of rule, frequently led bishops of the provincial towns, in the Eastern church, to aspire after the vacant bishoprics of the chief cities. Mischievous quarrels and disputes must often have arisen from this source, and the erroneous notion obtained, which was justly denounced by the emperor Constantine, that the large cities had greater claims than others to a bishop who was solicitous for the cure of souls.[2] Soon after the church in the East had become the dominant church of the state, it was deemed necessary to find some preventive against these abuses; but whatever measures were adopted, these, for the reasons already mentioned, like all similar precautionary legal measures against abuses springing out of the circumstances of the times, proved of little avail. The council of Nice, in its fifteenth canon, forbade the transfer, not only of bishops, but of presbyters and deacons, from one church to another, on account of the many disorders and schisms resulting from this practice, which, contrary to the laws of the church, prevailed in some districts. But although this law, which, in reference to the bishops, was sanctioned anew by the

[1] Thus in the year 361, the popular party at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, supported by the garrison of the place, insisted on having for their bishop one of the civil magistrates, Eusebius, who had as yet not been baptized; and the provincial bishops, many of whom perhaps had a better man in mind, allowed themselves to be forced to ordain him. A similar schism arose again on the demise of Eusebius, in choosing his successor. Basilius possessed without doubt, so far as spiritual qualifications were concerned, the best claims to the office; but he was opposed by a party to whom his spiritual strictness and his purely spiritual mode of thinking were not acceptable. As Gregory of Nazianzus affirms, (orat. 20, f. 342,) the most considerable persons of the province were against him, and these had the worst men of the city on their side. Gregory says (orat. 19, f. 310) on this occasion, that the election ought to proceed particularly from the clergy and from the monks; but not from the most wealthy and powerful, or the blind impetuosity of the populace. In the negative part of his remark, he is undoubtedly in the right; but, with regard to the positive part, it may be questioned whether, if the whole choice was made to depend on the classes mentioned, other impure motives might not equally enter in. In the letter which Gregory of Nazianzus wrote, in the name of his father, to the collective inhabitants of Cæsarea, he spoke against those elections which were decided by combinations and clanships (*κατὰ φρατρείας καὶ συγγένειας.*) As the ill health of Basil had been made use of as an objection to his appointment, he wrote to them that it became them to consider they were not choosing an *athlete*, but a spiritual teacher. See Gregor. Naz. ep. 18 et 19.

[2] See vit. Constant. III. 60.

twentieth canon of the Antiochian council, A.D. 341, was adhered to in all cases where there was a particular interest that it should be; yet it was often enough violated in the Eastern church, and treated in the same way, in fact, as if it had no existence; as, indeed, we find that Gregory of Nazianzus, about the year 382, could reckon it among the laws *which had long been defunct*.[1] In the same period, on the other hand, the Roman bishop Damasus declared it — and, on the principles held by the Western church, very justly — a law of the fathers which had always been in force, that no officer ought to be transferred from one church to another, because it gave occasion for disputes and divisions.[2] True, it was for the most part ambition that led to the violation of this law of the church; but there were cases, too, where this measure might conduce to the best interests of the church; as, for example, when the peculiar gifts of an eminent individual, whose place of labor in some smaller town might be easily made good, were peculiarly needed in some wider field of action.

We remarked above, that the bishops were often under the necessity of interceding at the court in behalf of oppressed cities or individuals; but this description of labor would often furnish a pretext for worldly-minded men, who preferred residing at court, rather than with their flocks, and who more willingly busied themselves with secular than with spiritual matters, to absent themselves from their communities. This restless and meddlesome activity of the bishops beyond the limits of their calling, proved the source of many disorders in the Eastern church. To counteract the evil, the council of Antioch, in the year 341, (canon 11,) ordained that every bishop, or ecclesiastic generally, who, without permission and a recommendatory letter on the part of the provincial bishops, and particularly of his metropolitan, presumed to visit the emperor, should be excommunicated from the church, and deposed from his office. Hosius, bishop of Cordova, complained at the council of Sardica, because the bishops repaired to the court so frequently and often so unseasonably with demands having no connection with their calling; leaving their dioceses, not, as it became them, to plead the cause of the poor and the widows, but for the purpose of securing places of honor and profit for this or that individual, and to manage for them their worldly concerns; — a practice which injured not a little the good name of the bishops, and which hindered them from speaking out with the same boldness where necessity called for it. Upon his motion it was resolved that in future, no bishop, unless he had been specially summoned by the emperor, should visit the court; but, as it was the case that persons deserving compassion, who had been condemned for some offence to exile, to transportation, or to some other punishment, often took refuge in the church, and the latter must not refuse its aid to such individuals; it was on his motion resolved that the bishops, in such cases, should transmit the petition of such offenders by the hands of a deacon, and that the metropolitan should assist him by letters of recommendation.

[1] Πάλαι τεθνηκότας νόμους.

[2] See Damasi epistola IX. ad Acholium Thessalonicensium episcopum.

The foundation having been already laid in the preceding period for distinguishing the bishops above the presbyters, and for gradually maturing the monarchical power of the episcopacy, this relation was carried out still farther, according to the same principles in the present period. Men were accustomed, indeed, already, to consider the bishops as the successors of the apostles, as the necessary intermediate links of connection between the church and the original apostolic foundation, through whom the influences of the Holy Spirit were to be transmitted to all the other grades of the *clerus*, the latter being organs for their wider diffusion. It followed as a natural consequence from this idea, that the bishops alone could impart spiritual ordination. Again, it was in the Western church considered as the distinctive mark of the bishops, that they alone were empowered to administer the rite of *confirmation* (σφραγίς, signaculum) — (see vol. I., section II., p. 316.) Hence at certain periods they visited the different parts of their dioceses, for the purpose of imparting this seal to those who had been baptized by their presbyters.[1] It was held that they alone could consecrate the holy oil, used in the rite of baptism; and that the presbyters could not, unless empowered by them, even bestow absolution.[2] Yet a Chrysostom and a Jerome still asserted the primitive equal dignity of the presbyters and the bishops; very justly believing that they found authority for this in the New Testament.[3]

As, from the idea of the bishops considered as the successors of the apostles, everything else pertaining to the primacy of these over the presbyters followed as a matter of course; so from the idea of the priesthood necessarily proceeded the distinction of the presbyters above the deacons. The deacons continued, in the main, to be the same as they were in the preceding period; they attended on the bishops and the presbyters, while performing their official functions, and they had various liturgical services of their own. It devolved on them to recite the church prayers, and to give the signal for the commencement of the different portions of divine service. In the Western churches, the gospels, as containing our Lord's discourses, were distinguished from the other selections of scripture, in that they were read, not by the prelectors, but by the deacons, at the public worship.[4] The office of deacons having been rightly derived from those seven deacons appointed by the apostles at Jerusalem, it was held, through a superstitious notion of the unchangeableness of the form, that even in large churches there should be but seven deacons; and hence, in large cities,

[1] See Hieronym. adv. Lucif. T. IV. f. 295, ed. Martianay. Qui in castellis aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros et Diaconos baptizati ante dormierunt, *quam ab episcopis inviserentur.*

[2] Ut, sine chrismate et episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habeant baptizandi. Comp. Innocentii epistola ad Decentium, § 6, codex canonum ecclesiæ Africanæ, canon. VI. et VII. Chrismatis confectio et puellarum consecratio a presbyteris non fiat, vel reconciliare quemquam in publica missa presbytero non licere.

[3] See Chrysostom. Hom. XI. on Timoth. at the beginning. Jerome in his commentary on the Epistle of Titus, and ep. 101 ad Evangelum. Quid facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat: where perhaps he only had in mind the usage of the East.

[4] See Hieronym. ep. 93 ad Sabinian. vol. IV. f. 758. Concil. II. Vasense (at Vaison) 529, canon II.

the great number of presbyters singularly contrasted with the small number of deacons.[1] Later, it came about in large cities that the original number was greatly exceeded, so that in the sixth century, in the time of the emperor Justinian, the principal church in Constantinople could count a *hundred deacons;*[2] and it was now attempted to obviate the objection that this was a deviation from the apostolic usage, by maintaining that the deacons of this period ought not to be compared with those of the apostolic institution. The latter were only a temporary order, designed for the dispensation of alms to the poor;—and, in support of this view, an argument, on an insufficient basis, was drawn from the changes which, since those times, had taken place in the business of the deacons, and in the management of the church funds.[3]

Although the *deacons*, according to the original institution, were to occupy a position far below that of the presbyters, yet it so happened in many districts that they sought to exalt themselves above the latter,[4] and it became necessary for the synods to make laws by which they should be once more confined within the appropriate bounds of their order.[5] The reason of this, in the opinion of Jerome,[6] was not that the deacons, being fewer in number, were, like other rare things, more highly esteemed, but rather because, owing to their closer connection with the bishops, they enjoyed special regard as the confidential agents of the latter. Hence, this was particularly the case with the *archdeacons*, who stood at the head of the order, just as the arch-presbyters stood at the head of the presbyters; for, as the former were often employed by the bishops as their deputies and plenipotentiaries, they thus obtained a predominant influence, which, doubtless, under weak bishops, they sometimes abused.[7]

The institution of *deaconesses* had, as we remarked in speaking of the origin of this office in the preceding period, its special reason in the circumstances of those times. When these circumstances changed, the office would also lose its significance. Originally the deaconesses were looked upon as the female part of the Clerus; and ordination was given them for the purpose of consecrating them to their office, in the same sense as it was given to the other clergy.[8] The Nicene council

[1] See Euseb. VI. 43. Hieronymus, ep. 146 or 101 ad Evangelum: Diaconos paucitas honorabiles facit. The order of the council of Neocæsarea, c. 15, that even in large towns not more than seven deacons should be appointed.

[2] See Justinian. Novell. I. I. N. III

[3] See Chrysostom, H. 14, act. ap. and Concil. Trullan. II. can. 16.

[4] Jerome, for instance, complains of this, particularly in reference to the Roman church, ep. 145 ad Evangelum.

[5] Concil. Nic. c. 18, and Concil. Laodicen. c. 25.

[6] L. c.

[7] Thus Isidorus of Pelusium objects to a certain Lucius of Pelusium, an archdeacon, that, by his wicked arts, he kept the bishop, who blindly followed him, (*τὸν πειθομενόν σοι ἀκρίτως ἐπίσκοπον,*) in the dark; that he made traffic of ordination. He calls here the deacons, *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπίσκοπου*; the archdeacon should therefore *ὅλος ὀφθαλμὸς ὑπάρχειν*. Isidor. Pelusiot. l. IV. ep. 188.

[8] We see this from Tertullian. ad uxorem, l. I. c. VII. viduam *alleqi in ordinem.* Also the apostolic constitutions still know of no difference between the ordination of deaconesses and other clerical ordinations. The ordinary prayer of the bishop should, according to the same authority, run thus: "Eternal God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Creator of man and of woman; thou who didst fill with thy Spirit Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, and Huldah; thou who didst vouchsafe to a woman the birth of thy only-

seems still to have recognized this also to be right.[1] But now, when exaggerated notions about the magical effects of ordination and the dignity of the clerical order became continually more predominant, men began to conceive something offensive in the practice of ordaining deaconesses, and associating them with the *clerus* — which practice was, perhaps, already forbidden by the council of Laodicea in their eleventh canon.[2] The Western church, in particular, declared very strongly against this custom.[3] Western synods of the fifth and sixth centuries forbade generally the appointment of deaconesses. Where ordained deaconesses were still to be found, it was ordered that they should in future receive the blessing of the bishop along with the laity; — another proof that before this they were reckoned as belonging to the clergy.[4] Those prohibitions came, however, only from French synods; and it cannot be inferred from them that the appointment of deaconesses

begotten Son; thou who didst, in the tabernacle and in the temple, place female keepers of thy holy gates; — look down now also upon this thy handmaid, and bestow on her the Holy Ghost, that she may worthily perform the work committed to her, to thy honor, and to the glory of Christ."

[1] Connected with this matter is the obscure passage in the 19th canon, where, moreover, the reading is disputed. The subject of discourse in this canon relates to the *Samosatenean* clergy, who, if they joined the Catholic church, and were found qualified and able, were to be permitted to retain their places; and it is then added, according to the common reading, "The same rule shall hold good with regard to the *deaconesses;*" and it is accordingly presupposed that the latter belonged to the spiritual order. Shortly afterwards, from the proper deaconesses are distinguished the (*abusivè*) so-called widows, who, *as they had not received the* χειροθεσία, *belonged generally to the laity.* According to this, the proper deaconesses received clerical ordination. Following the other reading, it would in the first place run as follows: "The same rule shall hold good with respect to the *deacons.*" And in this case, what comes after would relate to the proper deaconesses; and it would follow from this, that they had received no ordination whatever, and were reckoned with the laity. The whole connection, however, seems chiefly to favor the first reading; for it is difficult to see any reason why, after the whole body of the clergy had been mentioned in general, anything should now be said with regard to the deacons in particular.

[2] This canon is likewise of doubtful interpretation: Μὴ δεῖν τὰς λεγομένας πρεσβύτιδας ἤτοι προκαθημένας ἐν ἐκκλεσίᾳ καθιστᾶσθαι. It may be, that the canon had no reference whatever to deaconesses generally, but only to the oldest of them, who, according to Epiphanius, (hæres. 79,) were styled distinctively, πρεσβύτιδες. The phrase, ἐν ἐκκλησιᾳ, might then be connected either with the preceding or with the following word, and the passage explained thus: "As the oldest of the deaconesses have arrogated to themselves a special authority over the female portion of the church, the synod forbids the appointment of such." But since it was required generally, according to the ancient rule, that the deaconesses should be sixty years old, and since they were the presiding officers over the female part of the community, nothing forbids us to suppose that the name stands for the *deaconesses generally.* Now, if we suppose, what to be sure is not impossible, that the synod forbade the appointment of deaconesses generally, then this would conflict with the usage of the Greek church during this whole period. Or we might lay a particular emphasis on the phrase ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, and, connecting it with the word that follows, understand the sense to be, that *ecclesiastical consecration* or *ordination* only was forbidden to the deaconesses. The *article* in the passage would favor this last explanation.

[3] Hilarius (called the Ambrosiast) says of the Montanists: Etiam ipsas diaconas ordinari debere vana præsumptione defendunt. But the Montanists adhered in this case simply to the ancient usage of the church; for, as to the rest, they too followed the general rule which excluded women from speaking publicly before the church.

[4] The first council of Orange, (Arausicanum, in the year 441,) c. 26. Diaconæ omnimodis non ordinandæ: si quæ jam sunt, benedictioni, quæ populo impenditur, capita submittant. So, too, the council of Epaon, in the year 517, c. 27; the second council of Orleans, in the year 583, c. 18. Yet this council attributed to such an ordination a certain validity; since, in its 17th canon, it directed that the ordained deaconesses who had remarried, should be excluded from the fellowship of the church.

in the Western church ceased at once, and in all the districts alike. In the East, the deaconesses maintained a certain kind of authority for a longer period. We find among them widows possessed of property, who devoted their substance to pious works and institutions; like Olympias, known on account of her connection with Chrysostom. They there had it in charge also, by private instruction, to prepare the women in the country for baptism, and to be present at their baptism.[1] It was considered the privilege of the wives of bishops, who, by common understanding, separated from their husbands after the latter had bound themselves to a life of celibacy, that, if found worthy, they might be consecrated as deaconesses;[2] and thus the female church-office continued to be preserved in the East down into the twelfth century.

Without any change in the grades of the clerical order hitherto existing to the church-offices already established, many new ones, of greater or less importance, were added, which had been rendered necessary in part by the great increase of ecclesiastical business in large towns. As the chief wealth of the churches consisted in landed estates, and the care of improving and farming these estates required much labor and attention, the management of these matters was specially entrusted to one of the clergy, under the name of "steward," (*οἰκονόμος*,)[3] and this officer obtained by degrees the supervision generally over the income and expenditures of the church. This method of procedure was not, however, everywhere followed alike; and, for this reason, the council of Chalcedon directed, in its 25th canon, that all bishops should appoint such "stewards," who, entrusted under their authority with the management of the church revenues, could be witnesses of the manner in which they were administered. Thus the malappropriation of the property of the churches by the bishops, as well as the suspicion of any such thing, was to be provided against. But, inasmuch as the management of property and the protection of the poor who were supported by the church might sometimes lead to lawsuits; and inasmuch as the conducting of such suits did not seem compatible with the standing of the clergy, and they were wanting, moreover, in the requisite legal knowledge; the expedient was finally adopted that the church, like other corporations, should have, for the management of its affairs, a person skilled in the law, who should always stand prepared to defend its rights. This individual was called the *ἔκδικος*, defensor.[4]

[1] See Pelagius on Romans 16: 1. This custom must have existed also in other places besides the East; for in a collection of *Western*, perhaps North-African church ordinances, which are wrongly quoted as coming from a fourth council of Carthage, a canon (c. 12) occurs: Viduæ vel sanctimoniales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore, quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.

[2] Concil. Trull. II. 691, canon 48.

[3] Vid. Basil. Cæsar. ep. 285 and 237.

[4] The council of Carthage, of the year 401, resolved to petition the emperor, that persons might be assigned to the churches, with the approbation of the bishops, who should be prepared to defend the poor against the oppressions of the rich. See canon 10, in the Cod. canon. eccles. Afr. c. 75; the council of Carthage, in the year 407, c. 3, Cod. Afr. c. 97, ut dent facultatem defensores constituendi scholasticos (advocates.) Which was granted: see Cod. Theodos. l. 16, Tit. II. l. 38, comp. Possid.

Again, the drawing-up of the protocols, or reports of the public acts of the church, (the gesta ecclesiastica,) which were prepared with great exactness, rendered necessary the appointment of trustworthy secretaries, familiar with short-hand writing, out of the body of the clergy, (the notarii, exceptores.) The choice in this case, as in that of the prelectors, was made, by many of the churches, out of the class of young men who were to be trained up for the service of the church.[1]

As we observed in the preceding period, the spirit of Christian charity and tenderness was shown, from the first, in the care of providing for the sick, and in the attention bestowed on the burial of the dead. Yet perhaps no particular church-offices were, till now, instituted with reference to these objects: it had been a voluntary work of Christian love.[2] But, as in this period general hospitals had been established under the direction of the churches, it became necessary that particular individuals should be appointed in the churches to take care of the sick. They were called *Parabolani*.[3] At Alexandria they formed, in the fifth century, a distinct order or guild, which might legally consist of *six hundred* members. But it must be admitted, the same abuse seems to have crept in here which infected so many of the institutions of the churches in the principal cities. Wealthy citizens, who of course kept aloof from actual attendance on the sick, obtained admittance into this guild, merely for the sake of enjoying the exemptions to which it was entitled; and the ambitious prelates of Alexandria sought, by the multitude of these *Parabolani*, to form around them a body of men devoted to their interests, whom they could employ for purposes which were not always the purest. Hence it became necessary to provide by civil statutes against the abuses to which this institution was liable.[4]

The burial of the dead was also committed to the care of a particular class of men, retained in the service of the church, (the κοπιάται, copiatæ, fossores.[5])

In respect to the constitution of the episcopal dioceses, the country bishops, (χωρεπίσκοποι,) (see vol. I.,) who probably had their origin in very early times, first appear in conflict with the city bishops in the fourth century. The former name was borne by such as presided over the church of a principal village, and to whom a certain number of village churches, which had their own presbyters or pastors, were subjected.[6] As the episcopal system connected with the city churches

vit. Augustin. c. 12. Different from these defensores were the stewards and agents of the bishops, occurring under the same name in the Roman church. These latter the bishops chose from their clergy; and they are frequently mentioned in the letters of Gregory the Great.

[1] Epiphanius, afterwards bishop of Ticinum, (Pavia,) in the fifth century, after having been prelector when eight years of age, was admitted, as soon as he had made some proficiency in the art of short-hand writing, among the exceptores of the church. See his life by Eunodius.

[2] In respect to burial, comp. Cyprian's behavior during the pestilence, vol. I. sect. I.

[3] Παραβόλανοι, from the Greek παραβαλλέσθαι τὴν ζώην, ψὺχην, since these people, in cases of contagious disease, exposed their lives to danger.

[4] Cod. Theodos. l. 16. Tit. II. l. 42 et 43.

[5] Vid. Hieronymi ep. 17 ad Innocent. Clerici, quibus id officii erat, cruentum linteo cadaver obvolvunt, (of one who had been executed,) etc. Cod. Theodos. l. 13. Tit. I. l. 1, and l. 16. Tit. II. l. 15.

[6] Such a circle of village churches under a chor-bishop, was called a συμμορία. Οἱ προστησαμένοι τῆς συμμορίας. Basil. ep. 290, and ep. 142. The several places sub-

had at so early a period become already matured, this system would now, as a matter of course, be extended also to the relation of the churches subordinated to the rural or chor-bishops; and these latter themselves provoked the restriction of their power by the abuse which they made of it.[1] By synods of the fourth century it was settled that the chor-bishops should only have power to nominate and ordain, without consulting the city bishop, ecclesiastics of the lower grade.[2]

The council of Sardica, and the council of Laodicea, at length forbade wholly the *appointment of chor-bishops*. The former, indeed, prohibited the appointment of bishops in those smaller towns where one presbyter would suffice as presiding officer over the church. The reason given for this ordinance was one which grew out of a perverted hierarchical pride; namely, "*that the name and the authority of the bishop should not be degraded.*"[3] The council of Laodicea ordained moreover, that in place of the country bishops, *visitors* (περιοδεύται) should be appointed; that is, probably, that the bishops should nominate certain presbyters of their own clergy to make visitations of the country churches in their name; and thus, in respect to general oversight and other business, to supply the place of the chor-bishops.[4] Yet chor-bishops are still to be met with, at later periods, in the churches of Syria, and in the West.

But the practice became continually more general of substituting, in the place of the chor-bishops, presbyters placed by the city bishops over the country churches, which presbyters stood in a relation of more immediate dependence on the latter.[5]

ordinate to the episcopal main village were denominated ἀγροὶ ὑποκείμενοι or ὑποτελοῦντες τῷ . . . Basil. ep. 138, or canonica I. canon 10.

[1] Basil of Cæsarea learned that his chor-bishops had received into the service of the church many unworthy men, who were only seeking to escape the military service by procuring themselves to be ordained as ecclesiastics. For this reason he required them to send him an accurate list of all the ecclesiastics in their dioceses, and directed them to ordain no one for the future without informing and consulting him. He asserted, however, that this had been the ancient usage. Basil. ep. 54.

[2] See the 13th Canon of the council of Ancyra. Concil. Antiochen. canon. 9. The council of Laodicea directed, indeed, in its 57th canon, that they should have power to do nothing without consulting the city bishop.

[3] Concil. Laodicen. c. 57. Concil. Sardic. c. 6.

[4] The word περιοδεύειν is employed to denote those tours of visitation which the bishops, accompanied by a number of clergy and laity, made through the several parts of their dioceses. Athanas. Apolog. c. Arianos, § 74, according to ed. Patav. T. I. P. I. f. 151, a. We might accordingly suppose that those presbyters whom the bishops empowered, in their stead, to make such tours of visitation in particular portions of their dioceses, would be designated with the name περιοδεύται. Accordingly, such occur in the times of the Diocletian persecution, who, during the absence of the captured Egyptian bishops, were invested with full powers to make the visitations in their dioceses. The bishops say: Multi euntes et redeuntes ad nos, qui poterant visitare. See the letter of the Egyptian bishops to Miletius, in Maffei Osservazioni letterarie, T. III. p. 15. At the same time, the notion of a person travelling about as a visitor, is by no means necessarily implied in the term περιοδεύτης. It might also signify simply an *inspector*, who, the name only being changed, was the same as the chor-bishop before him; for περιοδεύειν, περιοδεύτης, are terms which sometimes occur in the sense, to attend upon, to heal, physician. See the Homily, erroneously ascribed to Athanasius, in cœcum, § 9 and § 12. The former signification is, however, the more probable one. The predicate περιοδεύτης is given to a presbyter: Σέργιος πρεσβύτερος καὶ περιοδεύτης, in the acts of the council under the Patriarch Mennas, at Constantinople, in the year 536, actio I.

[5] The term παροικία denoted originally each church: Ἐκκλησία ἡ παροίκοῦσα, Euseb. III. 28, subsequently the greater divisions

In respect to the city churches, it was absolutely necessary, it is true, in this period, that, besides the old episcopal and principal church, other churches should be founded; in which, since all could not be conveniently accommodated with room in the principal church, the portions of the community dwelling at a distance might hold their assemblies on Sundays and feast-days. Still it was by no means as yet a general regulation that in the cities, as in the country, separate filial communities arose under the supervision of the episcopal head-church. Epiphanius cites it as a peculiarity of the Alexandrian church, that there, on account of the wants of the inhabitants, different churches under particular presbyters, as parish clergymen, were founded, to which the residents in adjacent streets belonged.[1] At Constantinople, each church had also its own particular clergy. The founders of churches determined, at the same time, the number of clergy for them, and the proportional amount of revenue. The three filial churches of the mother church at Constantinople formed here the only exception: these had no separate body of clergy; but a certain number, taken interchangeably, according to a certain routine, from the clerus of the principal church, were sent on Sundays and feast-days to conduct the public worship in these churches. We are not warranted, however, from this fact, to determine anything as to the regulations of the other churches in this great capital.[2] At Rome the relation of *all* the other churches to the episcopal head-church seems to have been very nearly like the relation of those three filial churches to the head church at Constantinople; but perhaps with this difference, that though all the clergy were incorporated with the clerus of the episcopal head church, yet they did not conduct the public worship in the other churches by turns; but its own particular presbyter was constantly assigned to each one of these churches (tituli.)[3] The Roman presbyters who conducted the public worship in the filial churches had not, however, the right of consecrating the holy supper; but bread which had been consecrated by the

of the church, which in the political phraseology were denominated *διοικήσεις*, Basil. ep. 66; so also a smaller ecclesiastical whole, the city church, with its filial country communities; and finally the country communities in particular, Basil. ep. 206 and 240. Hence the Latin Parœcia, Parochia, Presbyter regens parochiam, Sulpic. Sever. dial. I. I. c. 8. And hence Parochus.

[1] Hæres. 29, Arian. Ὅσαι ἐκκλησίαι τῆς καθολίκης ἐκκλησίας ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ὑπὸ ἕνα ἀρχιεπίσκοπον οὖσαι, καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν ταύταις ἐπιτετάγμενοι εἶσι πρεσβύτεροι διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστίκας χρείας τῶν οἰκητέρων, πλησίων ἑκάστης αὐτῶν καὶ ἀμφόδων ἤτοι λάβρων ἐπιχωρίως καλουμένων.

[2] Justinian. I. T. III. Novell. III. Οὐκ ἰδιαζόνται κληρίκους, οὔδε εἰς τουτῶν ἔχει τῶν τρίων οἴκων, κοίνοι δὲ εἶσι τῆς τὲ ἁγιοτάτης μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας καὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ τούτους ἁπάντες περινοστούντες κατὰ τίνα περιόδον καὶ κύκλον, τὰς λειτουργίας ἐν αὐτοῖς ποιούνται.

[3] That the presbyters of the filial churches at Rome did not quit their connection with the clerus of the principal church, seems to follow from the words of the Roman bishop Innocent in his letter to the bishop Decentius, of the year 416, § 8: Quarum (ecclesiarum) presbyteri, quia *die ipso*, propter plebem sibi creditam, nobiscum convenire non possunt, (where seems to be understood the words, — sicuti cæteris diebus nobis — cum conveniunt,) as also in the words, — ut se a nostra communione, maxime illo die, non judicent separatos. But that the presbyters were usually appointed, in the case of these filial churches, to minister for some considerable length of time, seems evident from the designation of a church of this sort at Rome: Ἔνθα Θέιτων ὁ πρεσβύτερος συνήγεν (the church where he was accustomed to conduct the worship.) Athanas. apolog. c. Arian. § 20.

bishop was sent to them from the principal church: this they simply distributed,[1] — the holy symbol serving at the same time to denote the unbroken ecclesiastical bond between them and the bishop of the principal church.

The *metropolitan constitution* which we saw growing up in the preceding period, became in this more generally diffused and more perfectly matured and consolidated. On the one hand, to the metropolitans was conceded the superintendence over all ecclesiastical affairs of the province to which their metropolis belonged; it was decided that they should convoke the assemblies of provincial bishops, and preside over their deliberations; but, on the other hand, their relation to the entire *collegium* of the provincial bishops, and to the individuals composing it, were also more strictly defined, so as to prevent any arbitrary extension of their power, and to establish on a secure footing the independence of all the other bishops in the exercise of their functions. For this reason, the provincial synods, which were bound to assemble twice in each year, as the highest ecclesiastical tribunal for the whole province, were to assist the metropolitans in determining all questions relating to the general affairs of the church; and without their participation, the former were to be held incompetent to undertake any business relating to these matters of general concern. Each bishop was to be independent in the administration of his own particular diocese, although he could be arraigned before the tribunal of the provincial synods for ecclesiastical or moral delinquencies. No choice of a bishop could possess validity without the concurrence of the metropolitan: he was to conduct the ordination; yet not alone, but with the assistance of at least *two* other bishops; and all the bishops of the province were to be present at the ordination of the metropolitan.

We noticed already, in the preceding period, that the churches in some of the larger capital towns of entire great divisions of the Roman empire, from which towns also Christianity had extended itself in wider circles, had attained to a certain preëminence and peculiar dignity in the estimation of Christians. This, by force of custom, passed over also into the present period; yet without any distinct expression at first of the views of the church on that point. The council of Nice, in its sixth canon, which, by its vague, indeterminate language, gave occasion for many disputes, was the first to attempt to settle some definite rule on this point, particularly with reference to the *Alexandrian* church; having been led to do this, perhaps, by occasion of the Meletian controversies in Egypt. It is here said: "Let the ancient custom which has prevailed in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all these places, be still maintained; since this is the custom also with the Roman bishop. In like manner, at Antioch, and in the other provinces, the churches shall retain their ancient prerogatives."[2] Afterwards, this canon goes on

[1] In the above-cited passages from the letter of Innocence: Fermentum a nobis confectum per acolythos accipiunt.

[2] Τὰ ἀρχαία ἐθῆ κρατείτω τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τουτῶν ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπείδη καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τούτο συνήθες ἐστιν· ὁμοιῶς δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεία σωζέσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

to speak of the rights of the metropolitans generally; from which, however, we are not to infer that the bishops first named were placed in the same class with all the other metropolitans: on the contrary, they are cited as metropolitans of higher rank, though nothing was definitely said respecting their precise relation to the other metropolitans. As in the provinces here named, which were to be subordinate to the Alexandrian church, there were also particular metropolitans, it is plainly evident that some higher rank must have been intended, in this case, than that which was attributed to the ordinary metropolitan. The whole relation having been in the first place of political origin, it was designated at first by a name borrowed from the political administration of the empire. As the magistrates that presided over the political administration in these main divisions of the Roman empire were denominated *Exarchs*, (ἐξάρχοι,) this appellation was transferred also to those who presided over the ecclesiastical government.[1] Subsequently, choice was made of the more ecclesiastical name of *Patriarchs*.[2] Originally, it was the churches of the three great capital cities of the Roman empire, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, which held this prominent rank. In these churches, which were regarded, moreover, as ecclesiæ apostolicæ, ecclesiastical and political considerations were conjoined. But to these there was now added another church, which had in its favor neither antiquity of political nor of ecclesiastical dignity; while many churches which were subordinated to it, as for instance the church of Ephesus, had precedence over it, as by ecclesiastical character, so by its political relation in the ancient constitution of the Roman empire. When the city of Byzantium, which in earlier times was itself subordinate to the metropolis at Heraclea in Thrace, became, under the name of Constantinople, the seat of government for the whole of the Roman empire in the East, and the second capital of the entire Roman world, it was necessary that its church also should be distinguished as the church of the second imperial residence, and should receive the rank of a patriarchate. Accordingly the second ecumenical council of Constantinople directed already in 381, in its second canon, that the bishop of Constantinople should take rank next after the Ro-

[1] See Concil. Chalc. canon 8: Ὁ ἐξάρχος τῆς διοικησέως, and canon 16. Doubtless many eminent bishops were then still reckoned among the exarchs, who subsequently were not recognized as patriarchs.

[2] This name occurs first at the council of Constantinople, in the year 381, in an application somewhat different from that which it afterwards received. When, in consequence of the preceding controversies concerning doctrines, many schisms arose in the Eastern church, and it became necessary to correct various disorders, it was determined, for the sake of restoring unanimity and order in the church, to appoint — besides the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, who were already, through their churches, possessed of a peculiar precedence of rank — certain individual bishops that had acquired this distinction by virtue of their personal character; and these were entrusted with a supervisory power over the several dioceses and provinces of the Roman empire, — as Asia Minor, Pontus, and Cappadocia, — under the name of *Patriarchs*. In particular, it was decided that none but such as stood on terms of church fellowship with these individuals should share in the common rights of the Catholic church (see Cod. Theodos. l. 16. Tit. II. l. 3. Socrat. hist. V. 8.) To this arrangement, and the quarrel among the bishops which sprung out of it, Gregory of Nazianzus alludes in his carmen de episcopis, v. 798, where he says to the bishops: Θρόνους μὲν ἐχοίτε καὶ τυραννίδας | ὑμεῖς, ἔπει καὶ πρώτα ταῦθ' ὑμῖν δόκει· | χαιροίτε, ὑβριζοίτε, πατριαρχίας | κληροῦσθε· κόσμος ὑμῖν εἰκέτω μέγας.

man bishop, since Constantinople was New Rome;[1] and the council of Chalcedon, (A.D. 451,) in its last canon but one, confirmed this decree with the following noticeable comparison between the church of the ancient and that of the new Rome: "*The fathers rightly conceded that rank to the episcopate of ancient Rome, because Rome was the mistress city;*" and following out the same principle, the fathers of this council of Constantinople attributed equal rank to the episcopate of the new Rome, because they rightly judged that the city which was the seat of the imperial government and of the senate, enjoyed equal dignity with ancient Rome, had the same precedence in ecclesiastical affairs, and must take the second place after the latter; so that the bishop of Constantinople ought to ordain the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia Minor, and Thrace, and also the collective bishops of the barbarian tribes within those dioceses. Finally, after many disputes with the church of Antioch, there was added still the fifth patriarchate, of a church distinguished simply in a spiritual respect, enjoying originally not even the rank of a metropolis, the patriarchate of Jerusalem.[2]

This division of the whole Roman church jurisdiction into four or five patriarchates, intimately connected as it was, in part, with the political constitution of the Roman empire, would naturally have respect, in the first place, to those churches only which lay within the bounds of the Roman empire; although it naturally exerted some indirect influence also on those churches without the empire, which had been planted by the churches within it. But it did not apply in the same sense, and in the same way, even to all those parts which belonged to the empire. A peculiar spirit of freedom distinguished, from the earliest times, the church of North Africa. The church at Carthage had, it is true, enjoyed by custom particular consideration as the church of the principal city of North Africa; her bishop presided in all the general assemblies of the North-African church;[3] yet he by no means stood in the same relation to the bishops of the other five North-African churches, as the patriarchs did to the bishops of their greater church dioceses; and even the bishop of Rome did not properly possess the authority of a patriarch in the North-African church. This church, in a council at Hipporegius, (now Bona in the district of Algiers,) A.D. 393, protested expressly against such a title as the patriarchs bore in other countries, and would recognize the validity of no other title than that of bishop of the first church.[4]

Since the patriarchal constitution formed a still more universal bond of unity for the church than that of the metropolitan bishops, and since the patriarchs stood related to the metropolitans in the same manner as the latter to the bishops, it is possible that, by this means, greater unity and order were introduced into the management of all the eccle-

[1] Ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τίμης μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην.

[2] Concil. Chalc. act. VII.

Concilia plenaria Africæ.

[4] Canon 39, in Cod. Canon. eccles. Afr. Ut primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, (ἐξάρχος τῶν ἱέρων,) aut aliquid hujusmodi; sed tantum primæ sedis episcopus.

siastical affairs of the Roman church; but it may be questioned, if the outward unity which was brought about by this system of constraint, proved salutary in its influence on the church development. The bond of outward constraint could never rightly adjust itself to the spirit of Christianity, which requires a free outward development of the individuality of character from within. The history of the church in the fifth century, in particular, teaches how oppressive the despotism of the patriarchs at Alexandria and at Antioch sometimes became. And if, on the one hand, four principal portions of the Roman church were in this manner brought into closer unity; yet, on the other, oppositions so much the more violent were thereby engendered between the patriarchal churches of the East, — the sources of numberless schisms and disorders. The history of the church in these centuries shows how much of impure, worldly interest became diffused in the church, through the eager thirst and strife of the bishops for precedence of rank; what mischievous disputes sprang out of the mutual jealousies of the patriarchs, — particularly the jealousies of the patriarchs of Alexandria towards the patriarchs of Constantinople, — and how this state of things contributed to check the oppositions of the different tendencies of the dogmatic spirit in their free evolution, and to intermingle with them worldly and party passions; so that, by the impure motives which made use of the doctrinal interest as a pretext, this interest itself was smothered. Very justly could Gregory of Nanzianzus say, as he did at Constantinople in 380, when lamenting over the evils of the church, which he had learned from his own experience: "Would to Heaven there were no primacy, no eminence of place, and no tyrannical precedence of rank; that we might be known by eminence of virtue alone! But, as the case now stands, the distinction of a seat at the right hand or the left, or in the middle; at a higher or a lower place; of going before or aside of each other, has given rise to many disorders among us to no salutary purpose whatever, and plunged multitudes in ruin." [1]

In proceeding to speak, then, of the Roman bishop in particular, regard must be had to two different points of view: *the Roman bishop, considered as one of those four patriarchs*, in his relation to the more extended church jurisdiction which was subordinate to the Roman church in especial; *and the Roman bishop in his relation to the entire church, or particularly to that of the West.* As it respects the first; — it is to this, the above-cited sixth canon of the Nicene council has reference; and probably Rufinus [2] gives, in this case, the most correct explanation of the matter, when he expounds this canon as implying that the diocese of the Roman bishop embraced the whole circle or district which belonged to the administration of the vicarius urbis Romæ, (the provincias suburbicarias, i.e., the major part of middle Italy; all lower Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.[3]) Add to this, that the Roman church

[1] Orat. 28, f. 484.

[2] Rufin. I. 5, ut suburbicariarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat.

[3] See Notitia Dignitatum imperii Romani, sectio 45, and the letter of the council of Sardica to the Roman bishop Julius, § 5. Ut per tua scripta qui in *Sicilia*, qui in *Sardinia*, et in *Italia*, sunt fratres nostri, quæ acta sunt cognoscant.

had become possessed, by donations and legacies, of many landed estates lying without these limits, which gave her opportunity of knitting firmly to her interests many influential connections. Again, as the whole constitution of the church in the Roman empire hung closely connected with the political constitution, the Roman church necessarily possessed this advantage over all the patriarchal churches, that it was the church of the ancient capital of the Roman empire. This politico-ecclesiastical point of view was always made of prominent importance by the Orientals, as is shown in the above-cited decrees of the Constantinopolitan and of the Chalcedonian councils. Theodoretus, bishop of Cyprus, says, in a letter in which he solicited the aid of the Roman bishop, Leo the Great,[1] that everything conspired to give the church of Rome the primacy: those advantages which, in other cases, were found distributed among different churches, and whatever distinguishes a city, either in a political or in a spiritual respect, were here conjoined; — and he then proceeds to notice first the political superiority. Rome was the largest, the most splendid, the most populous city: from her proceeded the existing magisterial power; from her the whole empire took its name. Finally, the great distinction of the Roman church, in respect to religion, was, that she had been honored by the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, and possessed their tombs, which were objects of reverence also to the East.[2] All this taken together might create even among the Orientals a peculiar veneration for the Roman church.

With the people of the West, all this was made to rest on such dogmatic grounds as converted it into something entirely different. We observed already, in the preceding period, how, from confounding the ideas of the visible and the invisible church, from the notion of a necessary outward unity of the church, the idea had there sprung up of an uninterrupted outward representation of this unity, necessarily existing at all times; and how this idea had been transferred to the cathedra Petri in the Roman church. This idea, handed down, in its yet vague and unsettled shape, to the present period, in connection with its root, the false and grossly conceived Old-Testament view of the Theocracy, contains within it the entire germ of the papacy, which needed nothing more than to unfold itself, under favorable circumstances, in the congenial soil of the spirit of an age in which the confusion of the outward form with the inner essence became continually more inveterate.

We saw this idea carried out to some extent in the preceding period, particularly in the North-African church: — not that this tendency of the Christian mind prevailed more than elsewhere in the North-African church; but rather, because here was the dogmatic spirit which apprehended this tendency with the clearest consciousness, — and in this church it appears again, during the present period, with peculiar prominence. Optatus of Mileve, who wrote in the last half of the fourth

[1] Ep. 113.

[2] Theodoretus, in the letter above referred to, expresses himself on this subject as follows: Ἔχει καὶ τῶν κοίνων πατέρων καὶ διδασκάλων τῆς ἀληθείας, Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, τὰς ψήκας, τῶν πίστων τὰς ψύχας φωτιζούσας. So an illuminating influence, which issued from their proximity.

century, represents the apostle Peter as the head of the apostles, — as the representative of the unity of the church and of the apostolic power, who had received the keys of the kingdom of heaven for the purpose of giving them to the others. He finds it worthy of remark, that Peter, notwithstanding that he had denied Christ, yet continued to hold this relation to the rest of the apostles, so that the objective side of the unity of the church, which was thus incapable of being invalidated by any human fault, appears in its unchangeable constancy. In the Roman church he perceives the indestructible cathedra Petri. This stands in the same relation to the other episcopal churches as the apostle Peter stood to the rest of the apostles. The Roman church represents the one visible church, the one episcopate.[1] There was one apostolic power in Peter, from which the apostolic powers of the others issued forth, as it were, like so many different streams; and, in like manner, there is one episcopal power in the Roman church, from which the other episcopal powers are but so many different streams. How much might be derived out of this idea, so apprehended? Far more than the individual who thus expressed himself was aware of. Augustin would be led by his thoroughly Christian character; by the prevailing tendency in his inner life and in his system of faith to the objectively godlike; by that spirit of protestation against all deification of man which actuated him, — and by which no inconsiderable opposition was, in the next succeeding centuries, actually excited against the Catholic element, although, in the case of Augustin himself, this religious element had become completely fused with the Catholic, — by all these inward causes, Augustin would be led to more correct views of the words of our Lord in their reference to Peter. He rightly perceived, that not Peter, but Christ himself, is the Rock on which the church has been founded; that this word of our Lord, therefore, has reference only to that faith in Christ in the person of Peter, through which he was the man of rock; and that consequently the whole church, which rests on this faith, is represented by Peter. "He was," says Augustin, "in this case, the image of the whole church, which in the present world is shaken by divers trials, as by floods and storms; and yet does not fall, because it is founded on the rock from which Peter received his name. For the rock is not so called after Peter, but Peter is so called after the rock; just as Christ is not so denominated after the Christian, but the Christian after Christ; for it is on this account our Lord declares, On this rock I will found my church, because Peter had said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. On this rock, which thou hast

[1] See Optatus Milevitan. l. VII. c. 3. Bono unitatis Petrus satis erat, si post quod negavit, solam veniam consequeretur, et præferri apostolis omnibus meruit, et claves regni cœlorum communicandas cæteris, solus accepit. Thus men confounded the faith which Peter expressed in the spirit of all believers, and to which alone Christ's words referred, with the person of Peter as a man; instead of drawing the conclusion from this very circumstance of Peter's denial, that *his person* could, as little as that of any other man, furnish the rock on which the kingdom of Christ was to be built. And l. II. c. 2: In urbe Roma a Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur, ne cæteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent.

confessed, he declares, I will build my church ;[1] for Christ was the Rock on whose foundation Peter himself was built; for other foundation hath no man laid than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus."[2] Had Augustin made himself clearly conscious of what he here expressed, and prosecuted it to the end, he would have arrived at the conception of the church as the community of the believers in Christ, and so — as this faith is an inward invisible fact — to the conception of the invisible church ; and consequently this passage would no longer have retained with him the sense which men would fain give it in reference to the visible church, to the episcopal power, and to the relation of the Roman church in particular to the church universal. Having once been led, however, by the whole course of his religious and theological training, into the habit of confounding together the visible and the invisible church, and having allowed this error to become firmly rooted in his doctrinal system, his views became thereby narrowed ; and, instead of holding fast by the purely spiritual conception of the church which must have here presented itself to him, he involuntarily substituted for it the conception of the visible church, which had already been firmly established in his system ; and so it may have happened that even in his mind too, with the notion of Peter as a representative of the church, there came to be associated the idea of a permanent representation in the Roman church.[3] But, without question, the spirit of ecclesiastical freedom among the North Africans was the farthest possible removed, as we shall see hereafter, from any inclination to concede all the consequences which there was a disposition already in the Roman church to derive from these notions.

In the minds of the Roman bishops we perceive the idea beginning

[1] This exposition is certainly correct as to its spirit, but not exactly according to the letter; as these words refer literally not to Christ himself, but to Peter personally,— but at the same time only in so far as he had borne witness of this faith.

[2] Ecclesia non cadit, quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit. Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra; sicut non Christus a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur. Ideo quippe ait Dominus, Super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, quia dixerat Petrus: Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi. Super hanc ergo petram, quam confessus, ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Petra enim erat Christus, super quod fundamentum etiam ipse ædificatus est Petrus, 1 Cor. 3 : 11. Ecclesia ergo, quæ fundatur in Christo. In Johann. Evang. Tractat. 124, § 5. The other exposition of this passage, by which it is referred only to the person of Peter, Augustin himself had presented in his work contra epistolam Donati, which has not come down to us.

[3] In the book de utilitate credendi, § 35, he traces the development of the church as a divine institution, endowed with divine authority, ab apostolica sede per successiones episcoporum. This book he wrote, to be sure, before he had come to deviate, as he did afterwards, from the ordinary exposition of this passage, as it was understood at Rome and in North Africa; but the fact is explained in the way above described, that, by this change of views as to the exegetical meaning, nothing was changed in Augustin's doctrinal system. He distinguishes, in the place above referred to, a threefold relation of Peter; — the same person being considered in respect to his individual nature as a man, in respect to his nature by divine grace as a Christian, and at the same time as abundantiore gratia primus apostolorum. Those words, it is true, ought properly to refer to the second relation of Peter, inasmuch as he represented the person of all Christians; but it is easy to see, that, in substituting the notion of the church in the place of Christians, he might be led to confound the second and the third together. Thus Peter was distinguished as the first of the apostles by the very circumstance that he was to represent the visible church in his own person, and that its development was to proceed forth from him. And what was considered true of Peter, was transferred to the church of Rome.

already to develope itself more clearly and distinctly, that to them, *as the successors and representatives of the apostle Peter*, belonged the sovereign guidance of the whole church. Although it may be observed, doubtless, here and there, in occasional instances, that the idea of universal dominion, associated with Rome, was transferred from its political meaning, and clothed in a spiritual dress;[1] yet nothing was to them more offensive than that confusion of the political and spiritual provinces which they believed they discovered, whenever their higher dignity and authority, instead of being suffered to rest on the foundation of the divine institution, was attempted to be derived from the political superiority of Rome. The delegates of the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, protested emphatically against the above-mentioned decree of the council of Chalcedon, which on this ground attributed to the bishopric of Constantinople the same rights as to the episcopate of Rome. When this decree came to be made known to Leo, he despatched various letters to the emperor, to Anatolius the patriarch of Constantinople, and to the whole council, in which he strongly declared his disapprobation of what he pronounced to be a usurpation. In the letter to the emperor he says:[2] "The case is quite different with worldly relations, and with those that concern the things of God; and without that rock which our Lord has wonderfully laid as the foundation, no structure can stand firm. Let it satisfy Anatolius that, by your assistance, and by my ready assent,[3] he has attained to the bishopric of so great a city. Let not the imperial city be too small for him, which yet he cannot convert into an apostolic see," (sedes apostolica.) Leo appealed to the inviolable authority of the Nicene council: he alluded very probably to the above-cited sixth canon of that council, which really stood in necessary contradiction with this new arrangement, only on the principle that the dignity of the church stood wholly independent of political relations. He contended for the rights of the Alexandrian and of the Antiochian churches, which would be impaired in case that the church at Constantinople claimed to itself the primacy over the entire East; he contended for the rights of the metropolitan bishops, which would be jeopardized by the patriarchate which Anatolius assumed over Asia Minor, Pontus and Thrace. And he contrived, in the end, to trace back the higher inviolable dignity of the Alexandrian and Antiochian churches also to the apostle Peter; of the former, namely, to Mark, the disciple of the apostle Peter; and of the second, immediately to Peter himself, since he was the first to preach the gospel in that place. Anatolius having appealed to the authority of the second ecumenical council, which had adjudged this rank to the church of Constantinople, Leo

[1] In the remarkable work, de vocatione gentium, which was probably written by Leo the Great, while he was still a deacon, l. II. c. 6, it is said: Roma, quæ tamen per apostolici sacerdotii principatum amplior facta est arce religionis quam solio potestatis; and Leo M. p. 80: Civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sacram b. Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsidens religione divina, quam dominatione terrena.

[2] Ep. 78.

[3] Which refers to Leo's approval of the choice of Anatolius, which had been sought after in consequence of certain disputes as to matters of doctrine. The Roman bishops well understood, however, how to take advantage of every occasion which could be interpreted into the recognition of a right conceded to them.

replied, that no assembly of bishops, whether large or small, could decide anything against the authority of the Nicene council. He speaks on this occasion with singular contempt of a council which was afterwards generally reckoned, both in the Western and in the Eastern church, among the number of ecumenical councils. The canon drawn up by that body he declared to be null and void; and would allow it no validity, if for no other reason, because it had never been communicated to the Roman church.[1]

It is impossible to doubt as to what the popes, even as early as the fifth century, believed themselves to be, or would fain be, in relation to the rest of the church, after having once listened to the language which they themselves hold on this subject. When a North-African council at Carthage had sent a report of their conclusions, in the decision of a controverted point of doctrine, to the Roman bishop Innocent, and demanded his assent to these conclusions; in his answer of the year 417, he first praised them because they had considered themselves bound to submit the matter to his judgment, since they were aware what was due to the apostolical chair; since all who occupied this seat strove to follow in the steps of that apostle from whom the episcopal dignity itself, and the entire authority of this name, had emanated. With good right had they held sacred the institutions of the fathers, who had decided, not according to human, but according to the divine counsels, that whatever was transacted in provinces, let them be ever so remote, should not be considered as ratified, until it had come to the knowledge of the apostolic chair; so that, by its entire authority, every just decision might be confirmed, and the other churches (as the pure streams should be distributed from the original, undisturbed source, through the different countries of the whole world[2]) might learn from *this* church what they had to ordain, whom they had to pronounce innocent, and whom to reject as irreclaimably wrong. Leo the Great declares, in a letter to the Illyrian bishops, in which, after the example of the Roman bishop Siricius, he names the bishop of Thessalonica the representative of the apostolic power, (vicarius apostolicus,) "that on him, as the successor of the apostle Peter, on whom, as the reward of his faith, the Lord had conferred the primacy of apostolic rank, and on whom he had firmly grounded the universal church, was devolved the care of all the churches, to participate in which he invited his colleagues, the other bishops."[3]

[1] Ep. 80, c. 5. Persuasioni tuæ in nullo penitus suffragatur quorumdam episcoporum ante sexaginta (ut jactas) annos facta conscriptio, nunquamque a prædecessoribus tuis ad apostolicæ sedis transmissa notitiam, cui ab initio sui caducæ dudumque collapsæ sera nunc et inutilia subjicere fundamenta voluisti. It hardly answers the purpose to attempt, as has been done, to make out that the authority of this council was recognized by Leo, and thus to bring the latter into agreement with the opinion of the later Roman church, by referring this disparaging judgment of Leo, without any regard to the natural sense of the passage, simply to this single canon of the council.

[2] The thought is plainly implied, that all the churches could hold fast to the pure doctrine only by remaining steadfast in their connection with the Roman, as the mother church, — the original, invincible fountain-head of the transmitted, divine doctrine, as well as of all spiritual power.

[3] Quia per omnes ecclesias cura nostra distenditur, exigente hoc a nobis Domino, qui apostolicæ dignitatis beatissimo apostolo Petro primatum fidei suæ remuneratione commisit, universalem ecclesiam in funda-

The favorable situation of the Roman church in its relation to the Eastern churches, brought along with it many circumstances which might be turned in support of this assumption of the Roman bishops. As we have already had occasion to observe, the Eastern church stood in far greater dependence on political influences than the Western; and what, in some respects, stood connected with this fact, there was in the former no church possessed of such decided external preponderance as the Roman church enjoyed in relation to the West. On the contrary, the oppositions and jealousies among the patriarchal churches, as we have said, were the source of many disputes; and the higher authority of the recently promoted Byzantine church, in particular, was, at all times, a thing extremely offensive to the ancient patriarchal church of Alexandria. Again, the Western church, by reason of its predominant Roman spirit, so unbending and practical, and by reason of its characteristic life, which was not so restlessly scientific, preserved greater tranquillity in the course of its doctrinal development. On the other hand, the more excitable and actively scientific spirit of the Greeks, the speculative bent of mind, the manifold spiritual elements which here came in contact with each other, — all this was a source of manifold disputes in the Greek church, which, through the disturbing interference of the state, were still further promoted, and at the same time rendered more intricate and perplexing. Now, while in the Western church the greatest tranquillity prevailed, contrasted with this agitated condition of the Greek church, it came about that the contending parties of the latter, and especially those who had against them the dominant power, sought to obtain on their side the voice of the Western church, and especially of the Roman as the most influential and the one which gave the tone to all the rest; and that those who were persecuted by the dominant party, took refuge at Rome. Now, as it was of the utmost importance to such persons to gain in their favor the voice of the Roman church, so this interest influenced them in the choice of their expressions; and, to show their respect for the Roman church, they made use of such expressions as they would not have employed under other circumstances. But the Roman bishops, who were already in the habit of passing judgment on all the relations of the church from that once established and settled point of view which we have just described, found accordingly in such expressions, looking as they did at nothing but the letter, an acknowledgment of that point of view, without concerning themselves to inquire what the persons who used these expressions really had in their minds. Protestations undoubtedly sometimes followed from the dominant party of the East, when the decisions of the Roman bishops ran contrary to their interests. Thus, for example, when the Roman bishop Julius, instead of concurring with the dominant party of the Eastern church, which had deposed from his office the bishop Athanasius of Alexandria, had invited both parties to present the matter, by their delegates, before an assembly of the Western

mento ipsius soliditate constituens, necessitatem sollicitudinis, quam habemus, cum his, qui nobis collegii caritate juncti sunt, sociamus. Leo. ep. V. ad Metropolitanos Illyr.

church; the Eastern bishops, convened at Antioch, declared that it did not belong to him, a foreign bishop, to set himself up as a judge in the affairs of the Eastern church; that every synod was independent in its decisions; that he, as bishop of a larger city, was no more than the other bishops; that it had, in truth, just as little entered into the minds of his predecessors to interfere in the interior affairs of the Eastern church, to set themselves up as judges over the decisions of the Eastern synods in the Samosatenian disputes, as it had occurred to the older bishops of the East to constitute themselves judges in the controversies of the West; as, for example, the Novatian.[1] But the party in whose favor the Roman bishops had decided, finally obtained the victory; and they could accordingly, taking advantage of this fact, declare that protestation to be null, and maintain the validity of their own judicial sentence. Under such favorable circumstances they received many public testimonials of their supreme juridical authority, which in the sequel became of importance to them. To this class belong the *three* following decrees of the council of Sardica:[2] "I. When a bishop is condemned in a matter, and he believes that injustice has been done him, the synod which judged him shall write to the Roman bishop Julius; so that, if necessary, the investigation may be renewed by the bishops of the neighboring province, and he himself name the judges. II. That, in such a case, no other person shall be nominated to fill the place of the deposed bishop, until the Roman bishop shall have received notice of it, and decided on the point. III. If, in such a case, the deposed bishop appeal to the bishop of Rome, and the latter considers a new investigation to be advisable, he may commit such investigation to the bishops of the neighboring province, and may also send to it presbyters, out of the body of his clergy, to assist in the inquiry." Thus this synod, no doubt, assigned to the Roman bishop a certain supreme power of jurisdiction, a right of revision in the affairs of the bishops. But it admits also of being easily explained how they came to do this. Besides the Western bishops, those only from the East were present at this council who had been condemned and deposed there by the party hostile to them. It was the interest of the dominant party in this council, that the judgment of the Eastern synods with regard to Athanasius should be reversed, and the latter restored to his place again. The council of Sardica was intended, it is true, in its first arrangement, to be an ecumenical one. But as the Orientals had in a great measure separated from it, it could lay no just claims to this character; and it seems that its canons, in the next succeeding times, stood in no very high authority even in the Western church itself. But, very naturally, these canons must have been highly acceptable to the Roman church; and in this church, therefore, they could not be forgotten. So much the more easily might it here happen that these canons, to which a peculiar importance must have been attached, would be unconsciously confounded and given out for the same with those of the Nicene coun-

[1] Vid. Julii epist. I. adv. Eusebianos, § 4 et 5. Socrat. l. II. c. 15. Hilarii opus historicum Fragmentum, III. § 26.

[2] Canon. III. IV. et V.

cil. A second declaration, by which, in the year 378 or 381, a certain supreme authority of jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs was conceded to the Roman bishop Damasus, proceeded, however, only from an emperor, Gratian; and had reference simply to a schism which had arisen in Rome in which the Roman bishop was particularly interested. (See, below, History of Schisms.)

A third case was this: The bishop Hilarius of Arles, whose zeal in discharging the duties of his spiritual office, whose life of strict piety and active benevolence commanded universal respect, had proceeded, on a certain occasion, while visiting the churches as metropolitan bishop of this part of Gaul (Gallia Narbonnensis) — which authority the bishops of Arles had exercised for a long time, though not without its being disputed, — to depose from his office, with the consent of a synod, a certain bishop by the name of Celidonius.[1] The latter, however, applied to Rome, and succeeded in persuading Leo that injustice had been done him. Hilarius himself hastened to Rome, and openly defended his cause. But when he perceived that Leo was already committed on the side of Celidonius and determined to take his part, he judged it advisable to leave Rome again. At this proceeding, Leo was still more exasperated: it appeared to him a very punishable act of disobedience, that Hilarius ventured to withdraw himself from his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He, without further ado, reinstated Celidonius in his office; though, even according to the decrees of Sardica, it simply belonged to him to direct that a new investigation of the matter should be instituted in the province itself, by the neighboring bishops, in which he himself might participate by means of his delegates. He went so far as to declare that, as the metropolitan authority had been conferred by his predecessors on the bishop of Arles only by a special grant, Hilarius had forfeited this power by his abuse of it, and that it should again be transferred to the bishop of Vienna. His unspiritual mode of apprehending the idea of the church, and the hierarchical arrogance so easily combined therewith, carried him to such an extreme that he could say: "He who thinks himself called upon to dispute the primacy of the apostle Peter, will find himself in nowise able to lessen that dignity; but, puffed up by the spirit of his own pride, will plunge himself into hell."[2] Thus whoever refused to subject himself to the usurped spiritual domination of a man, was to be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. It had been well for Leo, if he had applied to himself what he addressed to the Gallic bishops: "That the fellowship of the church was not to be forbidden to any Christian by the arbitrary will of an angry priest; that a soul for which Christ has shed his blood, must not be excluded from the privilege of church communion on account of some insignificant word." The young emperor, Valentinian III., who was at the beck of the Roman bishop, issued thereupon a law in the year 445, in which he says: "The primacy of the apostolic seat having been

[1] It is disputed, whether this bishop belonged to the metropolitan diocese of Hilarius, or whether zeal for church discipline, or passion, led him to the wrong step of stretching his power beyond the limits of that diocese, and thus to violate ecclesiastical forms.

[2] Vid. ep. 9, 10.

established by the merit of the apostle Peter, by the dignity of the city of Rome, and by the authority of a holy synod,[1] no pretended power shall arrogate to itself anything against the authority of that seat. For peace can be universally preserved only when the whole church acknowledges its ruler." Resistance to the authority of the Roman bishop is declared to be an offence against the Roman state. It is established as a settled ordinance for all times, that as well the Gallic bishops, as the bishops of all the other provinces, could not properly undertake anything without authority from the Pope of the eternal city (Papa urbis æternæ.) What the authority of the apostolic seat ordained, should be law for all, so that every bishop who, when summoned before the tribunal of the Roman bishop, declined to appear, should be forced to do so by the governor of the province.

The emperor, by whom the spiritual and the political points of view were here confounded together, willed that the *church* of his empire, just as the *latter itself*, should have one acknowledged principal head; but the whole previous constitution of the church could not possibly be overthrown by an imperial edict. Hilarius seems, notwithstanding, to have remained in possession of his metropolitan dignity; he maintained the rights of his church, although he sought by a respectful deportment to become reconciled with the Roman bishop.[2]

The North-African church, which most distinctly expressed the principle from which these consequences were derived, was, however, the farthest removed from conceding these latter. That spirit of ecclesiastical freedom which had already, in the time of Cyprian, opposed itself to the Roman assumptions, was here ever predominant. As cases were frequently occurring in which members of the clerical body that had been deposed on account of their offences, took refuge with the Roman church, and were there received; the councils of Carthage, in the years 407 and 418, ordained[3] that whoever thereafter, instead of appealing to the jurisdiction of the North-African church itself, appealed to one beyond the sea, should be excluded from the fellowship of the church. Yet it subsequently happened that a deposed presbyter, Apiarius, appealed to the Roman bishop Zosimus. The latter was disposed to bring the matter before his tribunal; and when this met with some resistance, he fell back for support on the cited canons of the council of Sardica; which, however, he caused to be presented by his delegates at the council of Carthage in the year 419, as Nicene canons. To the Africans it appeared extremely strange that these canons, which were wholly unknown to them, were nowhere to be found in their collection of the doings of the Nicene council. They resolved that they would assume them for the present to be valid; yet cause inquiry to be made by consulting the genuine ancient manuscripts of the doings

[1] The council of Nice or of Sardica.

[2] It is to be regretted, that there are no remaining records of these transactions between Hilary and Leo. The words which the city præfect, (præfectus urbis,) Auxiliaris, who sought to make himself mediator, addressed to Hilary, are worthy of notice: Impatienter ferunt homines, si sic loquamur, quomodo nobis conscii sumus. Aures præterea Romanorum quadam teneritudine plus trahuntur, in quam si se Sanctitas tua demittat, plurimum tu nihil perditurus acquiris.

[3] Cod. Afr. c. 28.

of the Nicene council, preserved in the Eastern churches at Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, for the purpose of ascertaining whether they really belonged to them. This they gave notice of to the Roman bishop Bonifacius, who had meanwhile succeeded Zosimus. They invited him also to make inquiries of the like nature; but at the same time they declared that, even according to these laws, the affairs of other ecclesiastics besides bishops must be settled only within their own provinces. "Now although these laws were observed in Italy, yet they should not be compelled to submit to such intolerable encroachments. Yet they hoped that under his ecclesiastical rule they would not have to suffer from such arrogance."[1] Amid the doctrinal disputes of the fifth and sixth centuries, the Pelagian controversy and that concerning the edict *de tribus capitulis*, we see often the Africans maintaining their doctrinal principles even when in contradiction with the Roman; and we see, in fact, the Roman bishop Zosimus finally yielding to the decisions of the Africans.

We must accordingly hold fast to this as the result of the church development of this period, — that the idea of an external church theocracy under one sovereign head was already present in the minds of the Roman bishops; and although a spirit of ecclesiastical independence, which flowed from the earliest Christian antiquity, still presented many obstacles to the realization of this idea, and the Eastern church ever remained disinclined to acknowledge it, yet important germs of such a realization were already existing in the Western churches, which, under favorable circumstances, in later times, would doubtless be taken advantage of.

To represent the outward unity of the church, another important institution came in during this period, which, it is true, originated also in that general, fundamental idea of the external, visible church; yet, if the Christian doctrine had not first evolved itself into precisely this form of a universal monarchy, could not so easily have shaped itself in the way it did; — we mean the *general assemblies of the church*, concilia universalia, συνόδοι οἰκουμενίκαι (by οἰκουμένη was understood, originally, the Roman empire.) Men being accustomed already to regard the provincial synods as the highest legislative and judicial tribunals for the churches of the several provinces, it was natural, when disputes arose which occupied the largest portion of the Christendom of the Roman empire, that the thought should occur of forming, after some analogous manner, a like tribunal for the Christendom of the whole Roman empire; and this was soon transferred, generally, to the entire church universal. The provincial synods then being customarily regarded as organs of the Holy Spirit for the guidance of the churches of a certain district, so now this was applied to the relation of universal councils to the whole church. These universal councils had a two-fold aim, to decide disputes concerning doctrines, and to determine the constitution, the forms of worship, and the discipline of the church; to which latter, the canons of these assemblies had reference.

[1] Non sumus jam istum typhum passuri.

It was not possible, at these councils, to arrive at a calm understanding of disputed points of doctrine. Each party was fettered to its system already made out, and judged everything by it without entering at all into the examination of the notions entertained by others. It was a strife of party passions; and the result of the proceedings was already predetermined by the relation of the contending parties to the dominant power. Gregory of Nazianzus, who expressed the result of a large and various experience, gives the following remarkable account of the mode of proceeding at such assemblies:[1] "I am so constituted," he writes, "that, to speak the truth, I dread every assembly of bishops; for I have never yet seen a good end of any one, — never been at a synod which did more for the suppression, than it did for the increase, of evils; for an indescribable thirst for contention and for rule prevails in them, and a man will be far more likely to draw upon himself the reproach of wishing to set himself up as a judge of other men's wickedness, than he will be to succeed in any attempts of his to remove it."

Yet, despite of the many impure human motives which intruded themselves into these councils, men regarded them as the organs by which the Holy Ghost guided the progressive movement of the church, — as the voice by which the Holy Ghost determined what had before been doubtful, and to which every man was bound, therefore, to submit his own fallible, subjective judgment. The *theory* of Augustin on this subject was, that "the decision of controverted questions does not proceed in the first instance and directly from the transactions of these councils; but that these transactions, rather, are prepared by the theological investigations which have preceded them. The decisions of councils simply give the expression of public authority to the result at which the church, in its development thus far, has arrived. Hence it may happen that a controverted matter, at a particular time, cannot as yet be decided, even by a general council; because the previous investigations have not as yet sufficiently prepared the way for a definitive, a settled result." According to this theory, general councils should express and settle firmly the universal Christian consciousness, up to that point of its development which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who is the actuating principle of the whole life of the church, it has reached at a certain period of time. The universal Christian consciousness is thus merely fixed in a determinate expression, — the sum and contents of Christian truth more clearly and distinctly evolved in opposition to the latest errors. Hence an enlightened church-teacher may, at a particular period, be in error on some one important point, without therefore falling into heresy; since, in respect to this one point, there may as yet have been no general decision of the Christian consciousness. But when, by continual investigation, the evolution of the universal Christian consciousness has reached this point, and expressed itself on the matter in question through the voice of a general council, a proper humility requires it of the individual, that he should submit his own subjective judgment to that general decision guided by the Holy Ghost.

[1] Ep. ad Procop. 55.

It is only the pride of self-will that revolts against lawful authority; it is, in truth, a principle grounded in nature, that the part should subordinate itself to the whole. According to the theory of Augustin, however, the earlier councils might be corrected and improved by later ones; since each council gives only that decision which answers to the stage of development which the church has arrived at in each several period. Yet it may be a question whether Augustin really supposed that a council could express positive errors; or whether his opinion was simply like that soon afterwards expressed by Vincentius of Sirinum, in his Commonitorium, a work written somewhere about the year 434; namely, that a later council should correct the decisions of the earlier, only so far as to define what the other had left undetermined, just as the more advanced development of the church might require in its opposition to new forms of error.[1] Thus the freedom of the spiritual evolution of Christianity among mankind was to find an impassable barrier in the decisive authority of general councils.[2] We see here, fully developed already, the germs of that system of restriction which grew out of the habit of confounding together the visible and the invisible church, and which reigned supreme, until, by the work of God in the Reformation, was produced that *free* life of the spirit, which has its ground in the essence of the gospel, and uniformly accompanies it where it is preached in its purity.

The essence of Christianity struggles against the demand of a blind submission to human authority; it requires no other obedience than that which answers to the true nature and dignity of man's spirit; and it stands in no sort of contradiction with true freedom, but rather is the only thing that can produce it. All that it requires is, that man's spirit, having become conscious of its true wants, should submit to the teachings of God's eternal Spirit, who alone can communicate that which will satisfy all its longings. This Spirit speaks, through the divine word, to each individual, in the inner recesses of his heart, according to the measure of his recipiency; and it is only what each one knows from this source and through this revelation, in the inner recesses of his heart, that he can vitally believe, and from his inmost consciousness acknowledge to be true. Facundus of Hermiane says:[3] "To his priests, assembled in his name, Christ can never be wanting; because he, being almighty truth, can in no way prove false to his promise." But the condition here presupposed, without which the fulfilment of that promise could not be realized, was in fact precisely the thing so often wanting

[1] Augustin. de baptismo contra Donatistas, l. II. c. 3. Ipsa plenaria concilia sæpe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat et cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbiæ, sine ulla inflata cervice arrogantiæ, sine ulla contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum caritate Christiana. But where did ever such a spirit prevail in a council? Compare with this the above-cited words of Gregory of Nazianz.

[2] Thus the excellent bishop Facundus of Hermiane — a man who shows great freedom within certain limits — says, about the middle of the sixth century, (defens. trium capitulorum, l. V. c. 5:) Neque enim est alia conciliorum faciendorum utilitas, quam ut quod intellectu non capimus, ex auctoritate credamus.

[3] In the VIII. vol. of his work, Defens. trium capitulorum, c. 7.

in these assemblies. Almost anything else might, in many cases, be affirmed of them, than that they were assembled in the name of Christ. What warrant had men to believe that they who had not brought with them the temper which was required in order to hear the voice of the Divine Spirit, ought to be considered as its organs for the rest of the church? In things spiritual and divine, it cannot hold good that the individual must subordinate himself to the whole; for the individual spirit may, in truth, by its freedom and by the purity of its will, outrun, in its own course of development, the whole multitude chained to that spirit of the age which is not the spirit of truth. The individual may have fought his way to freedom, where the multitude are in bondage. Errors are often propagated without design, when they have made good their dominion over the consciousness of men. Individuals who surrender themselves to the spirit of truth, which speaks not barely to the masses, but also to each individual according to the recipient temper of his mind, attain by clear consciousness to the separation of the true from the false; and how could they possibly be under any obligation to subject themselves to the dominant spirit of untruth? But even in case the spirit of truth had been spoken by a general council, still this expression could be binding only on him who, by the same spirit of truth, had recognized the same as true from the divine word. Thus there was substituted here a cringing to human authority and consequent servility of spirit, in place of that true humility which gives all the honor to God, the Spirit of absolute truth alone; and which, therefore, in freeing men from bondage to human opinions, makes them free indeed.

As the decisions of general councils had respect not only to matters of doctrine, but also to matters connected with the outward life of the church, to the church constitution, and to church usages, another evil ensued; namely, that by means of them the forms of training, which, by their own nature, are multiform and variable, were subjected to an unchangeable law of dead uniformity.

Again, since the general councils constituted a legislative tribunal for the entire church, the material was now at hand for a universal ecclesiastical legislation. The Roman abbot, Dionysius Exiguus, presented to the Western church, in the early times of the sixth century, a book of ecclesiastical laws; consisting of a collection which he had made from the written decisions (decretales) of the Roman bishops — in answer to ecclesiastical questions addressed to them — from the time of Siricius, or from the year 385 and onward, and from decrees (canones) of the general, and of the more important provincial councils. This work soon obtained paramount authority; and it had an important influence in shaping out the papal monarchy in the Western church, that he had assigned so prominent a place to the papal decrees.

II. The Discipline of the Church.

The principle was transmitted from the preceding to the present times, that those who had by gross transgressions violated their baptismal vows, should be excluded from the fellowship of the church and from participating in the communion; and not till they had given satis-

factory proofs of repentance were they to receive absolution from the bishop, and to be admitted again to church fellowship. During the Novatian controversies of the preceding period, men had agreed on certain common principles respecting the nature of penitence. It was agreed that to no one, of whatever offence he might have been guilty, provided that by his conduct thus far he had shown the marks of sincere repentance, should be refused the communion in the hour of death.[1] Gradually the penitents came to be distributed into different classes, after the same manner as the catechumens, according to their different degrees of fitness for being restored back to the fellowship of the church. The first class was formed of those who were not yet allowed to enter the church.[2] They were bound to stand without the doors of the church, and to implore with weeping the intercession of the members of the community as they entered; at the same time prostrating themselves to the earth,—hence they were called *προσκλαιόντες*. Next followed those who were permitted to listen with all the unbaptized in the outer area of the church (the *νάρθηξ*, the ferula) to the sermon and to the reading of the scriptures. Then followed those in whose behalf a special prayer of the church was offered; on which occasion they fell on their knees, and hence were called *ὑποπιπτόντες*, substrati. Finally, those who were allowed to be present at all the prayers and transactions of the church, but yet could not themselves bring a gift to the altar, or participate in the communion (*χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνοίντες τῶν προσευχῶν.*)[4]

Entering under obligations to do penance for particular sins within a determinate time, was a practice which had no existence in this period. The only cases which could occur were, either that the bishop excluded from church fellowship those whose transgressions had become sufficiently notorious, and granted to them the privilege of readmission only on condition of subjecting themselves to a church penance fixed upon by himself in some proportion to their crime; or else that they voluntarily made confession of their sins to the bishop, which act was considered in itself a token of repentance, and therefore had some influence in mitigating the penance of the church.[5]

Still, in carrying out the principles which had been established on the subject of admission to the communion and of penance, the church, since it no longer constituted, as in the preceding period, a body subsisting by itself and independent of all others, found many difficulties

[1] See Concil. Nic. canon 13. If such a person subsequently recovered, he was to be placed back once more in the fourth class of pœnitentes.

[2] *Ἀπειργομένοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας* they are called, in Gregory Nyssen. epistola canonica ad Letojum.

[3] Basil. ep. canonica, III. Ambros. de Pœnitentia, l. II. c. 10.

[4] It is uncertain what is meant in the 17th canon of the council of Ancyra by *εἰς τοὺς χειμαζομένους εὐχέσθαι*,—whether it denotes those among the first class of catechumens without the doors of the church, where they were exposed to all weathers, or whether it stands for those in the class vexed by evil spirits, in the same place with Energumens. The first is the more probable.

[5] Chrysostom says of those who came to the communion as impenitent sinners: *Τοὺς μὲν δήλους ἡμῖν αὐτοὶ πάντως ἀπείρξομεν, τοὺς δὲ ἀγνώστους ἡμῖν τῷ θεῷ καταλείψωμεν, τῷ τὰ ἀπορρήτα τῆς ἑκάστου διανοίας εἰδοτι.* See the Homily on the feast of Epiphany, Savil. T. V. fol. 528. The same holds the deacons accountable if they should admit to the communion a person whom they knew to be guilty of any sin which was punishable with exclusion from the fellowship of the church. Hom. 82, Matth. near the end.

which could not exist in the foregoing period, at least in the same degree. Cases occurred in which the bishop, by rigidly carrying out these principles, must necessarily fear that a schism would be produced in the church. The Donatists, of whom we shall presently speak, maintained that in such cases, in order to keep the church pure, no regard should be paid to consequences; although even their own bishops, it was alleged, could not always proceed in exact accordance with this principle. Others, on the contrary, — as, for instance, Augustin, — maintained that men should be content simply to rebuke many of the evils which were widely spread. Much, they said, must be reserved to the judgment of God. At the same time it was necessary to proceed with wisdom and patience, so as to avoid a worse evil, and not to root up the good fruit with the tares.[1] The second difficulty was, to carry out these principles in their application to the great men of this world, who, even in the church, could not be forgetful of their worldly rank. It was everywhere an acknowledged principle that here, before the tribunal of God's word, no respect of persons ought to be admitted. Chrysostom, in requiring the deacons to debar the unworthy from participating in the Lord's supper, says: "Though the commander of an army or the governor of a province, though one decked with the imperial crown, should approach, yet, if he is unworthy, refuse him."[2] But there must also have been men, like Chrysostom, who spoke thus and acted accordingly; who did not fear to sacrifice everything temporal, in rigidly carrying out what they owned to be their duty as shepherds of the flock. In the Western church the example of an Ambrose of Milan, who declared to several emperors, that if they proceeded to execute a purpose which appeared to him in violation of the duty of a Christian emperor, he could not admit them to the communion, showed how much could be effected in these times of despotism by the firmness of a bishop deeply penetrated with a sense of the elevation and responsibleness of his calling. The emperor Theodosius I., incensed at a seditious tumult which broke out in the year 390 at Thessalonica, abandoned thousands, the innocent with the guilty, to the blind fury of his soldiers. When the emperor came afterwards to Milan, Ambrose, who had taken advantage of a sickness to retire into the country, at first avoided an interview with him, supposing that passion left in his soul no room as yet for the lessons of religion. He thought that a letter which the emperor might find time to peruse silently by himself, might make a more salutary impression on him. He placed before him the example of the penitent king David, and wrote: "Sin can be removed only by tears and repentance. No angel or archangel can forgive sin; and the Lord himself, who only was able to say to us, *I* am with you, when we sin, forgives the sins of those only who come to him with repentance. Add not to the sin already committed still another — that of presuming to partake of the holy supper unworthily, which has redounded to the ruin of many. I have no occasion to be obstinate with you; but I have cause to fear for you. I dare not distribute the holy elements, if you

[1] See Augustin. c. Parmenian. l. III. c. 13, et seqq. [2] Hom. 82. Matth. near the end.

mean to be present and receive them. Shall I venture to do that which I should not presume to do if the blood of *one* innocent individual had been shed, where the blood of so many innocent persons has been shed?"[1] These words of Ambrose made such an impression on the heart of Theodosius, that, penetrated with the deepest anguish, he subjected himself to the public penance of the church, having first laid aside his imperial robes; and, as Ambrose says, not a day of his life passed afterwards in which he did not remember with pain that cruel transaction.[2] Ambrose, it is said, did not give him absolution until, to prevent the like effects of his irascible disposition for the future, he had renewed a law of the emperor Gratian, which forbade any sentence of death pronounced by the emperor to be executed short of an interval of thirty days; so that the sentence might be recalled, if, after the subsiding of passion, he found occasion to repent of it. The excellent bishop Facundus of Hermiane observed subsequently to the emperor Justinian, who was distracting the church by his despotic conduct: "Would God but raise up another Ambrose, there would be no want of another Theodosius."[3]

When powerful individuals bade defiance to all the tribunals of the church, one means still remained in the hands of the bishops; that of solemnly excluding them from the church by the anathema, and making this, together with the crimes committed by such individual, known to all their colleagues in a circular letter. This means was employed by Synesius against Andronicus, the worthless governor of Pentapolis, who had oppressed the poor in the most cruel manner; and the means were attended with a happy result.

In the large cities, especially within the Greek church, a special presbyter was appointed for the purpose of attending to the duty of confession, and of determining for the penitents their due proportion of church penance. But when the patriarch Nectarius of Constantinople was led, by the scandal created by the crime of an ecclesiastic thus made publicly known, to rescind this office, (about the year 390;) the consequence of this was, that the whole system of confession and penance, as it had till now existed in the Greek church, came to an end; and it was left free to each individual, according to his conscience, to partake in the communion.[4] Still bishops — even the Greek church, as

[1] Paulinus, in his life of Ambrose. Theodoretus and Rufinus speak, it is true, of a personal interview of Ambrose with the emperor, whom he met at the threshold of the church. In this case we must suppose that the emperor, notwithstanding the written representations in this letter, still ventured to come to the communion; which is not probable. And as those writers make no mention at all of Ambrose's letter, but make Ambrose say orally to the emperor nearly the same things which are written in this letter, it is quite probable, that what was contained in the letter came to be transferred to an oral interview which never took place. How is it conceivable, that the emperor, as Paulinus states, should have adduced, in his defence on this occasion, that very example of king David which Ambrose, in the letter, had already used against him!

[2] Ambrose, in his funeral discourse over this emperor: Stravit omne, quo utebatur, insigne regium, deflevit in ecclesia publice peccatum suum, neque ullus postea dies fuit, quo non illum doleret errorem.

[3] Quia si nunc Deus aliquem Ambrosium suscitaret, etiam Theodosius non deesset. Pro defens. trium capitulorum, l. XII. c. V.

[4] Socrates, V. 19. Sozom. VII. 16. Comp. Morin. de Pœnitentia, l. VI. 22. The homilies of Chrysostom, which still presuppose the ancient usage, were preached by him at Antioch.

examples of the next succeeding times teach us — ever reserved to themselves the right of refusing the communion to vicious men. That abolition, however, of the ancient system of church penance had, if we may believe the church historian Sozomene, an injurious influence on the general state of morals.

III. History of the Schisms of the Church.

As in the preceding period, so also in this, we have concluded to separate the history of church schisms from that of the disputes concerning doctrine; the former standing closely connected with the history of the development of the idea of the church, and the history of the church constitution, and hence finding here its most natural place.

1. *The Donatist Schism.*

The most important and influential church division which we have to mention in this period is the Donatist, which had its seat in North Africa. This schism may be compared in many respects with that of Novatian in the preceding period. In this, too, we see the conflict, for example, of Separatism with Catholicism; and it is therefore important, in so far as it tended to settle and establish the notion of the visible, outward unity of the church, and of the objective element in the things of religion and of the church. That which distinguishes the present case is, the reaction, proceeding out of the essence of the Christian church, and called forth, in this instance, by a peculiar occasion, against the confounding of the ecclesiastical and political elements; on which occasion, for the first time, the ideas which Christianity, as opposed to the pagan religion of the state, had first made men distinctly conscious of, became an object of contention within the Christian church itself,— the ideas concerning universal, inalienable human rights; concerning liberty of conscience; concerning the rights of free religious conviction. The more immediate and local occasion of these disputes lay in a certain spirit of fanaticism, which, ever since the spread of Montanism, had prevailed in North Africa, and also in various circumstances superinduced by the Dioclesian persecution.

We observed already, in our account of the persecution under Dioclesian, that as there were many at that time who had been induced, by force or by fear, to deliver up the sacred writings in their possession, (the traditores;) so too there were many accused of this, against whom the accusation could by no means be proved. Such a charge might easily be converted into a weapon for the gratification of personal malice: the propensity to mistake inferences for facts rendered it no difficult matter to prove the accusations. When, for example, an individual who had been arrested by the pagan magistrates, found means, through some favorable circumstances or other, to deliver himself without denying; yet men were prone to draw the conclusion that if he had remained true to the faith, he would assuredly, like other true confessors, have suffered martyrdom,—he could have escaped only by denying. Again, as we have also remarked already in the history of that persecution, the same principles were not held by all with re-

gard to the proper mode of conduct on these occasions. Two parties stood opposed to each other; a prudent and a fanatical one. At the head of the prudent party was the bishop Mensurius of Carthage; and as it was common, especially in the Western church, for the archdeacons to be the confidants of the bishops, and to take pains that the regulations ordained by them should be carried into effect, and that the discipline of the church should be maintained; so it happened that his archdeacon Cæcilianus stood in this relation to Mensurius. The two seem to have been united in a mutual understanding to oppose superstition and fanaticism.

There were many who, with broken credit, having become weary of life and anxious to get rid of it, hoped in martyrdom to find a death honorable among the Christians and meritorious in the sight of God; or who, persecuted by the consciousness of guilt, hoped in this way to free themselves at once from all their sins; or who were eager to be thrown into prison as confessors, that they might there be loaded with honor, kind treatment, and presents of all kinds, by their fellow Christians. Mensurius could not endure that such persons should be confirmed in their knavery or their delusion, and that other Christians should be deceived and abused by them. He was desirous also of preventing the scandal which would thus be given to the Pagans. He therefore endeavored to put a stop to the expressions of honor and respect which were paid to such men in their prisons, as well as to the reverence shown them as martyrs after their death. In general, this prudent man was unwilling to allow that fanatics who, without being accused or called for, surrendered themselves to the pagan authorities, and though unasked, yet publicly declared they had Bibles in their houses, but that they would not deliver them up, — that such enthusiasts should be reverenced as martyrs. Since the Christians, moreover, without reflection or prudence, thronged in crowds to their dungeons, and uneasiness and alarm might in this way be easily excited among the Pagans, he directed his archdeacon to take precautions against such results. As Mensurius disapproved of everything like fanatical imprudence, so he considered it his duty to do everything for the preservation of his own life, and for the external quiet of his community, which could be done without directly or indirectly denying the faith. When he heard that a church at Carthage was to be searched by the Pagans, he caused all the manuscripts of the Bible to be removed from it to a place of safety, and writings of heretics to be substituted in their stead, which the inquisitors were satisfied to find there, and asked no farther questions.[1] Mensurius, as a natural consequence, made all with whose superstition and fanaticism, or with whose selfish interests, his own prudence and firmness came in conflict, his fiercest enemies; and these persons took pains to propagate the most infamous stories of his conduct. Whether in this matter he and Cæcilianus were *wholly* innocent, or whether, misled by a well-meant but over-earnest zeal

[1] Vid. Augustin. breviculus collationis cum Donatistis diei III. c. 13, N. 25, and the monumenta vetera ad Donatistarum historiam pertinentia in Optat. Milevitan. de schismate Donatistarum, p. 174.

against fanaticism, they allowed themselves to be drawn into various acts of violence which might furnish grounds for just crimination, cannot, for the want of impartial sources of information, be certainly known. Suffice it to say, that the antagonists of Mensurius accused him of concealing the truth, and of asserting that none but writings of heretics were surrendered to the Pagans, for the purpose of clearing himself from the charge of giving up the sacred scriptures. And even if the pretence were well grounded, yet, declared they, it was not allowable for a Christian to use such deception. Again, they accused him of having caused the most harsh and violent measures to be adopted by Cæcilian for the purpose of hindering the Christians generally from testifying their love and their sympathy for the imprisoned confessors.[1]

The fanatical party was patronized by the then primate of Numidia, Secundus, bishop of Tigisis. In a letter to Mensurius, he disapproved the manner in which that bishop had censured the fanatical confessors; and declared that all those who had suffered martyrdom rather than deliver up their Bibles, deserved to be honored as martyrs. Following the prevailing style of allegorical exposition peculiar to that age and country, he appealed to the example of Rahab, who refused to surrender up the two spies; for these were a symbol of the Old and New Testaments. "When the soldiers of the police," as he reported, "came also to him, and demanded copies of the Bible, he said to them: I am a Christian and a bishop; I am no *traditor*. And when they asked only for a few useless pieces as a show, (such as writings of heretics,) he refused to give them even these; — imitating the example of the Maccabee Eleazar, who would not consent even to appear as if he partook of the swine's flesh, lest he might set an example of apostacy to others."[2]

It is certain that the opinion was still prevailing with many in the North-African church, which had maintained its ground from the time of Cyprian,[3] that the validity of all sacerdotal acts depended on the subjective character of the persons who performed them, and that therefore they were valid only in case they were performed by members of the true Catholic church; — that consequently a sacerdotal act executed by an excommunicated person was wholly without force. When, therefore, in the year 305, the Numidian provincial bishops, under the presidency of the above-named Secundus, assembled at Cirta in Numidia for the purpose of ordaining a new bishop for this city, the presi-

[1] See the representation of this matter by a Donatist, in the collection of Du Pin, above referred to, f. 155 et 156. The fanatical, fact-perverting hatred of the Donatists, the language of unbridled passion, which is not to be mistaken even in this representation itself, inspire the reader with but little hope of finding here any historical truth. Thus among other things it is said: Et cædebantur a Cæciliano passim, qui ad alendos martyres veniebant, sitientibus intus in vinculis confessoribus, pocula frangebantur ante carceris limina, cibi passim lacerandi canibus spargebantur, jacebant ante carceris fores martyrum patres matresque sanctissimæ, et ab extremo conspectu liberorum excussi, graves nocte dieque vigilias ad ostium carceris exercebant. Erat fletus horribilis, et acerba omnium, qui aderant, lamentatio. prohibere pios martyrum complexus et divelli a pietatis officio Christianos, Cæciliano sæviente tyranno et crudeli carnifice.

[2] Augustin. breviculus collat. cum Donatistis, d. III. c. 13, § 25. Monumenta in Du Pin l. c. f. 174.

[3] See above, the disputes concerning baptism by heretics, vol. I. sect. 2.

dent opened the meeting by declaring that they ought first to examine themselves, and make sure that there was no traditor among them, (since a person of this description, excluded by the fact itself from the communion of the church, was unfit for the performance of any sacramental act.) Several among the existing bishops were accused by rumor; several could excuse themselves on the ground of having given up other writings (e.g. on medicine) instead of the Bible; one, who plainly had no such excuse to offer, but, though he had surrendered a copy of the Bible, yet remained steadfast in the confession of the faith, said to the bishop Secundus: "You know how long Florus (the police-officer) persecuted me, to induce me to scatter incense, and God delivered me from his hands, my brother; but since God has forgiven me, do you also leave me to the judgment of God." Hereupon Secundus, in a way characteristic of his fanatic, spiritual pride, exclaimed: "What are we to do, then, with the *martyrs?* Because they did not give up their Bibles, was the very reason for which they have been crowned." The accused said: "Leave me till I appear before the judgment-seat of God; there I will render my account." A certain bishop, Purpurius, of irascible temperament, — against whom a far weightier charge was pending, which doubtless required to be more carefully looked into, — instead of speaking in his own defence, cast suspicion on Secundus himself: "How could it be believed that when he had been seized, and had declared that he possessed copies of the Bible, and yet did not deliver them up, the officers of police would quietly receive such a declaration, and allow him to go free, while so many others who had declined to surrender their Bibles, were compelled to suffer severe tortures and death?" Since, however, the conduct of the pagan authorities varied so much according to their different tempers; and since so many particular circumstances might procure for one a better lot than fell to the others, this conclusion, which was intended to bring suspicion on Secundus, was at least a very unsafe one. Another Secundus among the assembled bishops, nephew of the one first mentioned, begged the latter to consider what danger threatened the peace of the church, if men should be disposed to push the matter further. All the accused would in the end unite against him; and consequently a schism was inevitable. Therefore it was finally resolved, for the preservation of the quiet of the church, to leave all that was past to the judgment of God.[1]

[1] See the transactions of this assembly in Augustin. contra Cresconium, l. III. c. 17, § 30, and the monumenta in Du Pin, f. 175. The Donatists declared, it is true, at the religious conference in Carthage, A.D. 411, that these documents were interpolated, (vid. Augustin. brevicul. collat. d. III. c. 17, and l. c. Du Pin, fol. 321;) but their assertions can be regarded no otherwise than as very suspicious, as they were inclined to deny everything that conflicted with the interests of their party; and the reasons alleged by them against the genuineness of these writings have no decisive weight whatever. *One* reason was the definite statement of the date and of the consuls, which common practice in civil transactions was contrary to the ecclesiastical custom. Without doubt this was censured too by Athanasius, as an unchurchlike thing, in the Sirmian formulas of faith; yet it was in the instance where he censured it, an entirely different affair, — it related there to a determination of doctrines, which could not be so bound to a particular time; but here, on the other hand, it related to a judicial investigation, and an external act of the church, where dates were of more impor-

We have brought together these characteristic traits out of the times that preceded the Donatist schism, because it is in the excitement of temper which here betrays itself, and in the hostile relations betwixt the prudent party of Mensurius of Carthage, and the opposite fanatical party of the Numidian bishops, we must look for the original causes of this schism.

The bishop Mensurius died soon after the Dioclesian persecution was ended, in the year 311, by the edict of Galerius. Having been called on some special business to appear before the emperor Maxentius at Rome, he died on the way when he was returning home. It was frequently the case, on the demise of a bishop, that his archdeacon was chosen to fill the vacancy; because, having possessed the confidence and been often vested with the full powers of the bishop, he had already acquired the greatest influence in the church. But inasmuch as the archdeacon was inferior in rank to the presbyters, this practice would easily become an occasion of jealousies and divisions. Cæcilian had particularly against him that party in the Carthaginian community and in the Numidian church who disputed the *principles* of Mensurius. At the head of his enemies in Carthage stood a bigoted widow by the name of Lucilla, a person of wealth, and, by means of her wealth, of power. This individual attached great importance to certain fragments of human bones which she had obtained from some quarter or other, and which she gave out to be relics. These pretended relics she was in the habit of kissing every morning previously to partaking, as was customary in this country,[1] of the consecrated bread.[2] She usually took them along with her also to the early morning service, and here too kissed her relics previously to partaking of the communion. The archdeacon, whose duty it was to look after the order of the church, reprimanded her for this superstitious custom, and threatened her, in case she did not desist from it, with ecclesiastical censures. It was undoubtedly necessary that some check should be given to the spreading super-

tance. At all events, enough has not been left us of the older synodal transactions to render it possible to decide, whether this was really so unprecedented. The other party could, however, adduce an example of the contrary. To the Donatists, who pushed their opposition to the confounding of ecclesiastical and political matters to the extreme of fanaticism, such a determinate date was in itself a hateful thing, because it looked like such confusion. It is worthy of remark, that they even required an example of such an ecclesiastical determination of date from the Holy Scriptures, — a proof of the very narrow character of their criticism. The *second* reason was, that at the time of the persecution no such assembly could have been held. This reason, Marcellinus, the president of the religious conference, who rejected the first as amounting to nothing, declared to be more weighty. But the bishops of the other party could easily cite examples out of the history of the persecutions, by which the possibility of such an assembly, even under these circumstances, might be proved.

[1] See vol. I. sect. 2, respecting the daily communion in the church of North Africa.

[2] See Optatus Milevit. de schismate Donatistar. l. I. c. 16. In this place it is said: ante spiritalem cibum et potum; which cannot refer to the domestic communion alone, for in this the second had no place. Probably Lucilla observed the same custom in the church communion which she had been in the practice of at home, and thus her superstitious observances became known to Cæcilian. The opinion of Aubespin, (Albaspineus,) that she had been led by the custom of the mutual kiss of brotherly love preceding the communion, to transfer this form to her relics, for the purpose of maintaining thereby the communion with her patron saint, is not sufficiently well-grounded, since the practice of kissing relics, especially with females, existed elsewhere also.

stition with regard to relics, and perhaps Cæcilian found it particularly offensive that she seemed to attribute a higher sanctifying power to her relics than to the sacrament of the supper.[1] Many indications go to show that the Numidian bishops anticipated the choice of Cæcilian, and immediately after Mensurius' death endeavored to secure for themselves a party in the community, and to oppose this party to Cæcilian. Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ in Numidia, is said to have been busy even at this early stage.[2] Secundus of Tigisis, primate of Numidia, the zealous antagonist of the Cæcilian party, sent certain ecclesiastics to Carthage, who held separate assemblies in the house of Lucilla, and placed a provisionary superintendent, under the customary title of visitor, (περιοδευτής,) over the entire affairs of the church.[3] The more resistance the party of Cæcilian had to fear against his choice, the more urgent reason had they for hastening the whole thing to a conclusion. But, without doubt, it was difficult here to hit upon the right course for preserving unanimity and quiet; for if they waited until the arrival of the Numidian provincial bishops, who were in the practice of assisting at the ordination of the bishop of Carthage, it was to be foreseen that these would oppose the election. Should the ordination be completed before their arrival, new cause would be given them for dissatisfaction and complaint; but still they could not pronounce the episcopal consecration, after it had once been solemnized, null and void; since, although the Numidian provincial bishops might often be invited to assist on these occasions, yet nothing had been expressly settled on this point in the ecclesiastical laws.[4] The election and ordination were therefore hastened to a completion, and the latter office was performed by a neighboring bishop, Felix of Aptungis.[5] Against the new bishop, the powerful Lucilla, with her party, now took her stand; and to this party belonged the elders of the Carthaginian church.[6]

[1] Optatus: cum *præponeret* calici salutari os, etc. — although the *præponeret* may be referred also simply to time.

[2] By the investigations of the tribunal which sat subsequently at Rome, under the Roman bishop Melchiades, it is said to have been proved: Donatum a Casis Nigris adhuc diacono Cæciliano schisma fecisse Carthagine. See Augustin. breviculus, l. c. apud Du Pin, f. 319.

[3] Thus says Augustin, Sermo 46, § 39, T. V. ed. Benedict. Paris, f. 146, D. The assertion of Augustin, a violent opponent of the Donatists, is testimony, indeed, which cannot be wholly relied on. Yet the thing is, in itself, not improbable; and all these preceding circumstances place the origin of the Donatist schism in a clearer light.

[4] The opponents of the Donatist party, at the religious conference in Carthage, affirmed that it was by no means a common custom for the bishop of Carthage to be ordained by a Numidian Metropolitan bishop, cum aliud habeat ecclesiæ Catholicæ consuetudo, ut non Numidiæ, sed propinquiores episcopi episcopum ecclesiæ Carthaginis ordinent, sicut nec Romanæ ecclesiæ ordinat aliquis episcopus metropolitanus; sed de proximo Ostiensis episcopus. Augustin, breviculus d. III. in Du Pin monumenta, f. 321. According to Optatus, I. 18, there were two individuals, Botrus and Celestius, probably presbyters in the Carthaginian church, who hastened the election in hopes that the choice might fall on one of themselves. The fact that so many reasons were hunted up from one quarter and another to invalidate that objection of the Donatist party, renders it probable, that the ordination of the bishop of Carthage was, according to the more common practice, solemnized in the presence and with the co-operation of the Numidian bishops. Optatus, however, introduces that remark of his only as a report (dicitur.) Perhaps the truth at bottom was simply this, that those two presbyters aspired after the episcopal dignity, and, having been disappointed, were for this reason led to foster the division.

[5] The name of this town is written variously: Aptugnensis, Aptungitanus, Autumnitanus.

[6] The seniores plebis, according to the

The primate of Numidia came afterwards, with his bishops, to Carthage, either without being sent for, or, as the other party alleged, at the invitation of Lucilla and those connected with her. They met from the latter with a very friendly reception; and they manifested, from the first, hostile feelings towards Cæcilian, whom they refused to acknowledge as a bishop. Cæcilian now challenged his adversaries to produce their charges, if they had any against him: but they began by accusing as a traditor the bishop who had ordained him; and, in conformity with that old principle of the North-African church, they refused to recognize as valid an ordination which had been performed by a traditor. Cæcilian went still farther: he offered to resign his office, and return to his former post as a deacon, so that he could be ordained anew by the Numidian bishops.[1] But the latter were too far committed against him to enter into any such compromise. They now proceeded to accuse Cæcilian himself; and, as they did not acknowledge him to be a regular bishop, they chose in his stead the reader Majorianus, a favorite of Lucilla. An assembly of seventy Numidian bishops at Carthage excommunicated Cæcilian, because he had allowed himself to be ordained by a traditor.[2] The fanaticism which prevailed already at this assembly is characteristically shown by the following expression of one of its members: "As unfruitful weeds are mown down and cast away, so the thurificati and traditores,[3] and those who are schismatically ordained by traditors, cannot remain in the church of God, except they acknowledge their error, and become reconciled with the church by the tears of repentance."[4]

Thus was laid the foundation of the schism in the North-African church. According to the usual mode of proceeding in such cases, each of the two parties now endeavored to secure for itself the recognition of other churches; and thus the breach would necessarily be extended. The emperor Constantine, who just at the present juncture had obtained the sovereignty over this part of the Roman empire, must have been prejudiced from the beginning against the party of Majorinus; for, in the very first laws by which he bestowed various privileges on the Catholic church in this quarter of the world, he expressly ex-

system of organization which prevailed in the North-African church (see vol. I. § 1). The adversaries of the Donatists explain this as follows: When the bishop Mensurius, uncertain as to the issue of his business, left Carthage, he entrusted the precious movables of the church to the care of these elders, with the charge to deliver them over, in case he died before his return, to his successor in the bishopric. But, as these seniores wished to retain the whole in their own possession, it grieved them to be obliged to deliver them over into the hands of Cæcilian, and this was the cause of their enmity to him. Optatus, I. 19: Qui faucibus avaritiæ commendatam ebiberant prædam. Cum reddere cogerentur, subduxerunt communioni pedem. But how was this known to be the fact? For these persons certainly could not decline giving up what had been entrusted to them; and, at all events, must have been obliged to give up the whole to the *new* bishop, whoever he might be. It is quite evident that, as often happens in similar cases, such motives, the existence of which could not possibly be proved, were falsely imputed to these persons, — after they became hated as the promoters of Donatism.

[1] Optat. I. 19. Cæcilian would hardly have been induced to consent to this, had he not at that time conceded the principle, that an ordination performed by a traditor was invalid.

[2] Augustin. breviculus d. III. c. 14, § 26.

[3] See vol. I. § 1.

[4] Liber c. Fulgentium Donatistam, c. 26. Du Pin monumenta, p. 176.

cluded the other party from all share in them, and declared himself decidedly opposed to it; although this proceeding was in direct contradiction to those principles of universal toleration which Constantine had avowed in the laws enacted about the same time. The fanaticism which we find prevailing in this party at its very origin, may doubtless have furnished occasion enough for representing it to the emperor as composed of dangerous men, without his knowing anything more about the character of these disputes.[1] The party of Majorinus, which saw itself condemned without a hearing, presented to the emperor, then residing in Gaul, a petition, entreating him, by his love of justice, to name judges in that country itself for the purpose of inquiring into the nature of the controversy which had arisen in the North-African church.[2] They probably chose to have their judges from Gaul, because these would be least liable to suspicion; inasmuch as this country had escaped the last persecutions of the Christian church, and therefore no traditors were to be found there as in the other churches. The emperor thereupon directed that Melchiades, (Miltiades,) bishop of Rome, with five other Gallic bishops, should inquire into the affair; that Cæcilian should appear before them, with ten bishops who were to present the charges against him, and ten other bishops who were to defend him. The trial was holden in the year 313; and Melchiades came attended with fifteen other Italian bishops. The bishop Donatus of Casæ Nigræ in Numidia, with whom, as we remarked above, the germ of the schism began, now also stood at the head of Cæcilian's accusers; as indeed he seems generally to have been at that time the soul of the whole party. His charges against the latter were found to be unsustained; but he himself was declared guilty of various acts contrary to the laws of the church. The party of Majorinus having declared, as was to be expected, that injustice had been done them by this decision, Constantine directed, in the year 314, that the charges against the ordainer of Cæcilian, the above-named bishop Felix, should be examined according to the usual judicial form at Carthage, where access could be had to all the records and witnesses that might be needed in the trial; and that an ecclesiastical convention at Arles should hear delegates from the two parties, and so enter into a new investigation of the whole matter. The result of the first inquiry was, that Felix was declared innocent. The council of Arles decided likewise against the party of Majorinus, and established at the same time three canons which in part were opposed to the conduct of this party, and partly were designed to prevent the occurrence of similar divisions for the future. As the charge of denying the faith in the Dioclesian persecution had been one of the principal occasions which led to this schism, and such accusations, repeated over merely on the ground of vague report, might often result in similar consequences, it was decided in the thirteenth canon that those only *who could be convicted by public documents* of having delivered up copies of the holy scriptures or property of the church,

[1] In a rescript, issued in the beginning of the year 313, addressed to Cæcilianus, bishop of Carthage, and cited in Eusebius, X. 6, the adherents of the other party are styled μὴ καθεστώσης διανοίας ἄνθρωποι; mention is made of their μανία.

[2] The petition is to be found in Optatus, I. § 22.

or of having informed against other Christians before the tribunals, should be deposed from their spiritual offices. No other accusation but those which could be thus substantiated, should be received. As, moreover, the party of Majorinus held fast to the ancient principle of the North-African church, that the validity of a sacramental act depended on the fact that the performer of it was a member of the Catholic church, it was established as a rule, in reference to ordination, that, although this ceremony had been performed by a person who could be legally convicted of those transgressions, it should still remain valid in case nothing else was to be objected against it. The same principle of the objectivity of sacramental acts was, moreover, in the eighth canon, so defined — probably with reference to the proceedings of the North-African schismatics — that baptism was always to be considered valid if it had been performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[1] For the rest, it may well be inferred from the passionate tone of the report drawn up by this council and sent to the Roman bishop Silvester, that the spirit which prevailed in it was not calculated to dispose the other party for peace. The party of Majorinus appealed from this decision to the judgment of the emperor himself. We have observed before, how very strange it then appeared to Constantine, that an appeal should be made from an episcopal decision on ecclesiastical matters to his own tribunal. In his reply to the bishops, he manifests his displeasure against the party of Majorinus by the most violent expressions.[2] Yet he accepted the appeal, and listened himself to the delegates of the two parties at Milan, in the year 316; his decision also went in favor of Cæcilian. From this time the whole matter took another turn; laws of the state now appeared against the party of Majorinus; they were deprived of their churches, and the places where they assembled were confiscated.[3] They were treated as transgressors of the imperial laws. The force by which it was sought to destroy them, proved, as usually happens, only the means of giving them a new impulse, and pushed the spirit of enthusiasm, already existing among them in the bud, into full development. Majorinus, indeed, died in the year 315; but with him the schism, which had struck deeper root, by no means ceased. Besides, he had rather served to give an outward name to the party, than really constituted the head and soul of it. The latter had till now been Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ in Numidia, who stood in the same relation to Majorinus as, under similar circumstances, Novatus had done to Novatian at the beginning of the Novatian schism. But Donatus, the successor of Majorinus, was himself the head and soul of the sect. And he was well suited to stand at the head of a party, being a man of fiery, untutored eloquence, of great firmness of principle, and of great energy of action. The excessive admiration of his party converted him into a

[1] According to one reading, this canon would be pointed, not against these North Africans, but against the Arians. But the other is most probably the original reading. What possible occasion could there be, at that time, especially in the Western church, for the expression of any such opposition to the Arians?

[2] See this letter in Du Pin acta, f. 184.

[3] Aug. ep. 88, § 3. Contra lit. Petiliani, c. 92, § 205.

worker of miracles, and gave him the title of *the Great.*[1] From him, too, they received their name, *the Donatists;* and by this name we shall henceforth call them.[2]

The Donatists, in their public declarations, must, of course, apply to themselves some appropriate title in order to distinguish their own sect from the party of their opponents, and from the dominant church in North Africa. They therefore called themselves by a name wholly inoffensive in itself, the "pars Donati," as the most convenient way of making themselves known in their relation to another determinate human party. This other party, it is true, following the unjustifiable practice of imputing inferences of their own as facts against their adversaries, argued from this party name that they were for being something else than the church of Christ and the Catholic church; that they thus set themselves off as a mere human party; just as in after times a similar license of imputation was often indulged in by the *church dominant* against *church parties* which had seceded from it. The Donatists by no means admitted the thing which was assumed in these accusations; they declared that they called themselves after the name of Donatus, not as the founder of a new church, but as one of the bishops of the ancient church derived from Christ.[3] And not without reason could they say that they might rightly call their adversaries, precisely after the same manner, Mensurists and Cæcilianists.[4] The name Dona-

[1] It went to such a pass that they were in the habit of swearing per canos Donati. August. Enarrat. in Ps. X. § 5.

[2] One might be doubtful, whether the names pars Donati, Donatistæ, Donatiani, were derived originally from Donatus a Casis Nigris, or from Donatus Magnus. The explanation given by Donatists themselves points, it is true, quite distinctly, to the latter derivation (see the words of Petilianus, bishop of Cirta in Numidia, which will presently be quoted, collat. c. Donatist. fol. 296, § 32). But it may be that although this name was taken originally from Donatus a Casis Nigris, yet this person was afterwards forgotten among his party, in consequence of the far greater influence of the second Donatus. The title pars Donati actually occurs already in the petition of the Donatist party addressed to the emperor Constantine, in the year 313, (in Optatus, l. I. § 22;) and, if this citation is perfectly correct, no further doubt could exist about the correctness of the derivation of the name from Donatus a Casis Nigris. But it is certain that Optatus does not give us the original title of this petition, but has modified it by the name which the Donatist party then bore. The original title we find rather in the relatio Anulini proconsulis Africæ, where it is said, libellus traditur a parte Majorini. Thus the party was styled, till the time when the name of Majorinus became wholly eclipsed by that of Donatus Magnus. Yet there is one other possible supposition, — that Donatus a Casis Nigris and Donatus Magnus were one and the same individual; that the former, on account of having so greatly distinguished himself by his activity in behalf of the interests of his party, had, after the death of Majorinus, obtained the first bishopric of his party. In favor of this would be the fact, that Optatus of Mileve seems to have knowledge of only one Donatus; but against it is the fact, that the Donatists expressly distinguished one of these two Donatuses from the other, (see Augustin. breviculus collat. c. Donatistis d. III. Du Pin, f. 323, c. 20;) and, moreover, the Catholic bishops recognized, at the religious conference in Carthage, this distinction as a correct one; and Augustin — who at an earlier period, as he says in his Retractions, had confounded together the two Donati — expressly distinguishes them, c. Cresconium Donatistam, l. II. § 2. Again: the translation of bishops, forbidden by the laws of the church, was by no means so common in the Western church as it was in the Eastern; and, had Donatus M. incurred the charge of an act so contrary to the laws of the church, his adversaries could hardly have failed to make use of such an advantage against him.

[3] The words of the Donatist Cresconius are: Quod Donatus non auctor et institutor ecclesiæ, quæ antea non fuerat, sed a Christo deductæ et antiquæ unus ex episcopis fuerit. In Augustin. c. Cresconius Donatistam, l. IV. § 7.

[4] The words of the Donatist bishop Petilianus at the conference in Carthage: Ego

tists, which was applied to them by their opponents, may, in its intended meaning, perhaps, have implied, from the beginning, something that was offensive: they themselves would never acknowledge it.[1]

Ursacius, a count of the empire, had been directed to carry the laws against the Donatists into effect; and a person of this description, accustomed to military despotism, was certainly not calculated to proceed in an affair of this kind with that spirit of kindness and forbearance, without which the enthusiastic spirit, already in existence, might easily be fanned into a fiercer flame. The forcible measures to which Ursacius resorted,[2] for the purpose of compelling the Donatists to unite with the dominant church, produced the most violent ferment of spirits. There existed in North Africa a band of fanatical ascetics, who, despising all labor, wandered about the country among the huts of the peasants, (whence they were called by their adversaries *circumcelliones*,) and supported themselves by begging. They styled themselves the Christian champions, *agonistici*. These people could easily be excited to any species of fanaticism: while the Pagans were still in power, parties of these circumcelliones had often, to no useful purpose, demolished the idols on their estates, and thus exposed themselves — which was in fact their object — to martyrdom.[3] It is no more than natural that these persons, stimulated perhaps by the discourses of their bishops, and roused by the persecutions against the Donatist party, should be easily hurried on to every species of fanaticism and violence.

The emperor Constantine was perhaps cool and prudent enough to have learned, from what had fallen under his own sad experience, the disastrous consequences of persecutions; or he may have been guided by the counsels of some one of the wiser bishops. For, as early as the year 317, he sent a rescript to the North-African bishops and communities, in which he exhorted them to forbear retaliating with wrong the wrong which they suffered from the Circumcellions. They ought not, with foolish hands, to intermeddle with the vengeance which God had reserved to himself; especially in a case where what they suffered from the rage of such men would, in the sight of God, be equivalent to martyrdom. If they adhered to this principle, they would soon see the fanaticism perish of its own accord.[4] When now the Donatists, in addi-

eos dicere possum, immo palam aperteque designo Mensuristas et Cæcilianistas, l. c. f. 296, N. 30.

[1] The Donatist grammarian Cresconius affirmed that, according to the Latin grammatical use, they ought at least to be called, not Donatistæ, but Donatiani, l. II. c. 1, § 2.

[2] The Donatists were persuaded that the death of this man, who was killed sometime afterwards in an affray with the barbarians, was a divine judgment in punishment for his crimes. But the logic of fanaticism, as usual, argued from one or two cases to all, and hence the Donatist bishop Petilianus said: Periit Macarius, periit Ursacius, cunctique comites vestri Dei pariter vindicta perierunt. Augustin. c. literas Petiliani, l. II. § 208.

[3] That it was by their opponents alone these people were called *circumcelliones*, while they gave themselves the name of *agonistici*, is clear from Augustin. enarrat. in ψ. 132, § 6. They sprang from the ancient ascetics, and hence were opposed to the more recent monasticism. Augustin describes them as follows: Genus hominum, *ab utilibus operibus otiosum*, crudelissimum in mortibus alienis, vilissimum in suis (fanatical contempt of life) *maxime in agris territans, ab agris vacans, et victus sui causa cellas circumiens rusticorum*, unde et *circumcelliones* nomen accepit. c. Gaudentium Donatistam, l. I. § 32.

[4] See Constantine's rescript in the *monumenta*. Du Pin, f. 138.

tion to what they had done already, transmitted to the emperor, in the year 321, a petition, in which they declared that nothing would induce them to enter into church fellowship with that scoundrel, his bishop;[1] that they would rather suffer everything he might choose to inflict on them;[2] Constantine became convinced, doubtless, still more than ever, by the tone of this document, of the dangerous consequences which must follow, if violent measures for the restoration of the peace of the church were pursued any farther. Experience led him to act according to the principles which, in obedience to the voice of reason and the spirit of Christianity, he ought to have pursued from the beginning. In a rescript addressed to the Vicar Verinus in North Africa,[3] he granted to the Donatists full liberty to act according to *their own* convictions, declaring that this was a matter which belonged to the judgment of God.[4]

To these principles Constantine remained firm to the end. When the Circumcellions, with force of arms, demolished a church which he had caused to be erected for the Catholics in the town of Constantina, the emperor ordered it to be rebuilt at his own expense, and demanded no indemnification of the Donatists.[5] If men had only remained true to these doctrines of toleration, and simply punished the acts of violence committed on both sides, according to the laws; had the emperor always spoken and acted on this principle of the Christian politician, (which consists precisely in acknowledging the just limits of all civil power,) a principle which is capable of exhibiting itself in the province of religion only on the negative side; the North-African church doubtless would not have been exposed to any of those disorders which subsequently ensued, although the Donatists might have long subsisted as a distinct party in the church. But disastrous was the result whenever an emperor was disposed to pursue any other than a negative course in relation to religious disputes.

The Western emperor, Constans, to whom North Africa fell after the death of his father, was not at first inclined to resort to any forcible measures for uniting the Donatists once more to the dominant church. He simply employed those means which were then frequently resorted to on the part of the court for the purpose of making proselytes.[6] He directed his two commissaries, Ursacius and Leontius, in the year 340, to endeavor, by the distribution of money under the name of alms, to win over the Donatist churches.[7] As the emperor Constans issued at

[1] Nullo modo se communicaturos antistiti ipsius nebuloni.

[2] In Augustin. breviculus collationis diei III. c. 21, n. 39.

[3] Epistola Constantini, qua libertatem agendi tribuit Donatistis. Index Collationis III. cap. 549.

[4] In expressions, it must be allowed, which were wounding to the Donatists, since he does not avoid such terms as *eorum furor*.

[5] The rescript in Du Pin, 189, composed, it must be admitted, in too theological a style for an emperor.

[6] See above, in the cases of Constantine and Julian.

[7] Optatus represents this as having been done *first* by Macarius. He mentions, indeed, the preceding persecutions by Leontius, Ursacius, and Gregorius. But, as he gives no precise dates, it is nevertheless quite possible that the whole ought to be referred to the first persecution under the emperor Constantine; and consequently the persecution under the emperor Constans would have first commenced after the death of the bishop Cæcilian of Carthage, and under the new bishop Gratus. But the discourse (sermo) in memory of the two martyrs, Donatus et Advocatus, first published by Du Pin in the collection of *monumenta*, (l. c.

the same time an edict whereby he called upon the North-African Christians to return back to the unity of the church which Christ loved,[1] it was the less possible that the object of these measures should remain concealed from the Donatist bishops. This covert attack served only to exasperate them: they excited their communities to the most determined resistance. More forcible measures soon succeeded; — the Donatists were to be deprived of their churches; — they were fallen upon by armed troops while assembled for the worship of God. Such acts could not be committed without the effusion of blood; those that fell victims to the persecution were honored by their party as martyrs;[2] and the annual celebration of the days of their death furnished new means for enkindling the enthusiasm of the Donatist party.

The second attempt was made by a count of the empire, named Gregorius. The bishop Donatus wrote to him in a wild, insurrectionary spirit,[3] with abusive language little becoming the character of a bishop. But the most furious persecution began in the year 347. The imperial commissaries, Paul and Macarius, traversed, in the first place, the whole of Northern Africa, distributed money to the poor in the name of the emperor, presented costly church utensils to individual communities, and, at the same

fol. 190,) represents the persecution as having begun already, under Leontius and Ursacius, in the attempt to win over the Donatist churches by means of the distribution of money. It is here said (c. 3:) "Mittit (viz. diabolus, salutis inimicus) pecunias, quibus vel fidem caperet, vel professione legis occasionem faceret avaritiæ (foster avarice under the pretext, that nothing more was intended than a profession of divine truth, — the *professio* being in this case nothing more nor less than a means of receiving money from the emperor)." But this hardly agrees with the first beginning of the persecution under the emperor Constantine; for then the Donatists were attacked at once with severe measures as violators of the imperial decree. The question now arises, whether we ought rather to follow the representation of the case in the *sermo*, or that of Optatus; or whether we should seek to unite them both together. In the first case, it might be assumed that everything said by Optatus, relative to the distribution of money and the measures taken by Donatus against it, should be transferred to an earlier time than that which he assigns, — namely to the first part of the reign of Constans; that what he relates of Macarius should be ascribed to Leontius and Ursacius; and that in place of the bishop *Gratus* of Carthage should be substituted his predecessor *Cæcilian*. Thus Optatus must have wholly confounded the times, — as indeed he is not remarkably exact in such matters. At the same time, however, we cannot be certain that we are justified in attributing to the unknown author of the "Discourse," although it is highly probable that he did not live at a period far remote from the time of these events, so much higher authority as an historical witness. It may furthermore be supposed, on the other side, that the author of the "Discourse" might himself have confounded times and names; and that thus the persecution under the emperor Constans began first with Macarius, in the year 347. But still it is not probable that the bishops of the Catholic party would have quietly observed, for so long a time, the toleration with which the Donatists were treated, without making any attempt to draw from the emperor Constans some new measures for the suppression of the schism. The reports of the "Discourse" and of Optatus may perhaps be reconciled by supposing that three separate attempts were made in the reign of Constans, — the first by Leontius and Ursacius, the second by Gregorius, and the last by Macarius. In the case of the first and of the second of these attempts, the beginning may have been made by the distribution of money. It cannot assuredly be affirmed to be improbable, that Constans would have resorted twice in succession to the same means with such unhappy results; since we are but too well aware, how slow the Byzantine emperors were to grow wise by experience.

[1] Christus amator unitatis est, unitas igitur fiat. l. c. Passio Donati et Advocati, § 3.

[2] Thus it was with Honoratus, bishop of Siciliba, whose life is related in the tract above referred to.

[3] Gregori, macula senatus et dedecus præfectorum; words quoted by Optatus, l. III. c. 3.

time, exhorted all to offer no resistance to the unity of the church. In this connection, the object of these presents was perfectly clear to every one. The bishop Donatus of Carthage repelled the advances of the imperial officer with the remark: "What has the emperor to do with the church?"[1] He sent admonitions to all the Donatist churches, charging them to receive none of the money. Judging from the character of Donatus, it may well be presumed that he betrayed a great want of Christian reflection and prudence — qualities most needful at this time to prevent the worst excesses of fanaticism, when parties of enthusiastic Circumcellions were wandering about through the country.

The principle expressed in those words of Donatus, that church and state should be kept wholly distinct from each other, had at that time, through the reaction which began to manifest itself against the dominant church party, become universally recognized among the Donatists. In their sermons, the Donatist bishops spoke of the corruption of the church, which had originated in the confusion of the church and the state. "The evil spirit, before openly combated in the church," said they, "was now a still more dangerous enemy in its covert attacks, since it made a pretext of religion itself, and strove to insinuate itself into men's heart by flattery.[2] Those whom it seduced to apostacy, (the traditors,) and who, by humbling themselves, might have been able to regain the divine favor, it now endeavored to make secure, by flattering them that they could still be Christians, and, in truth, bishops, and by tempting their ambition and their avarice with the favor of princes and worldly gifts." What impression must these and the like discourses have produced on the minds of the Circumcellions, inclined already to every fanatical extravagance! Accustomed to trace all corruption among the Christians to the influence of earthly power and grandeur, and to the abundance of worldly goods, this ruling idea mounted with them to a fanatical spirit, that breathed hatred against all who possessed power, rank, or wealth. They roved about the country, pretending to be the protectors of the oppressed and suffering — a sacred band who were fighting for the rights of God. Perhaps they rightly perceived that there was a great deal in the relation between the proprietors and their oftentimes heavily oppressed boors,[3] between masters and slaves, that was at variance with the spirit and doctrines of Christianity. But in the way in which *they* were disposed to better the matter, all civil order must be turned into confusion. They took the part of all debtors against their creditors: their chiefs, Fasir and Axid, who styled themselves the leaders of the sons of the Holy One,[4] sent threatening letters to all creditors, in which they were ordered to give up the obligations of their debtors. Whoever refused to obey was attacked on his own estate by the furious company, and might congratulate himself if he could purchase back his life by the remission of the debt. Whenever

[1] Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia? Optat. l. III. c. 3.

[2] In the Donatist sermon, quoted in Du Pin, f. 191: Blandæ deceptionis insidiæ, quæ sub obtextu religionis animas fraudulenta circumventione subvertunt.

[3] Of which oppressions the bishops by their *intercessiones*, and Libanius, frequently testify.

[4] The phrase: Deo laudes! constituted the watch-word of their fanaticism. Vid. Augustin. c. Petilian. l. II. § 146.

they met a master with his slave, they obliged the former to take the place of the latter. They compelled venerable heads of families to perform the most menial services. All slaves who complained of their masters, whether justly or unjustly, were sure of finding with them assistance and the means of revenge.[1] Several of the Donatist bishops, desirous of clearing their party from the reproach of being the abettors or advocates of such atrocities, when they found themselves unable to produce any effect by their representations on the fanatics, are said to have besought themselves the interposition of the civil power against men who refused to be governed and set right by the church;[2] and this gave the first occasion for resorting to force for the purpose of checking the outrages of the Circumcellions. Now came in those exhortations of Donatus, and other like-minded bishops, to excite the Circumcellions to revolt. Their ferocious deeds furnished a welcome pretext for resorting to other persecuting measures. It was determined that the unity of the church should be forcibly restored; the Donatists were to be deprived of their churches, and compelled to worship with the Catholics. It cannot be exactly determined, how much, in all that was done, proceeded from imperial edicts, and how much from the despotism, the passion, or the cruelty, of individual commanders. Force continually excited the fanatic spirit still more; the report spread that the emperor's image was set up after the pagan manner in the churches, and the worship paid to it which is due only to God. Many Donatist bishops and clergymen, many Circumcellions, fell victims to the persecution. It is natural to suppose that the reporters of the facts on the Catholic side would seek to curtail, and those on the other side to exaggerate, the truth: hence an accurate statement is out of the question. Certain it is, that many Circumcellions sought only the glory of martyrdom. Finally it came to that pass, that they threw themselves from precipices, cast themselves into the fire, and hired others to kill them.[3] The most eminent bishops of the Donatist party, such as Donatus of Carthage, were exiled; and thus it was imagined a final check had been given to the resistance of the Donatists. So much the more violent was the reaction when a change of political relations took place, and the party hitherto oppressed thereby recovered once more its freedom. This came about under the reign of the emperor Julian, in the year 361. The Donatists, in conformity with their peculiar principles, were quite satisfied that Christianity should cease, under the pagan ruler, to be the dominant religion of the state. Their bishops transmitted to him a petition, in which they besought a ruler who regarded only justice, to rescind the unjust decrees that had been issued against them. There could be no difficulty in obtaining a favorable answer, since the petition perfectly agreed with the principles of this emperor, (see Section I. p. 52.) He therefore issued an edict by which everything which under the preceding reign had been unlawfully undertaken against them, was to be annulled. As they were now reinstated in possession of the

[1] See, among others, Augustin. ep. 185, ad. Bonifac. § 18.

[2] According to Optatus, III., 4, this appears to have taken place before the attempt of Macarius to restore union.

[3] Vid. Optat. III. 4 and 12.

churches which had been taken from them, their separatist fanaticism displayed itself in the wildest freaks. They regarded those churches, and the church furniture, as having been stained and polluted by the use which the profane had made of them while they were in their possession; they dashed the utensils of the church to pieces; they painted over the walls of the churches; they polished down the altars, or removed them entirely from the churches.[1]

Under the succeeding emperors, the situation of the Donatists again became worse; and they themselves did the most injury to their cause by their wild fanaticism. The passionate temper of their bishops naturally led to new divisions among themselves. A Donatist deacon in Carthage, by the name of Maximian, who had fallen into a quarrel with Primianus, the Donatist bishop of that city, and who had been excommunicated by the latter, finding followers, set up a separate party, which stood in precisely the same relation to the main body of the Donatists as the Donatists themselves did to the Catholic church. In this controversy, the Donatists were driven into many inconsistencies, of which their adversaries were not slow to take advantage.

The deplorable effects of this long-continued schism on the peace and prosperity of the African church,[2] and also, as it must be allowed, the prevailing conviction that there was no way of salvation out of the Catholic church, fired the zeal of the North-African bishops to use every effort in order to heal the division. Particularly deserving of mention here, as a distinguished theological polemic, is Augustin, a presbyter, and subsequently a bishop, of Hipporegius in Numidia. His confidence in the validity of his logical and dogmatic principles made him feel perfectly sure, that, if the Donatist bishops could only be induced to enter into a calm investigation of arguments, they might easily be led to an acknowledgment of their errors.[3] But, not to mention that a fundamental error in the notion entertained on both sides concerning the church, presented a great difficulty in the way of a mutual understanding between the two parties, the chief obstacle of all, which prevented any hearty and permanent union, the prejudices of party spirit and passion did not admit of being banished from the dispositions of men by any power of logic; but, on the contrary, it was far more natural that disputation would serve only to excite the passions to a fiercer flame, and to cause the differences to appear still greater on both sides. It was an excellent plan which Augustin proposed to the aged bishop

[1] See Optat. Milevit. II. 25, and l. VI.

[2] The fanatical intolerance went so far, that when the Donatists were the dominant party at Hippo, none of them would venture to bake bread for the Catholics, who were in the minority. See Augustin. c. lit. Petiliani, l. II. § 184.

[3] The Donatist Cresconius was not so much out of the way, when he censured the confidence of Augustin, who professed to be able to dispose so easily of a controversy, on which, for so long a time, so many things had been said on both sides: Hoc velle finire post tot annos, post judices atque arbitros, quod apud principes tot disceptantibus litteratis ab utriusque partis episcopis finiri non potuit. See Augustin. c. Cresconium Donatistam, l. I. § 4. He ought indeed to have learned something from so long experience; but the only difficulty on the part of Augustin was not surely, as Cresconius complains, an intoleranda arrogantia, but the natural confidence of one who was firmly rooted, with all his habits of thinking, in a dogmatic system.

Fortunius, — both of them men distinguished, in their respective parties, for Christian love and moderation, — that each of them, with ten others, lovers of peace, and agreeing with them in doctrine, should come together in some villa, where there was no church of either party, and where members of both parties dwelt; that each should prepare himself, by silent prayer to the God of peace, for the common investigation;[1] and that they should agree not to separate till they had come to the wished-for union. But where would it have been possible to find ten such men of both parties, who would be able constantly to maintain, even in the heat of dispute, that tone of mind which Augustin required? Since the Donatists contended as the oppressed party with the dominant one, they had reasons, not without some foundation, for mistrust with regard to any proposal coming from that quarter; and, besides this, they feared and hated the superior logic of Augustin.[2]

At the general African council held at Carthage A.D. 403, a form was drawn up, whereby all the Donatist bishops were to be invited to choose delegates out of their own body, prepared to discuss the contested points with chosen men from the Catholic party. The forms of this invitation were conceived, it is true, in the spirit of love; yet it contained a good deal which was calculated to irritate the minds of the Donatists. The Catholic bishops could not consent to forget that *they* spoke, in the secure possession of the truth, with men who were *in error*, and whose errors it was *their* business to correct.[3] It was to be expected that the Donatists would refuse to comply with any such proposal. And when now, in addition to this, Augustin, in the name of the church, wrote a letter to the Donatist churches,[4] in which he exposed the inconsistencies of their party, and interpreted the conduct of their bishops in declining the invitation held out to them, as a token of distrust in the goodness of their cause, the effect could only be to increase their indignation. Hence it happened that the Circumcellions were stirred up to new fury, and that those ecclesiastics who had taken a zealous part in the disputation with the Donatists became the special objects of it. Such occurrences would furnish occasion for new penal statutes against the Donatist party; though influential voices already protested against the practice of applying to the emperors for the passage of such laws.

In respect to Augustin, he, at least, who through so many devious ways and severe struggles had come to the knowledge of the truth in which he found rest, must doubtless have been, on this very account,

[1] See Augustin. ep. 44, A.D. 398.

[2] The Donatist Cresconius objects to Augustin, that dialectics "non congruat Christianæ veritati," and that the Donatist teachers would therefore much sooner avoid than refute him, as a homo dialecticus, (c. Cresconium. l. I. §. 16.) In reply to this, Augustin says: Hanc artem, quam dialecticam vocant, quæ nihil quam consequentia demonstrare, seu vera veris seu falsa falsis, nunquam doctrina Christiano formidat. He refers to the fact that Paul did not avoid a disputation with the dialectic Stoics; that Christ repelled the entrapping questions of the Pharisees, Matth. 22: 17, with a syllogism: and he says of these latter, "They had not learned from you to revile; else perhaps they would have chosen, with more bitterness, to call him a *dialectician*, rather than a *Samaritan*."

[3] De vestra correctione gaudere cupientes. Cod. canon. eccles. afr. c. 92.

[4] Ep. 76.

more mildly disposed towards those who, in his opinion, were in error. He may have learned from his own experience, that errors were not to be expelled by force; that it required something else besides human wisdom to guide the development and purification of a human soul. The more deeply penetrated he was with the truth that grace alone could truly enlighten and sanctify men, the less would he be inclined to attempt producing religious conviction by outward means. In fact, Augustin, before his habits of thinking became fixed, and particularly before they had attained to a systematic harmony around *a single point*, was far from indulging any wish to subject to outward constraint, that which only can proceed, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, out of the free development of the inner man.

In the meeting above alluded to with the Donatist bishop Fortunius, it came about that the latter, as the Donatists were frequently in the habit of doing, urged against the Catholic church the violent measures of which it had been the occasion. Augustin, feeling compelled to say something in vindication of his party, was so far misled as to appeal to the example of Elijah, who slew with his own hand the prophets of Baal. But when Fortunius replied that a distinction was to be made in such matters between the times of the Old and of the New Testament, Augustin acknowledged that he was right.[1] Somewhat later, he published a work against the party of Donatus, in the first book of which he decidedly condemns all the measures which had been employed to force back the Donatists to the ruling church.[2] And when, at the council of the North-African church, held at Carthage A.D. 404, the question was agitated about requiring the emperor to pass new penal laws against the Donatists, by which numbers might be the more easily brought back to the Catholic church, Augustin, with several others of the younger bishops, declared against it. He said men must go forward simply with the word of truth, must seek to conquer by arguments, unless, instead of open and avowed heretics, they would have hypocritical Catholic Christians. Hence the council ought not to be satisfied with merely providing for the safety of those who, by defending the cause of the Catholic church, exposed themselves to the fury of the Circumcellions.[3] This opinion was adopted in part by the council. It was proposed to the emperor Honorius by the deputies of the North-African church, that the fixed pecuniary mulct of ten pounds of gold, which had been laid by his father Theodosius against the clergy of the heretics, or the owners of those places where they held their assemblies for worship, should be assessed only against those Donatist bishops and clergy, within whose dioceses acts of violence against the

[1] Ep. 44. Hic revera vidit, quod videndum erat, talia tum licuisse justis. Hæc enim *prophetico* spiritu auctoritate Dei faciebant, qui procul dubio novit, cui etiam prosit occidi.

[2] This work, contra partem Donati, has not come down to us; but its tendency has been thus described by Augustin, in Retractation. l. II. c. 5 He says in this place, he had then so conceived it, because he had not as yet learned by experience how much sin the Donatists were bold enough to commit, while they went unpunished, or how much a severe course of conduct would contribute to their improvement. But *one* wrong can never justify another, nor the end sanctify the means.

[3] Ep. 93. Augustini ad Vincentium, § 17, and epist. 185, ad Bonifacium, § 25.

Catholic clergy should be perpetrated. Yet the attempt is said to have been made, at the same time, to procure that the law whereby heretics were excluded from the right of receiving donations and legacies, and of leaving legacies in their wills, should be expressly extended to the Donatists, who would not consent to be reckoned among the heretics.[1] When, moreover, to the proposal of the North-African council were added the complaints of individuals who had been abused by the Circumcellions, there were enacted, in the year 405, against the entire Donatist party, as a heretical one, various laws which were still more severe than the council itself had required.

The North-African bishops, of whom Augustin was the soul, labored incessantly to bring about a religious conference with the Donatists, where they might be brought over to the true faith by the force of arguments. The Donatists, generally, sought every means of avoiding so useless an experiment. But it so happened, in the year 410, that certain Donatist bishops who had been summoned before the higher civil authorities were, by some means or other, perhaps by some objection which was brought against them, led to assert for the first time that they would doubtless be able to prove the truth of their cause, were they but allowed a patient hearing.[2] They were immediately taken at their word; and the Catholic bishops, urgently renewing their request that a religious conference might be appointed, appealed to the fact that the Donatists themselves were ready to acquiesce in that movement. And the emperor Honorius ordered a religious conference to be held between the two parties at Carthage, A.D. 411. If the Donatist bishops, after being three times invited, still declined taking any share in the religious conference, their conduct should be interpreted to signify a consciousness of being unable to defend their cause, and their communities should therefore be compelled to unite with the Catholic church. On the other hand, any who might comply with the invitation, should at some future time receive again the churches of which they were deprived. The imperial tribune and notary, Flavius Marcellinus, Augustin's friend, was appointed to preside over this religious conference as the emperor's commissioner, and to act as judge.

The Catholic bishops made such overtures to the Donatists as were calculated to give them confidence. They declared themselves ready

[1] Cod. Afr. canon 93. If we compare these minutes of the proceedings of the council with the report of them drawn up by Augustin, in the letter already referred to, addressed to Boniface, we shall doubtless see, that this report is not strictly correct; perhaps because the whole matter was no longer present to Augustin's memory; for this council certainly required, as is evident from the appendix, a penal law against the Donatists generally, as such, but one by no means so severe; and such a spirit of mildness and liberality as is described by Augustin in the two letters above referred to, as peculiar to his earlier mode of thinking, by no means expresses itself in those minutes. Moreover, it may be gathered from many of the works against the Donatists which Augustin had at that time already written, and which we shall hereafter cite, that he had then actually made the transition from his earlier liberal principles, to more strict and rigid ones.

[2] In the letters missive of this conference, the fact was appealed to, that the Donatists themselves had demanded it, (sic ante brevissimum tempus Donatistarum episcopos in judicio illustrium potestatum collationem postulasse non dubium est. Gesta collationis in Du Pin, f. 247,) although the Donatists denied all knowledge of having demanded any such thing.

to resign their bishoprics, and to surrender them into the hands of the Donatist bishops alone, in case the latter gained the victory in the conference. Such a proposition, it may be granted, required but little self-denial, since, beyond all doubt, they were well convinced that the case supposed could never happen. There was more in the other proposal, that if the cause of the Donatists was lost, and if their bishops would come over to the Catholic church, they should be recognized in their episcopal character, and stand on the same level with the Catholic bishops in the exercise of their functions. But if the communities were not satisfied with this, both should resign their dignities, and the Donatists and Catholics, now united, choose a new bishop. "Be brothers with us in the Lord's inheritance," said Augustin; "let us not, for the sake of preserving our own stations, hinder the peace of Christ."[1] Augustin preached in Carthage before the commencement of the conference, two discourses, in which he endeavored to inspire the Catholics there with love and gentleness towards the Donatists, and called on them sedulously to avoid everything which might be calculated to give offence to their excitable feelings, or to arouse their passions. "Their eyes are inflamed," said he: "they must be treated prudently and with forbearance. Let no one enter into controversy with the other — let no one at this moment even defend his faith by disputation, lest some spark from the controversy kindle into a great fire, lest occasion of offence be given to those who seek occasion for it. Do you hear reviling language, endure it; be willing not to have heard it; be silent. Do you say, he brings charges against my bishop, and shall I be silent? Yes; be silent at those charges; not that you are to allow them, but to bear them. You best subserve the interests of your bishop at the present moment, when you forbear meddling with his cause. Repay not revilings with revilings, but pray for him."[2]

There met together at Carthage, A.D. 411, two hundred and eighty-six bishops of the Catholic, and two hundred seventy-nine of the Donatist party. The Donatists had evidently come to the conference with reluctance, and full of distrust: this was shown on all occasions. The tribune Marcellinus, in conformity with the imperial edict, made known to them the proposal, that, in case they wanted confidence in him, they were at liberty to choose another person of equal or of superior rank to preside along with him. The Donatist bishop Petilianus thereupon declared: "It is none of our concern to ask for another judge, since in fact *we* did not ask for the *first*. The business belongs to those who have been the contrivers of this whole affair."[3]

Amid such vast numbers on both sides, the transactions could hardly be conducted in a quiet and orderly manner. Marcellinus demanded, in compliance with the imperial letters missive, that, according to the common mode of judicial proceedings, deputies should be chosen from each of the two parties, seven in number, to advocate the cause of their respective sides in the name of the rest. But the distrustful Donatists, prejudiced against the whole business, at first positively refused to enter

[1] Augustin. ep. 128, Sermo 358, f. 4. [2] P. 357, § 4. [3] Gesta collat. f. 248.

into such an arrangement. They declared that the judicial mode of proceeding was not applicable to this spiritual concern. Amid wearisome, fruitless disputes about this and other matters relating to the form of transacting business, the time of the meeting, during the greater part of the first day, was spent. At length the Donatists were obliged to yield, and to choose seven bishops. Augustin was the ablest speaker on the one side, Petilianus on the other.

When, on the second day of the assembly, the seven deputies of each party entered the hall, the imperial commissioner invited them to take their seats as he took his own. The Catholic bishops followed the invitation; but Petilianus said, in the name of the Donatists: "We do not sit in the absence of our fathers, (the other bishops, who could not assist at the conference,) especially as the divine law, Ps. 26: 4, forbids us to sit down with such adversaries." Marcellinus thereupon declared, that respect for the character of the bishops forbade that he should remain seated, if they chose to stand; and he ordered his chair to be removed.

The matters brought forward at this religious conference related to two disputed questions; the one, as to the fact whether Felix of Aptunga, and Cæcilian, were traditors; the other was a question of doctrine, viz. what belonged to the essence of the Catholic church,—whether the church, by communion with unworthy members, lost the predicate of the genuine Christian, Catholic church. The controversy on the first point can have no farther interest for us: in respect to the controversy on the second point, we shall treat upon it connectedly, when we come to survey the whole matter of dispute between the two parties.

The imperial commissioner decided, as was to be expected, in favor of the Catholic church. The decision was followed by severer laws, by which all the Donatist clergy were banished from their country, and the laity of the party were condemned to pecuniary fines. The fanaticism of the oppressed party was thereby excited to new and more violent outbreaks. When, in the year 420, the imperial tribune Dulcitius signified his intention to carry the laws against the Donatists into execution, Gaudentius, bishop of Thamugade, who had been one of the seven speakers on the side of the Donatists at the conference of Carthage, declared that, if force were used to take away his church, he would burn himself up in it, together with his community. The tribune having written to him, that such a proceeding would not be in conformity with the doctrine of Christ; that, according to this, he must rather seek safety in flight; Gaudentius defended his premeditated suicide, and appealed, among other arguments, to the example of Razis, 2 Maccab. 14. This was the occasion of Augustin's writing his work against Gaudentius; a treatise important on account of its bearing on the question of suicide, and on other points connected with the history of Christian morals, (see the fourth Section.) When the Vandals, in the fifth century, made themselves masters of this country, the Donatists, as such, had to suffer no persecutions from them. It was only as adherents of the Nicene creed that they were persecuted, in common

with other confessors of the same system. They continued to survive, as a distinct party, down to the sixth century, as may be seen from the letters of the Roman bishop Gregory the Great.

We now pass to consider the theological points of dispute between the two parties. The first point related to the doctrine concerning the church. The same remarks which we made on this subject, in speaking of the Novatian controversies in the preceding period, apply also to the Donatist disputes. Both parties were involved in the same grand mistake with regard to the conception of the church, by their habit of confounding the notions of the invisible and of the visible church with each other. Proceeding on this fundamental error, the Catholic fathers maintained that, separate from the communion of the one visible Catholic church, derived, through the succession of the bishops, from the apostles, there is no way of participating in the influences of the Holy Spirit and of obtaining salvation; and hence it could not seem otherwise than a matter of the highest importance to those of them who were actuated by a pure zeal of Christian charity, to bring the Donatists to acknowledge this universal visible church, although they were not separated from them by any difference of creed. On the other hand, the Donatists, owing to this same confusion of notions, held that every church which tolerated unworthy members in its bosom was itself polluted by the communion with them: it thus ceased to deserve the predicates of purity and holiness, and consequently ceased to be a true Christian church, since such a church could not subsist without these predicates.

As it concerns Augustin, the principal manager of this controversy, it is easy to explain, from the course of his religious and theological development, how this notion of the church came to be considered by him of so much importance; and the foundation on which this notion was established, by his logical, systematizing mind, exerted a great influence on all succeeding times. Augustin had been carefully educated, by his pious mother, Monica, in the faith, early implanted in his soul, that the way to heaven was to be found only in the Catholic church. From the years of his youth and upward, he had fallen into many errors of theory and practice, and into a series of violent conflicts. He passed, finally, from Manicheism, which had disappointed the expectations of many years, to Skepticism. Whilst he was in this state of skepticism, and whilst an inward impulse of his intellect and his heart compelled him still to believe in some objective truth, the thought took possession of his soul: Must not God have instituted an authority, capable of being known by sure and certain marks, to conduct the restless, doubting spirit of man, to the truth which he needs? From skepticism, the transition was here formed, in his case, — which was a case often repeated in history, — to the faith in the authority of a visible church, proved to be of divine origin by evidences not to be mistaken. Again, although the belief in the truth and divinity of the doctrines of Christ, which had attended him from his childhood, and never forsaken him, even when he embraced Manicheism, asserted its power in his soul more strongly as he grew older; yet he was in doubt as to the question where

these doctrines of Christ were to be found, since each one of the sects claimed to be itself in possession of them. He wanted that knowledge of the right hermeneutical, exegetical, and critical principles, which would have enabled him to answer this question, as to what were the true doctrines of Christ, out of the sacred scriptures alone. The hermeneutical and critical principles of the Manicheans had completely unsettled him: he wanted a stable authority, which could show him where the pure doctrines of Christ, the unfalsified collection of religious records, and the correct doctrinal exposition of them, were already present. This authority he believed he found in the tradition of the universal church. When Augustin considered that this church had come forth victorious out of all her conflicts with the powers that had assailed her from without, and with the manifold corruptions of Christianity in erroneous forms of doctrine; when he perceived what a revolution in the whole mode of human thought, and in the entire life of man, had been effected by means of this church, how the loftiest truths of religion had passed into the common consciousness of humanity where this church had become dominant; he confounded in this case what the church had effected through Christianity, and what Christianity had effected through the church, as the instrument and vessel for its diffusion and propagation, with what the church had done in and of itself as a visible, outward institution, in this determinate earthly form. What he might justly regard as a witness for the divine, world-transforming power of the gospel, appeared to him as a witness for the divine authority of the visible, universal church; and he did not consider that the gospel truth would have been able to bring about effects equally great, by its inherent divine power, in some other vessel in which it could have been diffused among mankind; nay, that it would have been able to produce still purer and mightier effects, had it not been in many ways disturbed and checked in its operation by the impure and confining vehicle of its transmission.[1]

As Augustin, at the time of his controversy with the Donatists, had already incorporated into his life, and woven into the very texture of his thoughts, this confused mixture of conceptions necessarily distinct; as this error, then universally prevailing in the Western, and particularly in the North-African church, had thus passed over into his inmost habits of thinking, it is easy to see of what weight this point must have seemed to him in the present dispute. Hence he could say:[2] "No one attains to salvation, and to eternal life, who has not Christ for his Head. But no one can have Christ for a Head, who does not belong to his Body, which is the church."[3] Hence the error, growing out of this confounding and mixing together of distinct notions, that the union of believers with Christ was brought about through the union with this

[1] The authorities for this delineation are furnished by Augustin's confessions, by the works which he composed during the great crisis of his inner life until the first years of his spiritual office, and especially the works de ordine, de moribus ecclesiæ catholicæ et moribus Manichæorum, de vera religione, and de utilitate credendi.

[2] De unitate ecclesiæ, c. 49.

[3] Habere caput Christum nemo poterit, nisi qui in ejus corpore fuerit, quod est ecclesia.

visible church. And hence, in following out this principle, he asserts: "The entire Christ is the Head and the Body; — the Head is the only-begotten Son of God, and the Body is the church. He who agrees not with scripture in the doctrine concerning the Head, although he may stand in external communion with the church, notwithstanding belongs not to her. But, moreover, he who holds fast to all that scripture teaches respecting the Head, and yet cleaves not to the unity of the church, belongs not to her." [1]

It is a fact particularly worthy of notice in the polemical writings of Augustin, that, whenever the Donatists made appeal to miracles, answers to prayer, visions, and to the holy lives of their bishops, as evidences that the true church was with them, he, on the other hand, will allow the validity of no other evidence than the objective testimony of the divine word. "Let them not try to prove the genuineness of their church," says he,[2] "by the councils of their bishops, by deceitful miraculous signs, since we have been warned and put on our guard against such proofs by the word of the Lord, (Matth. 24: 25,) but let them do it by the law and prophets, and by the word of the only Shepherd.[3] Neither do we ourselves affirm that men ought to believe us in maintaining that we are in the Catholic church, because this church is recommended by an Optatus of Mileve, or by an Ambrose of Milan, or other numberless bishops of our communion; or because it has been approved by the assemblies of our colleagues; or because such wonderful instances of answers to prayer, or of the healing of the sick, have been witnessed on sacred spots in the whole world, which have been visited by the members of our communion; or because this person has had a vision, and that other has heard in a trance, that he should not unite himself with the Donatist party, or that he should forsake it." It must be admitted, however, that Augustin is inconsistent with himself, and moves round in a circle, when, in disputing with the Donatists, he allows validity to no evidence but that of the scriptures, in favor of the Catholic church; while, in his controversy with the Manicheans, he makes the authority of the holy scriptures themselves to depend on that of the church which referred to them, and from which we have received the sacred canon.[4]

The Donatists maintained that the church should cast out from its body those who were known, by open and manifest sins, to be unworthy members. To prove this, they adduced the fifth chapter of Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, where the apostle has given certain rules for the practice of church discipline. "When the church did not act in accordance with these rules," said they, "but tolerated such unworthy members in her communion, she lost the predicates

[1] De unitate ecclesiæ, § 7.
[2] L. c. § 47.
[3] L. c. § 50.
[4] The well-known and remarkable words, contra epistolam Manichæi, § 6: Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicæ ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas; while, on the other hand, what he says against the Donatists would admit, perhaps, of being expressed by reversing the proposition: Ego vero catholicæ ecclesiæ non crederem, nisi me evangelii commoveret auctoritas. But if tradition conducts, through the church, to the scriptures, it by no means follows, that they are believed on the ground of its authority. We see here that confusion of ideas, the cause of which is so easily accounted for by what has been said above.

of purity and holiness." All those passages of holy writ which bid us avoid the company of the wicked, they referred — confounding inward disposition with outward conduct — to the avoiding of external companionship with them. Augustin, taking the position of the Catholic church, replied that, it was true, church discipline should, by all means, be vigorously maintained; but that still such a complete separation from the rest, even of manifest transgressors, was, in the existing state of the church, impracticable; that the evil must be patiently endured, to avoid a still greater one, and to give opportunity for reformation to such as could be reformed, especially in those cases where the wickedness which was to be corrected by church discipline, was shared by too many. The apostle Paul, he attempts to show, by what we must allow to be a rather forced interpretation,[1] was speaking only of *individuals*, whose vices were not common to many, and whose vices were universally known; so that the sentence of excommunication pronounced against such persons must have been acknowledged as just by all. But when the same disease had infected many, nothing was left to the good but pain and grief, that so by the mark revealed to Ezekiel, (Ezek. 9: 4,) they might be preserved from the destruction with which all were threatened. Where the infection of sin had seized on the many, the severity of a divine chastisement was required; for the counsels of human separation were vain and mischievous; they proceeded from pride; they rather disturbed the weak among the good, than exerted any power of reformation on the boldly wicked. Let man then punish, what he may punish, in the spirit of love. Where he may not, let him suffer patiently, sigh and mourn with love, until either chastisement and reformation come from above, or, at the general harvest, the tares be rooted out, and the chaff sifted away. Thus the good and faithful Christians, certain of their own salvation, may persevere to dwell in unity among the corrupt, whom it is beyond their power to punish, seeking to extirpate the sin which is in their own heart.[2] The Catholic party appealed to those parables of our Lord which treat of the separation of the good and bad, reserved unto the final judgment; the parables of the tares, of the good fruit, of the draught of fishes. The Donatists replied, either that these passages referred simply to the mixing together of the good and the bad in the *world*, and not within the church; that by the *field*, the *net*, was to be understood, not the church, but the world; or they maintained that those passages referred simply to the mixing in of secret sinners with the saints; since even *they* allowed, that a complete separation was in this life impossible, and demanded only the exclusion of those who were manifestly vicious.[3] As it respects the first of these

[1] In the phrase, "si quis," he maintained, was implied one among many differently disposed; and in the words, "fratres nominantur," that his offence was generally known.

[2] Augustin. c. epist. Parmenian, l. III. § 12, et seqq.

[3] As it respects the second position, the Donatists explained: Hoc de *reis latentibus* dictum, quoniam reticulum in mari positum quid habeat a piscatoribus, id est a sacerdotibus, ignoratur, donec extractum ad littus ad purgationem boni seu mali prodantur. Ita et latentes et in ecclesia constituti et a *sacerdotibus ignorati*, in divino judicio proditi, tanquam pisces mali a sanctorum consortio separantur. See Collat. Carthag. d. III. ed. Du Pin, fol. 314, and the breviculus of Augustin concerning this day.

positions, we may remark here a noticeable dispute between the Donatists and their antagonists, relative to the use of the term, "world," in the sacred scriptures; where it becomes evident, how the same fundamental error in confounding *the notions of the invisible and of the visible church*, in which both parties were involved, prevented their coming to a mutual understanding. The Donatists appealed to the fact, that Christ himself, in explaining this parable, taught that the *field* is the *world*. Augustin, on the other hand, replied, that in this passage Christ used the term, "world," in place of the church.[1] This was perhaps correct; but the question comes up, In what particular point of view was this notion of the church employed? That portion of the visible church which belongs at the same time to the invisible, could, however, only form an antithesis to that portion which the New Testament calls, in a peculiar sense, the *world*. But of the external, visible church, in so far as it is not *one* with the invisible, it may with propriety be said, that it belongs to the world in the sense of the Bible. Precisely because the Donatist bishop Emeritus failed to mark this distinction of ideas, he uttered — as Augustin expressed it — that petulant exclamation. He then proceeded directly to quote those passages from John, where the *world* expresses that which is opposed to the kingdom of God; and demanded, whether that could be said of the church? — for example, the world knows not God, therefore the church knows not God. But of one portion of the *visible* church all this may with propriety be said; and the Donatist himself could have no hesitation in applying all this to the secret unworthy members who yet belonged to the visible church. Pity that he had not made himself distinctly conscious of this! Augustin answered, that the holy scriptures used the term, "world," sometimes in a good, and sometimes in a bad sense. In the former, for example, when it is said, the world believes in Christ, is redeemed by him; but he ought to have considered, that the invisible church receives its members out of the world; that they who once belonged to the world, in that biblical sense, do, by becoming incorporated, by faith and participation in the redemption, into the invisible church, cease belonging to it any longer. Augustin says, one need only distinguish the different senses of the term "world," and one would no longer find any contradiction here in the scriptures. But he would have advanced farther, and been still more free from prejudice, in his interpretation of the Bible, if he had duly distinguished the different significations of the word "church." He says: "Behold the world in the bad sense, all who cleave to earthly things among all the nations; — behold, on the other hand, the world in the good sense, all who believe and have hope of eternal life among all nations."[2] But are not the last mentioned precisely the members of the genuine church of Christ, of the *invisible* church, among all the nations where the gospel has found its way, — among all the different earthly forms of appearance of the visible church?

It is remarkable, but also very natural, that the Donatists, to show

[1] Mundum ipsum appellatum esse pro ecclesiæ nomine. [2] L. c. f. 317.

the necessity of a severe sifting in the church, and to prove that the church was corrupt where such a sifting had not been made, drew their arguments, for the most part, from the Old Testament, and from such passages of the Old Testament as treat of the external purity of the people of God.[1] They ought, however, in this case, to have paid some regard to that necessary distinction between the positions of the Old and of the New Testament, which they were not slow to insist on, in other cases, against their opponents.

According to *the Catholic point of view*, to the essence of the genuine Catholic church belonged its *general spread through the medium of the episcopal succession down from the apostles*. From the conception of the Catholic church in this sense was then first derived the predicates of purity and holiness. On the other hand, according to the Donatist point of view, the predicate of Catholic ought to be subordinate to those of purity and holiness. When the church, however widely extended, — they inferred, — became corrupted by intercourse with unworthy members, then that church, in whatever nook or corner of the earth it might be, which had no manifestly vicious members within its pale, is the genuinely Catholic one.[2] They appealed, not without reason, from the prejudgment grounded on numbers and universality, to the passages of scripture where the little band of genuine confessors were distinguished from the great mass of apostates, or of those belonging to the kingdom of God merely in outward appearance; as, for example, the seven thousand that had not bowed the knee to Baal, — where the few, who went in the strait way towards heaven, were opposed to the multitude of those who went in the broad way to destruction. They maintained that when Christ represented it as so doubtful, (Luke 18: 8,) whether at his reappearance he should find faith on the earth, this indicated that the faithful, in the true sense, would not be thus diffused in one mass over the whole earth.[3] But although they were right here, in distinguishing those who in the visible church constituted the church proper, the invisible one, from the great mass of those who made up the appearance of the visible church; yet they were wrong in this respect, that, confounding once more, on another side, notions distinct in themselves, they persisted in forming this genuine church only according to the dictates of a separatist pride. They imagined the saying was here confirmed, that the last should be first; the holy, pure church was at present in Africa; while the East, where Christianity commenced its progress, had fallen from purity; — and although in Africa (i.e. North Africa) no church was to be found which was of apostolic origin. They protested here, therefore, against the claims of the sedes apostolicæ, and against those who were for uniformly attaching to the outward fellowship with these the predicate of a Catholic church.[4]

[1] Collat. l. c. fol. 313, 314.

[2] The Donatist bishop Emeritus says, in opposing the assumption of the other party, who always proceeded on the supposition that they were the Catholic church according to the principle of universality: Quicunque justis legitimisque ex causis Christianus fuerit approbatus, ille meus est Catholicus. And the bishop Gaudentius: Catholicum nomen non ad provincias vel gentes referendum; cum hoc sit quod sacramentis plenum, quod perfectum, quod immaculatum. Collat. d. III. f. 301 et 2.

[3] Augustin. de unitate ecclesiæ, § 33, et seqq.

[4] De unitate ecclesiæ, § 37.

Midway between both parties stood the Donatist grammarian, Tichonius, approving neither of the intolerant, proud spirit of separatism, nor of Catholicism, which was for forcing men into an external unity. He allowed that his party was wrong in holding themselves to be the alone pure church; and in making the fulfilment of the divine promise, as to the blessing which should be dispensed through the posterity of Abraham to all mankind, — the blessing of a preached gospel which should reach the whole world, — to depend on a subjective human purity which nowhere existed. He could not agree that, by communion with unworthy members which it did not expel from itself, the church could lose its character, which rested on an objective, divine foundation.[1] He doubtless made his own party mark their inconsistency in the fact, that the Donatists might perceive a great deal of the same impurity in their own communities which they so sharply reproved in the Catholic church as a profanation of its character. What was holy or not holy must be determined by their own caprice.[2] Augustin, however, accused Tichonius himself of inconsistency,[3] because he did not, in accordance with these principles, abandon his party, and acknowledge those who stood in church fellowship with the Christendom extending throughout the entire world, as the Catholic church. This inconsistency, however, he could find in Tichonius, only by supposing in his mind the same confusion of the invisible with the visible church in which he himself was involved, and the same principles of a necessary visible unity of the church. But on this very point he was mistaken. Tichonius distinguished two parts of the body of Christ, (corpus Domini bipartitum,) i. e. of that which exhibits itself in manifestation as the body of Christ, as the church; — one part, the individuals scattered through the whole world, who, by faith and temper of mind, really belong to Christ's spiritual body, who are truly one with him as the Head of the spiritual body; in whom he is daily born and grows up into the holy temple of God;[4] to whom the description applies which Paul gives in Ephesians 5: 27, inasmuch as they are purified in the faith by the blood of Christ — therefore the true community of the saints; — another part, those scattered throughout the world, who belong indeed, as to visible appearance, to the same body of Christ, and draw nigh to God with their lips, but in heart are far from him.[5] Accordingly, Tichonius could say that the two portions of the manifested body of Christ remained connected with each other throughout the whole world; and the important question was, to which of these two portions did each individual belong, by the

[1] See Augustin. c. epistolam Parmeniani, l. I. c. 1 et 2; l. III. § 17. Comp. also the hermeneutic rules of Tichonius, reg. I., where, probably in opposition to the other Donatists, he remarks: Non enim sicut quidam dicunt, in *contumeliam regni Dei invictæque hæreditatis Christi*, quod non sine dolore dico, Dominus totum mundum potestate et non sui corporis plenitudine occupavit. Bibl. patr. Ludg. T. VI. f. 50.

[2] Quod volumus sanctum est. Augustin. c. epist. Parmeniani, l. II. § 31.

[3] C. epist. Parmeniani, l. I. c. 1.

[4] Reg. I. God as the fountain of divine life in human nature through Christ. Deus in corpore suo filius est hominis, qui quotidie nascendo, (the spiritual *becoming* of the divine life.) venit et crescit in templum sanctum Dei.

[5] Reg. II. Qui ejusdem corporis sunt visibiliter, et Deo labiis quidem adpropinquant, corde tamen separati sunt.

temper of his mind. Owing to this intermediate relation to both parties, he could of course make his cause good to neither; in addition to which it must be remarked that he seems to have been somewhat obscure in his mode of expressing himself.[1]

That separatist pride of the Donatists, which attributed so much weight to the subjectively human element, as their principle compelled them to do, often expressed itself, in the heat of controversy, in an extremely harsh and unchristian manner. On the other hand, Augustin not unfrequently explains his own views in a very beautiful style, and in the genuinely Christian sense, respecting the might and validity of the objectively divine element; respecting the relation of the human element to the same, as a mere organ; and respecting the vanity and emptiness of the human element, whenever it aspires to be anything more than this.

When the Donatist bishop Petilian pressed Augustin to declare explicitly whether he acknowledged Cæcilian as his father, in which case the cause of the Catholic church would be made to depend wholly on the guilt or innocence of this latter individual, Augustin at length declared: "I have *one* Head, but this is Christ; whose apostle I hear saying: 'All is yours, but ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.' For even in the case where the apostle called himself a father, he added, that we might beware of attributing to his paternity any *weak human* foundation, 'I have begotten you *through the gospel*.' To the gospel, then, I trace my parentage. It is one thing, when, from motives of respect, we call the more aged or the more deserving, our fathers; and it is quite another, when the question is put us, whom have we for our father as it respects eternal salvation, as it respects the communion of the church, and the participation in the divine promises. As it concerns eternal salvation, — I beg pardon of the apostle, or rather it is he that bids me so speak, — the apostle is not my father in respect to that; — he who tells me: 'I have planted, and Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So, then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.' In respect to my salvation, I acknowledge no other father than God; of whom our Lord says: 'Ye shall call no man father on the earth, for one is your Father, who is in heaven,' and to whom we daily say: 'Our Father which art in heaven.'"[2] When Petilian made use of the strongest expressions to show that all religious acts possessed their true significance only in their (the Donatists') alone pure and holy church, that none but a clergyman without spot or blame could duly administer the sacraments; when Petilian expressed himself to this purport, that everything depended on the conscience of him who imparted baptism, since it was through him the conscience of the recipient was to be cleansed; Augustin replied: "Often the conscience of man is unknown

[1] Augustin doubtless perceived much that was anti-catholic in the hermeneutical rules of Tichonius relative to the significations of the body of Christ. These he calls Donatist views: Quæ sicut Donatista hæreticus loquitur: he could not, however, exactly specify what they were. De doctrina Christiana, l. III. § 43.

[2] Collat. c. Donatist. l. c. f. 312.

to me, but I am certain of the mercy of Christ. When Petilian said: "Whoever receives the faith from an unbeliever, receives not faith, but guilt,"[1] Augustin answered: "But Christ is faithful, from whom I receive faith, and not guilt." When Petilian said: "The character of everything depends strictly on its origin and its root (consequently here on the character of the person administering the sacraments) — a genuine new birth can proceed only from good seed, Augustin replied: "My origin is Christ, my root is Christ, my Head is Christ. The seed, from which I am regenerated, is the word of God, which my Lord exhorts me obediently to follow, although he through whom I hear it, may not himself practise what he teaches." To the remark of Petilian: "How absurd to suppose that he who is guilty through his own transgressions, can absolve others from guilt!" he replied: "He alone makes me free from guilt, who died for our sins, and rose again for our justification; for I believe not in the minister by whom I am baptized, but in Him who justifies the sinner, so that my faith is accounted unto me for righteousness."[2]

As Petilian, in his pastoral letters against the Catholic church, had brought many charges against Augustin himself, the latter replied to these charges in his third book against Petilian, confining himself wholly to the interests of the cause. "Let no man," he says, "glory in man. If you see anything praiseworthy in us, let Him be praised from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift. And in all which you acknowledge to be good in us, be followers of us, if we also are followers of Christ. But if ye surmise, believe, or seek after, things that are bad in us, hold fast to the word of the Lord, and, throwing yourselves on that, forsake not his church on account of the wickedness of men, Matth. 23: 3. Observe, do what we bid you; but, where ye believe or know that we do wrong, do not after our works; for at present it is not the time for me to justify myself before you, since I have undertaken to recommend to you the cause of truth and salvation without regard to my own personal concerns, that none may glory in a man. For cursed is he that putteth his trust in man. If this word of the Lord is kept and observed, even though I may fall, so far as it concerns my own personal interests, yet the cause I serve will come off victorious."[3]

Since the Catholics, in their controversy with the Donatists, distinguished the church on earth, in which genuine and spurious members are mixed together, from the church of heaven, purified from its spurious members, they might easily have been led, by pursuing this distinction still further, to distinguish the conceptions of the visible and of the invisible church. In this way they furnished occasion to the Donatists of charging them with supposing the existence of *two churches;* but they were extremely uneasy under this accusation, and would allow of no other distinction than that of two different conditions of one and the same church, inasmuch as it was at present a mortal church, but would

[1] Qui fidem a perfido sumserit, non fidem percipit, sed reatum.

[2] Augustin. c. Petilian. l. I. § 8.

[3] Contra Petilian. l. III. § 4.

hereafter be an immortal one.[1] And Augustin, in his book, "de unitate ecclesiæ," says: "Many stand, in the communion of the sacraments, *with* the church, and are still not *in* the church."[2] But what means this: They are *not in the church*, and they yet stand in communion with the church? In the outward, apparent church they are certainly; but in the inner, invisible church, to which none can belong otherwise than by the temper of the heart, they are not. And with what church can they stand in communion by a bare outward participation of the sacraments alone? Certainly with no other but with that which is itself merely an outward and visible one; from which, inasmuch as it *is* the bare form of manifestation, destitute of the inner life, no true life can proceed. Augustin would, therefore, if he had made himself distinctly conscious of what was implied in his own conceptions, have properly said: "Many stand in outward communion with the visible church, who are yet, by the temper of their hearts, by no means members of the invisible church." And he himself does in fact intimate, in another place, that there is a church, which is the body of Christ, something other than the bare appearance of the church, or the bare visible church — a church with which they who did not belong to it by the temper of their hearts, stood in no sort of connection, — when he says of such: "We ought not to believe that they are in the body of Christ, which is the church, because, in a bodily manner, they participate in its sacraments. But they are not in that communion of the church, which, in the members of Christ by mutual union, makes increase to that measure of its growth which God has appointed; for that church is founded on a rock, as the Lord says: On this rock will I build my church. But such persons build on the sand."[3] To what results would Augustin have arrived, if he had made clear to himself the distinction of ideas which lies at the bottom of these words?

Another more important point of dispute related to the employment of force in matters of religion. The Donatists bore their testimony on this point with emphasis in favor of that course which the example of Christ and the apostles, which the spirit of the gospel, and the sense of man's universal rights, called forth by the latter, required. The point of view first set forth in a clear light by Christianity, when it made religion the common good of all mankind and raised it above all narrow political restrictions, was by the Donatists manfully asserted, in opposition to a theory of ecclesiastical rights at variance with the spirit of the gospel, and which had sprung up out of a new mixture of ecclesiastical with political interests. They could not succeed so well in unfolding the relation of the church to the state, for here they easily passed from one extreme over to the other. If their opponents erred on the side of confounding too much the church with the state, they, on the other hand, were too much inclined to represent the opposition between

[1] Collat. fol. 318. Eandem ipsam unam et sanctam ecclesiam nunc esse aliter, tunc autem aliter futuram.

[2] § 74. Multi sunt in sacramentorum communione cum ecclesia, et tamen jam non sunt in ecclesia.

[3] C. Petilian. II. § 247, and de doctrina Christiana, l. III. § 45. He himself, in censuring the expression of Tichonius, bipartitum corpus Domini, distinguishes the *corpus Christi verum* atque *simulatum*.

the two, which was grounded in the early relation of the church to a pagan state, as a relation that must ever continue to exist.

The Donatist bishop Petilian says: "Did the apostles ever persecute any one, or did Christ ever deliver any one over to the secular power? Christ commands us to flee persecutors, Matth. 10: 23. Thou who callest thyself a disciple of Christ oughtest not to imitate the evil deeds of the heathens. Think you thus to serve God,—by destroying us with your own hand? Ye err, ye err, poor mortals, if ye believe this; for God has not executioners for his priests. Christ persecutes no one; for he was for inviting, not forcing, men to the faith; and when the apostles complained to him of the founders of separate parties, Luke 9: 50, he said to them: 'He who is not against us, is for us;' and so too Paul, in Philippians 1: 18.[1] Our Lord Christ says: 'No man can come unto me, unless the Father, who hath sent me, draw him.' But why do you not permit every man to follow his own free will, since God, the Lord himself, has bestowed this free will on man? He has simply pointed out to man the way to righteousness, that none might be lost through ignorance. Christ, in dying for men, has given Christians the example to die, but not to kill. Christ teaches us to suffer wrong, not to requite it. The apostle tells us of what he had endured, not of what he had done to others. But what have you to do with the princes of this world, in whom the Christian cause has ever found only its enemies?" He cites examples from the Old and the New Testament; he supposes he finds mention made of princes hostile to the church in 1 Corinth. 2: 6. Yet he adds: "This may have been said, however, of the ancient pagan princes; but you suffer not the emperors of this world, who would be Christians, to be such, since you mislead them, by your false representations, to turn the weapons prepared against the enemies of the state, against Christians." The Donatist bishop Gaudentius says: "God created man free, *after his own image*. How am I to be deprived of that by human lordship, which God has bestowed on me? What sacrilege, that human arrogance should take away what God has bestowed, and idly boast of doing this in God's behalf! It is a great offence against God, when he is defended by men. What must *he think* of God, who would defend him with outward force? Is it that God is unable to punish offences against himself? Hear what the Lord says: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you.' The peace of the world must be introduced among contending nations by arms. The peace of Christ invites the willing with wholesome mildness; it never forces men against their wills. The almighty God employed prophets to convert the people of Israel; he enjoined it not on princes; the Saviour of souls, the Lord Christ, sent fishermen, and not soldiers, to preach his faith."

[1] Petilian would say, that to Christians every one should be welcome who preached Christ; but this the Catholics could not see, since to them the faith in Christ was nothing without faith in the visible church. And even the Donatists, in recognizing nothing as genuinely Christian beyond the pale of their own spotless church, did not act consistently according to this principle; with which inconsistency Augustin took care to reproach them. Vid. Augustin. contra literas Petiliani, l. II. § 178 et 180.

Augustin, in attacking these arguments of the Donatists, now appeared as the advocate of a theory of ecclesiastical rights, of which he himself, as we have already remarked, was at an earlier period the opponent. He was, in this case, carried along by the spirit of the times; and this spirit had found a point of union for such errors in his habit of confounding the visible and the invisible church. He who possesses at all times a clear consciousness that the true and real church of Christ is an invisible one, is also constantly aware that it cannot be built up and advanced by any outward human mechanism, but only by that which penetrates into the inmost recesses of the mind, and begets a free conviction. But he who overvalues the vehicle of the outward church, will also deem it a matter of high importance that men should, in the first place, be introduced into this — and that indeed can be effected by a great variety of outward, human means.

As early as the year 400, Augustin had changed his principles on this subject; for already he defended against the Donatist bishop Parmenianus, the resort to force against the Donatists, though, in his advice given at the same time before a council in Carthage, (see above,) he did not yet allow himself to be determined by these principles. But, even at a still subsequent period, we find examples to show that he suffered himself to be guided in his mode of action by a milder Christian spirit than that was which could give birth to such principles.[1] Pity it was that errors which grew first out of practice should, by the application of Augustin's logic, — so adroit in combining things true, half true, and false, into a plausible whole, — be wrought into a systematic theory, and thereby become the more firmly rooted in the ecclesiastical polity. Augustin did indeed know too well what constituted the essence of inward Christianity, the Christianity of faith and of temper, to be capable of entertaining the opinion that faith could be brought into the heart by outward arrangements; — penetrated as he was with the conviction that man's conversion can only be a work of divine grace operating on the soul. Moreover, he never lost sight of the truth, that mere external communion with the church, which alone was capable of being forcibly brought about by means of fear and punishment, can make no one a member of the kingdom of God. But he maintained that man may nevertheless be prepared in various ways, by outward means, by suffering, for faith and conversion. He appealed to the highest example, that of God, who by suffering educates men, brings them to a consciousness of themselves, and conducts them to faith; — to the example of the parent who corrects the son for his profit. "Who doubts but what it is better to be led to God by instruction, than by fear of punishment or affliction? But because the former, who will be guided only by instruction, are better, the others are still not to be neglected. Show me the man who, in real faith and true consciousness, says with the whole strength of his soul: 'My soul thirsteth after God;'

[1] He demanded that even deeds of violence, which had been committed by furious Circumcellions on the clergy, should be punished, not according to the strictness of the laws, but according to the spirit of Christian gentleness; and if he could accomplish his end in no other way, he was determined himself to make application to the emperors. See Augustin. ep. 139 ad Marcellinum.

and I will allow that for such a person, not only the fear of temporal punishments or imperial laws, but even the fear of hell, is unnecessary: whatever separates him from his highest good, is punishment enough for him. But many, like bad servants, must often be reclaimed to their master by the rod of temporal suffering, ere they can attain to this highest stage of religious development." [1] We are shown here how seductive may be a comparison of two relations altogether differing in kind. Augustin forgot to inquire into the *natural limits of the civil power*, and of all outward human might, in conformity with what the sacredness of man's universal rights, grounded in God's creation, requires. He failed to consider that, owing to the natural limits fixed and determined by these universal rights of man, the government of a state can be compared, neither with the divine government of the world, nor even with the course of training to which the parent subjects his son in the years of his pupilage. What, according to this principle set up by Augustin, might not despotism hold to be allowable, for the sake of the pretended holy end, the general good; as soon as the question, which is the only one here, *What is right?* came once to be subordinated to the question, What is expedient and salutary?

Very justly Augustin observes: "The state is as far from being able, by punishment, to exert an influence on the moral disposition, as on inward piety. Goodness, too, comes only from free will." [2] But he wrongly infers from this, that, as the state is authorized and bound to restrain the outward sallies of wickedness by punishment, the same holds good also of the outward sallies of heresy or schism. Here again he compares things wholly differing in kind. Not everything that exhibits itself outwardly, becomes subject thereby to the jurisdiction of the state. Much evil reveals itself outwardly in actions, and nevertheless cannot on that account be brought under the jurisdiction of the state. This latter extends only to that evil which can be judged on principles of political law and equity, and which violates the outward order of the civil community. But with this, the individual or common expression and the individual or common profession of religious convictions, of whatever sort they may be, do not of themselves come in conflict. It might be agreeable to the spirit of Paganism, but it was in contradiction with the spirit of the gospel, to subject the individual or common expressions of religious faith to maxims of civil jurisprudence.

On these false premises Augustin goes on to affirm, from the principle that the state has no concern with the piety of its subjects, because this must spring solely out of free conviction, "that the state must here leave everything to the freedom of each individual; from this principle it would follow that the state must also leave full freedom to its subjects for every crime. Or ought murder, adultery, and all other crimes, to be punished, and sacrilege alone be left to go unpunished?" [3] He descended to the sophistic reasoning: "Divisions and sects are derived

[1] See c. Petilian. l. II. ep. 185 ad Bonifacium.

[2] C. lit. Petiliani, l. II. 184.

[3] C. Gaudent. Donatist. l. I. § 20. Puniantur homicidia, puniantur adulteria, puniantur cætera quantalibet sceleris sive libidinis facinora seu flagitia, sola sacrilegia volumus a regnantium legibus impunita.

by Paul, Gal. 5 : 19, like all other transgressions, from one and the same fountain of inward corruption, the flesh — hence classed in the same category. If, then, the state is not authorized to employ punishment against some fruits of the flesh, neither can it be authorized to employ it against others ; " — where he makes no account whatever of the consideration that the religious-moral point of view, from which Paul here regards the matter, is altogether different from the civil and judicial, from which alone the state can regard it.[1]

With good right, it is true, Augustin asserts, in opposition to the Donatists, that even kings are bound as Christians to serve their particular vocation in a Christian spirit; that as each must serve God in his own peculiar way, according to *his particular vocation*, so they, too, must serve God in a peculiar way in the fulfilment of the duties of their office.[2] But he erred only in deriving, from this correct position, consequences which he was in no way authorized to derive from it. The question arose, in the first place, in what does a government in the Christian sense consist; and how far does the province of kingly power, or of civil power generally, in human affairs, reach ? To make use of their power against heretics, cost the emperors no sacrifice of self-denial. On the contrary, it flattered the consciousness of the sovereign's rights; and he might believe that in this way, which was so easy for him, he could atone for many transgressions. But if he allowed himself to be actuated, in his whole conduct as emperor, by the spirit of Christian self-denial, he would assuredly have far better subserved the cause of Christianity than he could have served it by the demolition of every idol, which work Augustin so highly extols as the prerogative of imperial power.[3]

But we may allow that Augustin was perhaps authorized to avail himself, in defending the church, of a principle which at this time had already become universally predominant in church practice, and of which this theory of church rights already lay at the foundation. " Who," says Augustin, " will not give his approbation to the laws by which the emperors forbid sacrifices even on penalty of death ? Will not the Donatists themselves agree with us here ? " If they did so, it must be allowed that they were defeated by their own inconsistency.[4]

It was the case with Augustin here, as in many other instances, that, owing to his ignorance of the rules of a right interpretation of scripture,

[1] Augustin against the Donatists : Cum in veneficos vigorem legum exerceri juste fateantur; in hæreticos autem atque impias dissensiones nolint fateri, cum in iisdem iniquitatis fructibus auctoritate apostolica numerentur ? C. epist. Parmeniani, l I. § 16.

[2] C. lit. Petiliani, l. II. § 210. Habent reges excepta humani generis societate, eo ipso quo reges sunt, unde sic Domino serviant, quomodo non possunt, qui reges non sunt.

[3] Non enim auferenda idola de terra posset quisquam jubere privatus. Augustin. l. c.

[4] This inconsistency could not, perhaps, be laid to the charge of all the Donatists. In the passage referred to above against Parmenian, Augustin speaks doubtfully on this point: Quid istis videatur, ut crimen idololatriæ putent juste ab imperatoribus vindicari aut si nec hoc volunt, etc.; and he says here, that many Donatists would, in general, allow only of a vindicta spiritalis by excommunication in religious matters. On the other hand, ep. 93, directed to the Donatist Vincentius, he says, § 10: Quis vestrum non laudat leges ab imperatoribus datas adversus sacrificia Paganorum ?

he imagined he had found, in some detached and misapprehended passages of the Bible, a false theory, which, in his systematizing mind, he had framed to himself independently of holy writ; and thus by his means the wrong apprehension of such a passage of scripture was established as the classical foundation of an error that prevailed for centuries. Thus, in his exposition of the parable of the supper, Luke 14, paying no regard to the rule which requires that the point of comparison should be ascertained and held fast, and affixing too literal a sense to the word *αναγκάζειν*, v. 23, he supposed he found the theory expressed here that men were authorized and bound to employ force, and compel men to participate in the supper; — that is, to enter into communion with the universal visible church, out of whose pale salvation was not to be obtained. Thus he laid the foundation of the theory, "Coge," or "compelle intrare in ecclesiam." [1]

True, Augustin continually explains, that everything must flow from the temper of love; but of what use was this principle, in a theory which gave full sway to arbitrary will? How often was not the holy name of love abused by fanaticism and the love of power? It was by Augustin, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which, tempered though it was, in its practical application, by his own pious, philanthropic spirit, nevertheless contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the inquisition.

II. *The Meletian Schism in Egypt.*

The second schism which deserves notice in this period was the *Meletian*, which originated in Egypt. The causes which led to it were in many respects similar to those that gave occasion to the Novatian and to the Donatist schisms. In the very place where the spirit of peace and of love should have most prevailed, in the prison cells, where many bishops, companions of the same sufferings, were together, arose a dispute about the different principles of proceeding with those who had fallen away during the Dioclesian persecution. There existed among the prisoners a more rigid party, who maintained, on the same principle which Cyprian had once advocated under the persecution of Decius, that all who should have violated, in any way, their fidelity to the Christian faith, ought to be excluded from the fellowship of the church until the perfect restoration of peace; and that if, up to that time, they had manifested a spirit of sincere contrition, they should then first obtain forgiveness, according to the measure of their guilt. At the head of this more rigid party stood Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis in the Thebaid. The bishop of this city, being a metropolitan, possessed the highest rank next after the bishop of Alexandria, and frequently stood on the same level with him in administering the general concerns of the church.[2]

[1] Vid. ep. 93 ad Vincent. ep. 185 ad Bonifacium. Hi qui inveniuntur in viis et sepibus, id est, in hæresibus et schismatibus, *coguntur* intrare. In illis qui leniter primo adducti sunt, completa est prior obedientia: in istis autem qui coguntur, inobedientia coërcetur.

[2] Epiphan. hæres. Meletian. 68. *Τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον προήκων καὶ δευτερεύων τῷ Πέτρῳ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ὡς δι'*

Peter, bishop of Alexandria, on the other hand, who, as it seems, had, like Cyprian in the Decian persecution, for special reasons, withdrawn himself awhile from his community, agreed in his principles with the milder party. The pastoral letter on church penance, which, in the year 306, this bishop addressed to the Egyptian church, breathes a spirit of Christian love and wisdom.[1] He displayed in it a more correct appreciation of penitence as a moral duty, than generally prevailed; attaching more importance to the temper than to the external conduct, and judging with less severity those who, yielding solely to physical weakness, had been forced, by the anguish of torture, to a momentary denial of the faith, which they afterwards deeply regretted.[2] Many Christians had been mean enough to force their Christian slaves to offer, instead of themselves, under the delusive notion that God's tribunal could be deceived like a human one. The bishop Peter showed in this case his correct moral judgment, in treating the slaves with more lenity than the masters. Inasmuch as the former had been in a sense constrained by force and fear, their church penance was therefore to last only a year; and they were thus to learn, for the future, to do the will of Christ, and to fear only him. But the masters were to be subjected to three years of penance, as hypocrites, and because they had forced their fellow-servants to offer, not having learned from the apostle Paul that servants and masters have one Lord in heaven. "But if we all have one Lord, with whom there is no respect of persons, as Christ is all in all among Barbarians, Scythians, bond, and free, they should consider what they had done, when they would fain deliver their own souls, but compelled their fellow-servants to the worship of idols." His correct judgment was seen again in the severity which he showed to those of the clergy who, instead of caring solely for the salvation of the communities entrusted to them, and waiting, in their appointed sphere of labor, the will of the Lord, had, in the pride of fanaticism, abandoned their communities,[3] and voluntarily given themselves up to martyrdom, and then — what was frequently the punishment of fanatical presumption — shrunk back and denied in the immediate prospect of death.

Meletius, at a subsequent period, obtained his freedom; while those bishops who held other and milder principles of penitence, remained still in the prison. He exercised his authority as the second metropolitan in Egypt, during the absence of the bishop Peter, whom, being a confessor, he thought himself entitled, perhaps, to despise, on account of

ἀντιλήψεως αὐτοῦ χάριν. It is also highly probable, that the *sixth* canon of the Nicene council had its origin in this relation; and its object was to secure as incontestible, to the bishop of Alexandria, his general primacy over the entire Egyptian church, which was not to be encroached upon by the rank of the church of Lycopolis.

[1] This letter was received by the Greek church into the number of the letters incorporated into the ecclesiastical code of laws, under the title of *ἐπιστολαὶ κανονικαί*.

[2] *Προδιδόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς ἀσθενείας τῆς σάρκος*.

[3] Touching this point he says, c. 10: "So did no one of the apostles; for the apostle Paul, who had gone through many conflicts, and who knew that it was better to depart and be with Christ, added, 'Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.' Since he did not seek his own profit, but what would be for the good of many, that they should be saved, he held it to be more necessary than his own rest, to abide with the brethren and care for them."

his flight; he travelled through the whole diocese of the Alexandrian patriarch, within which, relying on the authority just described, he undertook to ordain, and to excommunicate, according to his own pleasure. He did not recognize the official power of those to whose charge, as *Periodeutæ*, or visitors, the bishop Peter of Alexandria had committed the destitute communities. Their different views respecting the proper mode of treating those who had fallen, or who had become suspected of denying God in some way or other, was here, too, probably made a subject of discussion, or at least used as a pretext; since the Meletians boasted of representing the pure church of the martyrs. Four Egyptian bishops, among the imprisoned confessors, declared themselves firmly against the arbitrary proceedings of Meletius, who, however, took no notice of this protestation. The bishop Peter of Alexandria issued a writing to the Alexandrian church, wherein he bade all to avoid fellowship with him, until the matter could be more closely investigated in connection with other bishops; and at length he excluded him — probably after his own return — from the functions of the episcopal office, and from the fellowship of his church, as a disturber of the peace of the communities.[1] Also, subsequently to the martyrdom of

[1] Among the sources which treat of the origin of the Meletian schism, there is found a good deal of contradiction. The first place among these sources is certainly due to the documents published by Maffei, from a manuscript of the chapter of the cathedral of Verona, (in the osservazioni letterarie, T. III. Verona, 1738,) which, therefore, we must make the point of departure in inquiring into these contradictions. First, a letter of four imprisoned confessors from Egypt, the bishops Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus, and Phileas, who subsequently died as martyrs, (according to Euseb. h. e. VIII. 13,) addressed to the bishop Meletius. In this letter it is urged against Meletius, whom still they call dilectus et comminister in Domino, that, in violation of the rights of foreign bishops, and particularly of Peter of Alexandria, he is reported to have undertaken to ordain in foreign dioceses; which, nevertheless, was altogether at variance with the ancient laws of the church. It is worthy of remark, that among the grounds of excuse here mentioned, to which Meletius might perhaps appeal, that borrowed from the difference in the principles of penitence is not cited at all, as if no dispute had as yet arisen on that point. Next follows the story, that, when Meletius had received this letter, he did not answer it, did not even repair to the bishops in prison, nor seek for the bishop Peter; but, after those bishops had already perished by martyrdom, that he came to Alexandria, and there entered into a combination with two restless men, who were anxious to obtrude themselves on the communities as teachers, of whom Arius was one, (see the section relating to doctrinal controversies.) These discovered to him two presbyters, nominated by Peter as church visitors, who had concealed themselves. The text now reads: Commendans eis occasionem Meletius separavit eos, (in the Greek probably *ἀφωρίζειν*.) The sense of the obscure passage is probably this: Meletius accused these presbyters of having shown inconstancy to the faith, or cowardice under the persecutions; he excluded them for a season from the fellowship of the church, or suspended them from their offices, recommending to them to improve the opportunity furnished them by the persecution, of restoring themselves to their good standing, by showing steadfastness in confessing the faith. He himself ordained two as presbyters, one of whom was in prison, and the other had been condemned to work in the mines, as a reward of their constancy.

From this narrative it is apparent, that the disputes which Meletius excited were, beyond all doubt, connected with his severe principles as to the proper mode of conduct during the persecutions; although no mention is made of this in the preceding letters. The *third* document is the letter of the bishop Peter to the Alexandrian community, in which he bids them, on account of the difficulties with Meletius, to hold no communion with him. With the account of the origin of the Meletian controversies which is to be gathered from these documents, the report of Epiphanius for the most part agrees. He represents the separation, which had its ground in the difference of views as to the principles of penance, to have taken place already in the prison. Of this the letters above cited do, indeed, say nothing. The zealous Meletian author whom Epiphanius makes use of, may per-

the bishop Peter, A.D. 311, and in the time of the bishop Alexander, under whom the Arian controversies broke out, this schism still continued to exist.

The council of Nice endeavored to get rid of this schism by milder regulations. The council directed that Meletius, since no confidence could be placed in his restless character, should reside, simply as a titular bishop, without active jurisdiction, at Lycopolis; and for the future refrain altogether from bestowing ordination, whether in the city or in the country. Yet the clergy who had been already ordained by him, should remain in possession of their offices, only taking rank after the others who had received ordination from the bishop of Alexandria. But if these should be removed by death, before them, then they might take their places, in case they should, by the vote of the communities, be found worthy; and this was confirmed by the bishop of Alexandria.[1] But the Meletian schism, which, moreover, found fresh sources of nour-

haps also have represented the affair in an exaggerated light; still it is quite possible that a dispute of this sort may have already occurred, although it had as yet led to no open rupture. The narrative, which is the second of those documents of Maffei, intimates this. According to Epiphanius, Meletius, when he left the common prison, had been condemned to labor in the mines. On his journey to the place of his punishment, he is represented as having undertaken to ordain according to his own pleasure. This story is perhaps false — perhaps it is a rumor which gradually arose and spread among the Meletian party in order to shield him against some evil suspicion. The documents of Maffei seem to presuppose, that Meletius had then obtained his entire freedom. What Epiphanius relates is, on the other hand, in accordance with the narrative of Maffei, that as the party of Peter had styled themselves the catholic church, so the party of Meletius styled itself the church of the martyrs; for it is clear, in fact, from that narrative, that Meletius was fond of making confessors ecclesiastics. In the church history of Socrates, I. 24, *one* account is especially deserving of notice, that while the bishop Peter, who afterwards died as a martyr, had taken refuge in flight, (*φεύγοντος διὰ τὸν τότε διωγμόν,*) Meletius usurped the right of ordaining in his diocese. If this account were correct, the origin of the schism would be still more clear. Meletius had, perhaps, remonstrated against his flight with Peter himself; and imagined himself to be the more warranted, on that account, to interfere with his authority. The narrative of Epiphanius does indeed conflict with this view; but anachronisms are no uncommon thing in this author. From the documents edited by Maffei, the absence of Peter from Alexandria at this time is clearly made out indeed, but not his imprisonment. The bishops who style themselves prisoners say nothing, however, of the imprisonment of Peter; neither does he mention it himself in his letter. Moreover, Eusebius, IX. 6, reports that under the persecution renewed by Maximinus, in 411, the bishop Peter was suddenly seized and beheaded, without making mention of any earlier imprisonment of his. On the contrary, from the last words of Peter, which, to be sure, in the Latin translation, in which they are preserved to us, sound somewhat obscure, it might be inferred, that he was in a state of freedom, and was intending soon to appoint an ecclesiastical trial in Alexandria itself: Ne ei communicetis, donec occurram illi cum sapientibus viris et videam quæ sunt, quæ cogitavit.

With these narratives, however, the story of Athanasius, Apolog. c. Arianos, § 59, (which Socrates follows,) in part conflicts; that the bishop Petrus (*Μελετίου*) *ἐπὶ πόλλοις ἐλεγχθέντα παρανομίαις καὶ ὑφυσίᾳ ἐν κοίνῃ συνόδῳ τῶν ἐπισκόπων καθεῖλεν.* As it concerns the *παρανομίαι*, this coincides with the reports above cited; for by them would of course be understood these very arbitrary ordinations. In respect to the second matter, however, the passionate opponents of the Meletians are not to be wholly believed. It might perhaps be, that this charge was conjured up at a later period, by enemies of Meletius. They inferred from the fact that Meletius had been released from the same imprisonment in which the others had experienced martyrdom, according to the same licentious mode of drawing conclusions we have already noticed, that he must have procured his freedom by consenting to offer. For the rest, this story of Athanasius, too, seems to go in favor of the supposition that the bishop Peter was still in a state of freedom, that he subsequently returned to Alexandria, and there convoked a synod against Meletius.

[1] See the letter of the Nicene council, in Socrates I. 9.

ishment amid the Arian disputes, continued to propagate itself till into the fifth century.

III. *Schism between Damasus and Ursinus, at Rome.*

In this schism, we observe the corrupting influence of worldly prosperity and abundance, and of the confusion of spiritual things with secular, on the spirit of the Roman church.[1] We see what a mighty interest of profane passions was already existing there. The particular occasion which led to the breaking-out of this schism, lay in the immediate circumstances of the times. The Roman bishop Liberius had, in 356, been deposed from his place, and sent into exile, by the emperor Constantius, because he would not consent to the condemnation of Athanasius.[2] The archdeacon Felix, who acceded to the emperor's wishes, was elevated to the place of Liberius. But, when the latter subsequently consented to subscribe a creed drawn up at Sirmium by the Arian party, Constantius permitted him, in the year 358, to return to Rome; and he was again at liberty to resume his bishopric. Meanwhile a distinct party had been formed in the church by a certain presbyter, named Eusebius; which party held their conventicle in a private house, and avoided all fellowship with those who were favored by the party at court.[3] Now this party refused to recognize Liberius as bishop, on account of his recantation, and hence continued to hold their separate assemblies. Felix was banished; and he is reported, at least by the enemies of Liberius,[4] to have subsequently repented of his transition to Arianism, and, for this reason, to have led a life of penance at the villa to which he had withdrawn himself. The meetings of the Eusebian party were forcibly broken up; Eusebius was kept confined in a room of his own house, where the meetings had been held.

In this ferment of the Roman communities, schisms might easily be occasioned by the new election of a bishop in the place of Liberius, after his death, in 366. The real course which matters took, as we have two opposite reports, which proceed from the opposite parties, cannot be certainly traced. According to the account of one party, Damasus was, in the first place, regularly chosen and ordained bishop; but, afterwards, a deacon, Ursinus or Ursicinus, who had aspired to the episcopal dignity, with his party, took possession of the church, which was called after its builder, or the presbyter who conducted divine worship in it, the *church of Sicininus*;[5] and caused himself here to be ordained bishop.[6] According to the other report,[7] the party which had always continued to be faithfully devoted to the bishop Liberius, immediately after his death made choice of Ursicinus. But Damasus, who

[1] As Ammianus Marcellinus very justly remarks on occasion of this controversy, l. 27, c. 3.

[2] See below, under the head of doctrinal controversies.

[3] See the history of the sufferings of this Eusebius, which, it must be allowed, as it comes from an enthusiastic admirer, is not entitled to full belief. Published by Baluz, Miscellan. l. II. pag. 141.

[4] See vita Eusebii, l. c.

[5] Basilica Sicinini.

[6] See the accounts in the chronicle of Jerome, in Socrates and Sozomen.

[7] The introduction to the petition of Marcellinus and of Faustinus, two presbyters belonging to the party of Ursicinus, and of Lucifer of Calaris, to the emperors Theodosius and Arcadius. Published by Sirmond. opp. T. I.

belonged to those who, during the banishment of Liberius, had attached themselves to Felix, and who had ever aspired after the episcopate, was nominated bishop by the party of Felix. Thus it cannot be determined which one of the two competitors had the principal share in the disturbances and deeds of violence. Although the truth is, that, whenever any matter became an object of zealous contention among the lower classes of the passionate and restless Roman people, many things might be done which the heads of both parties would gladly have avoided; yet it is most probable that neither of the two, in this case, could be wholly exempted from blame. Damasus appears, moreover, on other occasions, to have been a proud man.[1] Bishops, who should be ministers of peace, and surrender up everything, sooner than allow any strife to go on for their own honor, suffered the matter to take such a course, that a bloody struggle must decide the question, which of the two was the regular bishop. On one day there were found, in the church occupied by Ursicinus, which was stormed by the party of Damasus, the dead bodies of a hundred and thirty-seven men.[2] Damasus at last conquered, and Ursicinus was banished. But the division continued to exist longer; and, moreover, other foreign bishops were drawn into it. To suppress this schism, and the quarrels that grew out of it, the emperor Gratian issued, in the year 378 or 381, the law which we have noticed already in a cursory manner, and to which he was moved by the petition of a Roman council. By this law, he conferred on the Roman bishop the right of deciding, in the last instance, on the affairs of the bishops who were implicated in this schism;[3] providing, however, that they should not encroach, by so doing, on the authority of the metropolitans in the provinces.

Remark. — The schisms of Lucifer of Calaris and of Meletius of Antioch, on account of the intimate connection in which they stand with the history of doctrinal controversies, are reserved for the fourth section.

[1] See Basil. Cæsar, ep. 239, § 2.
[2] Ammian. Marcellin. l. 27, c. 3.
[3] By this schism, occasion was given for the law, although its expressions are general.

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

I. Christian Life.

1. *Its General Character in this Period.*

From the changes which, in the preceding sections, we saw taking place in the relations and circumstances of the church, it would be easy to form some probable conjecture as to what would be the new shaping of the whole Christian life in the present period. The vast numbers who, from external considerations, without any inward call, joined themselves to the Christian communities, served to introduce into the church all the corruptions of the heathen world. Pagan vices, pagan delusions, pagan superstition, took the garb and name of Christianity, and were thus enabled to exert a more corrupting influence on the Christian life. Such were those who, without any real interest whatever in the concerns of religion, living half in Paganism and half in an outward show of Christianity, composed the crowds that thronged the churches on the festivals of the Christians, and the theatres on the festivals of the Pagans.[1] Such were those who accounted themselves Christians, if they but attended church once or twice in a year;[2] while, without a thought of any higher life, they abandoned themselves to every species of worldly pursuit and pleasure. There were multitudes, especially in the large towns of the East, who, although no longer Pagans, and although they were denominated, in the most general sense of the word, believers, yet kept back, during the greatest part, or even the whole of their lives, from the communion of the church; and only when admonished by the actual or apprehended approach of death, in sudden attacks of sickness, in earthquakes, or the unforeseen calamities of war, took refuge in baptism. Others, who had received baptism, thought themselves religious enough, if they attended church on all the festivals — a practice denounced, therefore, by Chrysostom, as a mere form, wholly without influence on the inner life; — custom, but not piety.[3]

The greater the number of these nominal Christians, the more mischievous became the errors which made them feel secure in this outward Christianity, which confirmed them in the delusive notion that they could live in sin, and yet obtain salvation. Of this kind were those many corruptions of purely Christian ideas which we have already had occasion to notice in the preceding period; — false notions of what

[1] Augustin. de catechizandis rudib. § 48. Illæ turbæ implent ecclesias per dies festos Christianorum, quæ implent theatra per dies solennes Paganorum.

[2] Ἅπαξ ἢ δεύτερον μόλις τοῦ παντός ἐνιαυτοῦ. Chrysostom. in baptism. Christi T. V. f. 523. Savil.

[3] Συνήθειας ἐστιν, οὐκ εὐλάβειας. In Annam, H. V. T. V. f. 73.

constitutes faith; the confounding of the inward thing with the outward sign; that reliance on externals in religion, which grew out of this very habit of overlooking what belongs to faith and to the life of faith, and of confounding the divine realities which faith apprehends, with the outward, earthly forms which were designed merely to symbolize them. To sum up the whole here at once, — which it will be our object afterwards to explain more fully in detail, — the mischief presents itself in the delusive persuasion that any man, no matter what his life, could make sure of being delivered from divine punishment, and introduced into the community of the blessed, by the charm of outward baptism; which mistaken confidence in the magical cleansing and atoning efficacy of baptism encouraged numbers to persevere to the last in the indulgence of their lusts, hoping to avail themselves of this as a final remedy. It presents itself again in the delusive persuasion respecting the sanctifying effects of the communion, even when received without suitable preparation, and only on the principal festivals; in the delusive persuasion respecting the merit of an outward attendance on church, of pilgrimages to certain spots consecrated by religious remembrances, of donations to churches, of alms-giving, especially to ecclesiastics and monks, — no respect being paid to the manner in which what was thus bestowed had been acquired, nor to the disposition with which it was given. Instead of bearing the cross in their hearts, men relied on the magical power of the outward sign. Instead of soberly carrying out the doctrines of the gospel in their lives, they folded up the scroll on which it was written, to wear about the neck as an amulet.[1]

Mischievous was the influence resulting from the doctrinal controversies, inasmuch as they were conducted with an inconsiderate zeal; inasmuch as the leaders of the contending parties sacrified everything else to the one interest of a formal, orthodox theory; inasmuch as the attention of men was directed away from the true essence and from the demands of practical Christianity. Mischievous was the influence, also, of the unevangelical notion, which continually gained ground, of a distinct outward priesthood, confined to a single class of men, — whereby the original idea of the priestly character belonging in common to all Christians, ever became more completely obscured and suppressed. That which should be the concern of all Christians, and which should be required of them all, as spiritually-minded men, was supposed to belong exclusively to the spiritual order and to monks; and whoever was exhorted to lead a more sober and holy life, was ever ready to reply: "I am of the world; and secular men, if they are believers, if they abide in the communion of the church, and do not lead an extremely vicious life, will doubtless reach heaven; though they may not attain to those higher seats which are reserved for the saints. I have not left

[1] Jerome, after having spoken of the Pharisees: Hæc in corde portanda sunt, non in corpore. Hoc apud nos superstitiosæ mulierculæ in parvulis evangeliis et in crucis ligno et istiusmodi rebus usque hodie factitant. In c. 23, Matth. l. IV. ed. Martianay, IV. fol. 109. Chrysostom, ad pop. Antiochen. H. 19, § 4, T. II. ed. Montfaucon, f. 197. Αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ τὰ μικρὰ παιδία ἀντὶ φυλακῆς μεγάλης εὐαγγέλια ἐξαρτῶσι τοῦ τραχήλου.

the world. I am no clergyman, no monk. Of such alone these loftier virtues can be required."

At the same time, however, it would be wrong to judge, from the great mass of nominal Christians, the character of the whole church. The many examples of individual church-teachers, who were truly penetrated with the gospel spirit, and earnestly labored to promote it, may rightly be considered as testifying to what was within the church itself; for, without the Christian spirit under which they had been trained and educated, they assuredly never could have become what they were. So, too, in many of the appearances of Monasticism, notwithstanding all its aberrations, there was still expressed a warm Christian spirit, which must have come originally from the church.

It was natural, however, that the *bad element, which had outwardly assumed the Christian garb*, should push itself more prominently to notice in public life. Hence it was more sure to attract the common gaze, while the genuinely Christian temper loved retirement, and created less sensation; except in those cases, which were not unfrequent in this period, where opposition elicited the hidden Christian life, and made it appear brighter in the conflict. "Watch the oil-press," said Augustin to those who saw nothing but the evil swimming on the surface; "watch it a little more narrowly, and do not look at the scum alone that floats on the top. Only seek, and you will find something."[1]

At the present time, the relation of *vital Christianity* to the *Christianity of mere form* resembled that which, in the preceding period, existed between the Christianity of those to whom religion was a serious concern, and Paganism, which constituted the prevailing rule of life. As, in the earlier times, the life of genuine Christians had stood out in strong contrast with the life of the pagan world; so now the life of such as were Christians not merely by outward profession, but also in the temper of their hearts, presented a strong contrast with the careless and abandoned life of the ordinary nominal Christians. By these latter, the others, to whom Christianity was a serious concern, and who placed it neither in a formal orthodoxy, nor in a round of outward ceremonies, were regarded in the same light as, in the earlier times, the Christians had been regarded by the Pagans. They also were reproached by these nominal Christians, just as the Christians generally had been taunted before by the Pagans, with *seeking to be righteous overmuch*. Such is the picture which Augustin has drawn from the life of these times. "As the Pagan who would be a Christian, hears rude words from the Pagans; so he, among the Christians, who would live a better and more conscientious life, hears himself abused by the Christians themselves. He who would be sober among the intemperate, chaste among the incontinent; he who would honestly serve God among those who consult astrologers; he who would go nowhere but to church among those who flock to the silly shows, must hear rude language from Christians themselves, who will say: 'You are really a very great and righteous man, a second Elijah or Peter; — you must have descended

[1] Enarrat. ψ. 80, § 1.

from heaven.'"[1] In another place, he says:[2] "As soon as a man begins to live for God, to despise the world, to abstain from revenging injuries, from seeking after riches, or any earthly goods; to look down upon all these things, and to think of nothing but God, and to walk faithfully in the way of Christ, — not only the Pagans say of him, 'He is mad;' but what should give us greater concern, because it shows that, even in the church, many sleep and will not be awakened, he must expect to hear Christians themselves remark: 'What is the man about? What can have entered into his head?'"[3] Such individuals of the laity as were distinguished by their piety from the great mass of nominal Christians, and from the worldly-minded members of the clergy, often excited the jealousy of these latter, and had to suffer their persecutions.[4] Such examples were too troublesome; — they were too severe censors of morals.

We have already observed, in describing the spread of Christianity, where we adduced the testimony of Pagans themselves, as unimpeachable evidence of the fact, that pious Christian females, presenting patterns of genuine wives and mothers, often furnished a beautiful contrast to the prevailing depravation of manners and reckless pursuit of earthly things, to be found in the families of Pagans, or of mere nominal Christians. From such wives and mothers, the true religious instruction of the husband, or at least the pious education of the children, often proceeded. By them, the first seeds of Christianity were planted in the souls of those who afterwards produced great effects as teachers of the church. The pious Nonna, by her prayers and the silent influence of the religion which shone through her life, gradually won over to the gospel her husband Gregory, who had belonged to an unchristian sect, and he became a devoted bishop. Their first-born son, whom they had long yearned after, was carried, soon after his birth, to the altar of the church, where they placed a volume of the gospels in his hands, and dedicated him to the service of the Lord. The example of a pious education, and this early consecration, first received from his mother, of which he was often reminded, made a deep impression on the son; and he compares his mother with Anna, who consecrated Samuel to God. This impression abode upon him, while exposed, during the years of his youth, which he spent at Athens, to the contagion of the Paganism which there prevailed. This son, the distinguished church-teacher Gregory of Nazianzum, says of his mother, that her emotions, when dwelling on the historical facts connected with her faith, overcame all sense of pain from her own sufferings: hence, on festival days, she was never known to be sorrowful, and death surprised her while praying before the altar.[5] The pious Anthusa of Antioch retired

[1] In ψ. 90, T. I. § 4.
[2] In ψ. 48, T. II. § 4.
[3] In ψ. 48, T. II. § 4.
[4] So says Jerome: Vere nunc est cernere, in plerisque urbibus episcopos sive presbyteros, si laicos viderint hospitales, amatores bonorum, invidere, fremere, quasi non liceat facere quod episcopus non faciat, et tales esse laicos damnatio sacerdotum sit. Graves itaque eos habent, et quasi cervicibus suis impositos; ut a bono abducant opere, variis persecutionibus inquietant. In ep. ad Tit. c. 1. T. IV. f. 417.
[5] Gregor. Nazianz. orat. 19, f. 292, and the epigrams of Gregory Nazianzen, in Muratori anecdota Græca Patav. 1709, pag. 92.

from the bustle of the great world, to which she belonged by her condition, into the still retreat of domestic life. Having lost her husband at the age of twenty, from regard to his memory, and a desire to devote herself wholly to the education of her son, she chose to remain a widow; and it was owing in part to this early, pious, and careful education, that the boy became afterwards so well known as the great church-teacher, John Chrysostom. Similar was the influence exerted on the education of her son, by the mother of Theodoret. In like manner, Monica, by her submissive, amiable, and gentle spirit, softened the temper of a violently passionate husband; and, while she had much to suffer from him, scattered the seeds of Christianity in the young soul of her son Augustin, which, after many stormy passages of life, brought forth their fruit in him abundantly. To make their children early acquainted with the holy scriptures, was considered, by such mothers, as a task which belonged peculiarly to them.[1]

2. *Ascetic Tendency, and the Monastic Life which proceeded from it.*

In the preceding period, we saw that the tendency to ascetism was promoted, in the more earnest Christian minds, by the opposition to the *pagan* depravation of manners. Now, as it was the case in the present period, that, owing to the great multitude who outwardly professed Christianity, especially in the large cities, this depravation obtruded itself on these more earnest souls, even under the external forms of Christianity; and as within the outward church itself so marked a contrast had arisen between those who were Christians in spirit and disposition, and those whose Christianity consisted only in profession and ceremonial performances, the necessary consequence was, that, by pushing this opposition, apprehended in too outward a manner, to an undue extreme, this ascetic separation from the world was carried to a still greater extent; as indeed it is quite evident that the first appearances of this sort manifested themselves in the vicinity of large cities, which were seats of corruption.

In the preceding period, the ascetics were accustomed to live singly, each according to his own inclination, without any specific form of union, within the precincts of the church to which he belonged. In Egypt it was customary for the ascetics to settle down singly in the country, at no great distance from some village, where they supported themselves by the labor of their own hands, and devoted the surplus to charitable purposes.[2] It was first in this present period, when the previously ex-

[1] Daughters also were early made familiar with such portions of the holy scriptures as were deemed to be especially suited to the capacity of childhood. They were taught to commit Psalms to memory. See Gregor. Nysseni vita Macrinæ opp. tom. II. f. 179. What was generally supposed to constitute the pattern of a Christian woman, may be seen from the description which Nilus gives of Peristera: constant study of the holy scriptures, (*μελέτη τῶν θείων λογίων ἀηνεκής,*) fervent prayer proceeding from a broken heart, liberal support of the poor; care for the burial of the dead, who were poor or strangers; active pity for all in distress, reverence for the pious, care for the monks, providing for their support to the satisfaction of all their bodily wants, so that they might devote themselves to their calling without disturbance. Vid. Nil. Perister. c. III.

[2] Athanas. vita S. Anton. *Ἕκαστος τῶν βουλομένων ἑαυτῷ προσέχειν, οὐ μακρὰν τῆς ἰδίας κώμης κατὰ μόνας ἠσκεῖτο.*

isting germs of all tendencies of life attained to a more settled and definite mode of growth, that the freer form of the ascetic life shaped itself into Monasticism — a phenomenon of great importance, as well on account of the influence which it had already, in this period, on the evolution of Christianity, and of the Christian and church life in the East; as on account of the vast influence which it had in later times on the culture of the Western nations.

As it is true of this whole ascetic tendency, that, although it might find some foothold in a partial and one-sided apprehension of Christianity, yet it cannot be regarded as a phenomenon peculiarly Christian; so is it also true that this particular product of the ascetic tendency cannot, in itself considered, be regarded as a phenomenon peculiar to Christianity, and springing simply out of the spirit of this religion. Something like it is in fact to be found in other religions, (as for example in Buddhaism;) and particularly in those countries of the East where Monasticism first developed itself, the way was already prepared for it in the circumstances of the climate, and in the prevailing habits of feeling, which were, in some measure, due to these circumstances. In Egypt, the birth place of Monasticism, something like it had, in fact, already appeared among the Jews, in the sect of the Therapeutæ; and in Palestine, where Monasticism early found its way, the Essenes, with many other societies of a similar kind, had preceded it. Monasticism, on the contrary, was at variance with the pure spirit of Christianity; inasmuch as it impelled men, instead of remaining as a salt to the corrupt world in which they lived, outwardly to withdraw from it, and to bury the talent which otherwise they might have used for the benefit of many. But though Monasticism was not a form of life that sprang originally and purely out of Christianity, yet there can be no doubt that by Christianity a new spirit was infused into this foreign mode of life, whereby with many it became ennobled, and converted into an instrument of effecting much which could not otherwise have been effected by any such mode of living.

In the fourth century, men were not agreed on the question, as to who was to be considered the founder of Monasticism, whether Paul or Anthony. If by this was to be understood the individual from whom the *spread* of this mode of life proceeded, the name was unquestionably due to the latter; for if Paul was the first Christian hermit, yet he must have remained unknown to the rest of the Christian world, and, without the influence of Anthony, would have found no followers.[1] Before Anthony, there may have been many who, by inclination or by peculiar outward circumstances, were led to adopt this mode of life; but they remained, at least, unknown. The first whom tradition — which, in this case, it must be confessed, is entitled to little confidence, and much distorted by fable — cites by name, is the above-mentioned Paul.[2] He is said to have been moved by the Decian persecution, which,

[1] Jerome, in his account of the life of Paul, says very justly of Anthony: Non tam ipse ante omnes fuit, quam ab eo omnium incitata sunt studia.

[2] Jerome himself speaks of the absurd fables which were circulated about Paul; but even his own biography of him is not free from them, and it gives no distinct picture of the man.

no doubt, raged with peculiar violence in his native land, the Thebaid in Upper Egypt, to withdraw himself, when a young man, to a grotto in a remote mountain. By degrees he became attached to the mode of life he had adopted at first out of necessity. Nourishment and clothing were supplied him by a palm tree that had sprung up near the grotto. Whether everything in this legend, or, if not everything, what part of it, is historically true, it is impossible to determine. According to the tradition, Anthony, of whom we shall presently give a more detailed account, having heard of Paul, visited him, and made him known to others. But as Athanasius, in his life of Anthony, is wholly silent as to this matter, which he certainly would have deemed an important circumstance, — though he states that Anthony visited all ascetics who were experienced in the spiritual life, — the story must be dismissed as unworthy of credit.

Anthony, whom we may regard, therefore, as the father of Monasticism, sprang from a respectable and wealthy family in the village of Coma, in the province of Heracleopolis (magna) a city of the Heptanome, bordering on the Thebaid.[1] He was born about the year 251. He received a simple, pious education, but no literary training; — a thing, indeed, hardly known in the old Coptic families, into which the influence of the Alexandrian Hellenism had not penetrated. *The Coptic language* was his vernacular tongue; he would have been obliged to learn the Greek in order to make himself master of the Greek culture; and as often happens with such men, in whom the contemplative bent of mind predominates, he had no disposition to learn a foreign language. He would have been under the necessity, moreover, of resorting to the school in which instruction in the Greek language was given; but, owing to the more serious, retiring disposition for which he was early distinguished, he avoided the society of noisy boys.[2] From the first, too, he took little interest in matters of worldly learning; but a deep religious feeling, and a craving after the intuition of divine things, were

[1] Sozom. l. I. c. 13.

[2] Athanasius says of him, in the account of his life, § 1: Γράμματα μάθειν οὐκ ἤνεσχέτο. We might take this to mean that Anthony did not learn how to read at all. Thus Augustin understood it, who, in the prologue to his work, de doctrina Christiana, § 4, says of Anthony, that without knowing how to read, he committed the Bible to memory by merely hearing it read. But this is inconsistent with what Athanasius says of him in the same paragraph. Τοῖς ἀναγνώσμασι προσέχων, τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὠφελείαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ διετήρει. This might, perhaps, still be understood as referring solely to those portions of scripture which he heard read in the church. But afterwards too, where he is speaking of Anthony's ascetic life, he says of him: Καὶ γὰρ προσεῖχεν οὕτως τῇ ἀναγνώσει. It would be possible, indeed, still to understand Athanasius, not as speaking in this passage of Anthony's private exercises, but only explaining why it was that to him the invitation of scripture, to pray without ceasing, was so constantly present; namely, because he had every thing which he had heard read from the scriptures, so deeply imprinted on his memory. If the passage is so explained, it might be understood here also as speaking simply of the public reading at church, and it would be unnecessary to suppose that Anthony knew how to read. This interpretation, however, is at any rate not the most simple. But even supposing that Anthony had first read the Bible himself in the Coptic translation, yet it follows, from the narrative of Athanasius, that at a later period he could dispense entirely with the written scripture, because its words were so deeply impressed on his memory as to be constantly present to him: Καὶ λοιπὸν αὐτῷ τὴν μνήμην ἀντὶ βιβλίων γίνεσθαι. Thus the statement of Augustin, and what we shall afterwards cite from a conversation between Anthony and a man of learning, may be reconciled with the above account.

the predominant characteristics of the youth as he grew up to maturity. He was a constant attendant at church, and what he read himself in the Bible, as well as what he heard read in the scripture lessons at church, became deeply imprinted on his soul: it was to him matter for spiritual nourishment, which he constantly carried with him, so that in his subsequent years he could wholly dispense with the written scriptures. Between his eighteenth and twentieth years he lost his parents; and on him alone devolved the care of a young sister, left with himself an orphan, and of all the affairs of the family. These cares may, perhaps, have proved irksome to him, unsuited to his peculiar temperament. Once, as he was walking in the church, — which, for the purpose of elevating his heart to God in silent devotion, he frequently visited, even at seasons when there was no service, — his imagination set vividly before him the contrast between a man perplexed with the care of earthly matters, and the primitive apostolical community, in which, as it was usually conceived, no one possessed any earthly property of his own. Occupied with such thoughts, he once attended a meeting of the church; and it so happened that the gospel concerning the rich young man was read before the assembly. Anthony considered those words of the Saviour to the rich young man, which he heard in this particular state of mind, as words particularly addressed from heaven to himself. And as the language was understood by him, in common with many of his time, in a sense which Clement of Alexandria had already shown to be incorrect (see Vol. I., Sect. II., p. 279,) as if it had reference, not to the inward disposition alone, but to the outward deed; he persuaded himself that he was thus called to make an outward renunciation of all his earthly goods and possessions. The considerable landed estates which belonged to him, he gave to the inhabitants of his village, under the condition that, for the future, they would trouble neither him nor his sister with demands for the payment of the public taxes and other claims of that kind.[1] He sold everything that was moveable, and distributed the avails to the poor, reserving only the smallest portion of it for his sister. While listening a second time, during divine service, to those words of our Lord which bid us take no care for the morrow, taking the language once more in too literal and outward a sense, and not according to the spirit and connection of the whole, he now gave away to the poor the small remainder of his property which he had reserved particularly for the maintenance of his sister, that he might free himself entirely from all cares about earthly things. He placed his sister to be educated with a society of pious virgins,[2] and, settling down near his paternal mansion, began a life of rigid asceticism. He heard of a venerable old man, who was living as an ascetic on the border of a neighboring village. He sought him out, and made him his pattern, fixing his own residence in the vicinity of the village; and, whenever he chanced to hear of approved ascetics living anywhere in those districts, he visited them, abode with them for a season, and then returned to his former place. He supported himself by the labor of his own hands, and distributed what he did not need for himself to the poor.

[1] Vita, § 2: Ἵνα εἰς μηδ' ὅτιουν ὀχληςώσιν αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῇ αδελφῇ. [2] Παρθενῶνι.

Anthony wanted a right conception of the Christian renunciation of property. He failed of the right conception of supreme love to God, which, instead of destroying man's natural feelings, would include them in itself, would refine, sanctify, and ennoble them. Starting with these wrong views, he struggled forcibly to suppress the thoughts and feelings of love which drew him to his sister and other members of his family. He wanted to forget everything that bound him to the earth; but nature claimed her rights: these feelings and thoughts would intrude upon him, in spite of himself, and disturb him in his meditations. In feelings which God himself planted in man's heart, he imagined that he saw a temptation of the adversary, when he should rather have perceived in his own self-will and presumption, which aspired to rise above the natural feelings of humanity, a perversion of the pure divine impulse, and a temptation of the ungodly spirit, which vitiated and disturbed in him the pure longing after holiness. Moreover, the lower impulses and energies of nature were excited to greater activity, the less they were employed. Hence, in his solitude, he had to endure many conflicts with sense, which in some active vocation, demanding the exertion of all his powers, might perhaps have been avoided. The temptations he had to battle with were so much the more numerous and powerful, as he was given to idle self-meditation, as he busied himself in fighting down the impure images that were constantly rising up from the abyss of corruption within his heart, instead of despising them, and forgetting himself in worthier employments, or in looking away to the everlasting source of purity and holiness. At a later period, Anthony, with a conviction grounded on long years of experience, acknowledged this, and said to his monks: "Let us not busy our imaginations in painting spectres of evil spirits; let us not trouble our minds as if we were lost. Let us rather be cheerful and comforted at all times, as those who have been redeemed; and let us be mindful, that the Lord is with us, who has conquered them and made them nothing. Let us ever remember that, if the Lord is with us, the enemy can do us no harm. The spirits of evil appear different to us, according to the different moods of mind in which they find us. If they find that we are weak-hearted and cowardly, they increase our fears by the frightful images they excite in us, and then the unhappy soul torments itself with these. But if they find us joyful in the Lord, occupied in the contemplation of future blessedness and of the things of the Lord, reflecting that everything is in the Lord's hand, and that no evil spirit can do any harm to the Christian, they turn away in confusion from the soul which they see preserved by such good thoughts."[1]

At that time he was for overcoming the evil spirits, in whom he beheld the enemies of his holy endeavors, by still stricter regimen of life. He betook himself to a certain grotto in the rock at some distance from the village, which served the purpose of a tomb (called in the East a mausoleum.) Here, as it is probable, by excessive fasting, and by exhaustion from his inward conflicts in this unnatural place of abode, he

[1] Athanas. vit. Anton. § 42.

brought himself into states of an over-excited imagination and nervous derangement, in which he fancied he had received bodily harm from the spirits of darkness. He fell at last into a swoon, and was conveyed back to the village in a state of unconsciousness. At a later period, he retired to a still more distant mountain, where he passed twenty years amidst the ruins of a dilapidated castle. After this, he yielded to the entreaties of those who desired to have him for their guide in the spiritual life. He gave himself up to the men who sought him out. Many joined themselves to him, and, under his guidance, trained themselves to the abstemious life of hermits. The deserts of Egypt became filled with the cells of these eremites. Many flocked to him, from different countries, partly to see the wonderful man, partly for advice and consolation, and to obtain the cure of diseases (particularly of those fits which men were in the custom of tracing to the influence of malignant spirits) by the virtue of his prayers. Parties in strife submitted their matters of dispute to his arbitration. He exhorted all to sacrifice everything to the love of Christ; striving to make them feel the love of God, who spared not his only-begotten Son, but gave him up for all.

To escape the wonder of the multitude, and deliver himself from the throng of men, of all conditions, that disturbed him in his prayers and meditations, Anthony betook himself to a more distant solitude among the mountains. Certain Nomadic Saracens, who wandered over this district, were seized with reverence at the impression of his appearance, and brought him bread. This, together with the fruit of some date trees which he found on the spot, sufficed for his nourishment. But as soon as the monks whom he had left behind him, discovered the place of his retreat, they provided him with bread. Yet Anthony was resolved to save them this labor. He procured some implements of agriculture, sought out a spot, near the mountain, capable of tillage, and well watered, and sowed it with grain, from which he harvested what sufficed for his support. As he was afterwards visited here, too, by strangers, he raised a supply of vegetables, that he might have wherewith to refresh those who had made the long and wearisome journey to find him. He wove baskets, and exchanged these for such articles of nourishment as were brought to him.

He could easily acquire the fame of being a worker of miracles; since many, particularly of those who were thought to be possessed of evil spirits, were indebted to his prayers, and to the impression of tranquillity and peace which went forth from him, for the soothing of the tumultuous powers which had agitated their inner being. But he pointed those who applied to him for help, or had been indebted to him for it, away from himself to God and Christ. Thus, to a military officer who applied to him for the healing of his daughter, he said: "I also am a man, like thyself. If thou believest in the Christ whom I serve, only depart, and pray to God in thy faith, and it shall be done."[1] Usually, he exhorted the suffering to patience. They were to know that the power of healing belonged neither to him, nor to any other man, but was the work of God alone, who wrought it when and for

[1] Vit. Anton. § 48.

whom he pleased. Thus those who left him without having obtained the bodily relief they expected, learned from him a lesson more valuable than any deliverance from bodily ills, — submission to the divine will.[1] He exhorted his monks not to attribute too great worth to miraculous gifts and wonderful cures; and not to estimate, by these, the degree of progress in the Christian life, but to esteem holiness of living still higher. "To do wonders," he told them, "is not our work, but the Saviour's. Hence he said to his disciples: 'Rejoice not that the spirits are subject to you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven:' for that our names are written in heaven is a witness of our virtue, and of our life; but to expel evil spirits is the grace of the Saviour, which he has bestowed on us."[2]

It was only on extraordinary occasions, that Anthony made his appearance at Alexandria; and then his appearance always produced a great effect. Thus it was, when, in the year 311, the emperor Maximin renewed the persecution in Egypt. True, Anthony did not think it proper to give himself up as a victim; but neither did he fear danger, in firing the courage of other Christians to unwavering confession, in manifesting love to the confessors in the prisons and the mines. His example and his words did so much, that, to hinder them, the governor issued a command for all monks to leave the city. Other monks, who, on this occasion, had also come into the city, concealed themselves; but Anthony appeared in public, yet no one dared to touch him.

A second time, in the year 352, when he was a hundred years old, he made his appearance in Alexandria, to counteract the spread of Arianism, which was then supported there by the power of the state. His appearance made, at that time, so great a sensation, that Pagans themselves, and even their priests, came to church, for the purpose of seeing the man of God, as they themselves called him.[3] People belonging to the pagan ranks pressed forward with the rest, to touch the garments of Anthony, in hopes of being healed, if they could only do that. It is said more Pagans were converted to Christianity during the few days of his residence in Alexandria, than during a year at other times.

Many sayings of this remarkable man, which have come down through the oral tradition of his disciples, lead us, indeed, to recognize in him a great soul. The favor of princes, by which so many, in other respects distinguished men of the church, have still allowed themselves to be corrupted, could not touch the mind of Anthony. When the emperor Constantine and his sons wrote to him as their spiritual father, and begged of him an answer, it made no impression on him. He said to his monks: "Wonder not that the emperor writes to us, for he is a man; but wonder much rather at this, that God has writ-

[1] L. c. § 56.
[2] L. c. § 38.
[3] What Athanasius relates, § 70, is confirmed by the reverence which a Synesius, while yet a Pagan, shows towards Anthony. He names him among the rarer men, who, by virtue of their greatness of mind, could dispense with scholastic culture; whose flashes of spirit might serve instead of syllogisms; and places him by the side of Hermes and Zoroaster. In his Dion. ed. Petav. f. 51.

ten his law for men, and spoken to them by his own Son." At first it was with some difficulty he could be prevailed on to receive the letter, since he knew not how to answer a letter of that sort. But when the other monks represented to him that they were Christian princes, and that they might look upon his neglect as a mark of contempt, and thereby take offence, he allowed the letter to be read. In his answer, he first congratulated them that they were Christians, and next told them what he considered would be most conducive to their welfare; that they ought not to look upon their earthly power and glory as a great thing, but rather to think of the future judgment; that they ought to know that Christ is the only true and eternal King. He exhorted them to philanthropy, to justice, and to care for the poor.[1]

Once there came to him a learned man of the Pagans, and made merry with him, because he could not read. He asked him how he could endure to live without books. Anthony thereupon asked him which was first, "spirit or letter." The learned man replied: "Spirit is the first." "Well," said Anthony, "the healthy spirit, then, needs not letters. My book is the whole creation: this book lies open there before me, and I can read in it when I please, — the word of God."[2] When others were ridiculing the faith of the Christians, Anthony asked them which, from the very nature of the case, went first in the knowledge of all things, and especially in the knowledge of God, and which gave the more assured conviction, "the conclusions of reason, or the faith which comes from immediate contact."[3] When they said, the last, he rejoined: "You are right; for faith proceeds from a state of the soul, (a certain determination of the whole inner life.)[4] What *we know* by faith, that *you seek to prove* by argument; and oftentimes you cannot even express that which we behold in the spirit."

Anthony, who, in the early years of his monastic life, had tormented himself so much with temptations, and been able to find no rest in constant self-contemplation, observed afterwards, from his own experience: "This is man's great work, to take his guilt upon himself before God, and expect temptations till his latest breath. Without temptation no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven." To an abbot, who asked him what he ought to do, he replied: "Trust not in your own righteousness, and regret not what is already past."[5]

Severe to himself, Anthony was mild to all others. A monk, for some offence, had been expelled from his cloister, and his brethren were unwilling to receive him back. Anthony, sent him back again to his cloister, with these words to the monks: "A ship stranded, lost her cargo, and was with difficulty drawn to the shore; but ye are for sink-

[1] L. c. § 31.

[2] Vit. Anton. § 73. Socrates hist. eccles. IV. 23. Perhaps this story was floating before the mind of Synesius, and he merely confounded Ammun with Anthony, when he said of the former: Οὐκ ἐξεῦρεν, ἀλλ' ἐκρίνε χρείαν γραμμάτων, τοσοῦτον αὐτῷ τοῦ νοῦ περίην, f. 48.

[3] Ἡ δί ἐνεργείας πίστις.

[4] Ἡ μὲν γὰρ πίστις ἀπο διαθέσεως ψυχῆς γίνεται.

[5] He would probably say, men should not spend so much time in reflecting on their sins, instead of getting free from themselves, and striving continually forward in the work of holiness. (See Apophthegm. patr. § IV. Coteler. monument. eccles. Græc. T. I.)

ing again at sea what has been safely brought into harbor."[1] To Didymus, the learned superintendent of the catechetical school at Alexandria, who, from his youth up, was blind, he said, on meeting with him during his last residence in Alexandria: "Let it not trouble you that you are in want of eyes, with which even flies and gnats can see; but rejoice that you have the eyes with which angels see, by which, too, God is beheld, and his light received."[2] At the age of a hundred and five years, feeling the approach of death, and, with entire consciousness, calmly and cheerfully awaiting the end of his earthly career, he was solicitous that the exaggerated reverence of the Egyptians towards him should not convert his remains into an object of superstition. It was their custom, after the ancient manner, to embalm the bodies, especially of those who were venerated as saints, as mummies, take them into their houses, and place them there on small couches. The superstitious veneration of reliques might here easily find a foothold. To guard against this, Anthony urgently recommended to his monks to keep the place of his burial concealed, lest his body might be dug up by others, and preserved in the manner above described; for he wished not to be more highly honored than the patriarchs, and Christ himself, who had all been buried.

Anthony gave to his age a pattern, which was seized with love and enthusiasm by many hearts that longed after Christian perfection, and which excited many to emulate it. Disciples of Anthony, belonging to Greek and to old Egyptian families, spread Monachism throughout every part of Egypt; and the deserts of this country, to the borders of Lybia, were sprinkled with numerous monkish societies and monkish cells. From hence Monachism spread to Palestine and Syria, where the climate was most favorable to such a mode of life, and where, too, even at an earlier period, — among the Jews,[3] — much that was analogous had already existed. Anthony, indeed, was visited, not only by monks belonging to Egypt, but also by monks from Jerusalem.[4] The person who most contributed to the promotion of Monachism in Palestine was Hilarion. Born in the village of Thabatha, or Thanatha, in Palestine, four miles south of Gaza, he resided, while a youth, for the purpose of study, at Alexandria, when the fame of Anthony moved him to seek out the great anachoret; and, after having spent several months in Anthony's society, he returned to his native country, with the intention of pursuing there the same mode of life.[5] Anthony, *without any conscious design of his own*, had become the founder of a new mode of living in common; for it had, in truth, happened, of its

[1] L. c. § 21.

[2] Socrat. l. c.

[3] We might refer here to the example of the Essenes, of a Banus. Joseph. de vita sua, § 2. At this time Nilus speaks of Jewish monks, in the Tractatus ad Magnam, c. 39, opuscula, Romæ, 1673, f. 279. Ἰουδαίων τινὲς μὴ ἀπαιτούμενοι ἀκτημοσύνην παρὰ τοῦ νόμου, ἑκουσίως ταύτην ἠσπάσαντο, ἐν σκήναις κατοικήσαντες. It may be, as Nilus seems to suppose, that this was at that time a new appearance among them, and perhaps had arisen from an emulation of the Christian monks; but may also have been a mode of life which had come down from ancient times, and which was incorrectly thought to be something new.

[4] See Palladii Lausiaca, c. 26, biblioth. patrum parisiensis, T. XIII. f. 939.

[5] Hieronymi vita Hilarionis. Sozomen. III. 14.

accord, without any special efforts of his, that persons of similar disposition had attached themselves to him, and, building their cells around his, made him their spiritual guide and governor. Thus arose the first societies of Anachorets, who lived scattered, in single cells or huts, united together under one superior. But, independent of Anthony, an individual made his appearance in Egypt, who brought together the monks in one large connected building, and gave to the entire monastic life a more regular and systematic shaping. This was Pachomius, the founder of the cloister life. The societies of the Anachorets, who lived in a certain union with each other in single cells, were called Λαῦραι, (lauræ ;) a term which, derived from the ancient Greek adjective λαῦρος, denoted properly a large open place, a street; the connected buildings, in which monks dwelt together, under a common superior, were called κοινόβια, (cœnobia,) μοναστήρια, (monasteria,) φροντιστήρια.[1] Pachomius, at the beginning of the fourth century, when a young man, after having obtained his release from the military service, into which he had been forced, attached himself to an aged hermit, with whom he passed twelve years of his life. Here he felt the impulse of Christian love, which taught him that he ought not to live merely so as to promote his own growth to perfection, but to seek also the salvation of his brethren. He supposed — unless this is a decoration of the legend — that, in a vision, he heard the voice of an angel giving utterance to the call in his own breast, — it was the divine will that he should be an instrument for the good of his brethren, by reconciling them to God.[2] On Tabennæ, an island of the Nile, in Upper Egypt, betwixt the Nomes of Tenthyra and Thebes, he founded a society of monks, which, during the lifetime of Pachomius himself, numbered three thousand, and afterwards seven thousand members ; and thus went on increasing, until, in the first half of the fifth century, it could reckon within its rules fifty thousand monks.[3] This whole association was called a κοινόβιον, cœnobium, — a term which, originally designating the entire whole of a monkish society, although distributed through several buildings, was afterwards transferred to single cloisters ; of which, too, it was usually the case that each one embraced a distinct society. The entire body of monks stood under the guidance of Pachomius ; and afterwards his successors, the abbots of the cloister in which the institution had its origin, continued to be the heads of the whole order.[4] He was regarded as the superior of the whole cœnobium, the abbot or abbas-general,

[1] Thus Evagrius, hist. eccles. l. I. c. 21, distinguishes φροντιστήρια καὶ τὰς καλουμένας λαύρας: and in the life of the abbot Sabas, which Cyril of Scythopolis composed, we find a distinction made between λαῦραι and κοινόβια, § 58, in Coteler. ecclesiæ Græcæ monumenta, T. III. The name μοναστήρια appears here as uniting the meaning of both. Anthony himself, in the ancient life of Pachomius, § 77, names the latter as the founder of the more closely connected societies of monks: Κατὰ τὴν ἀρχην, ὁτε μοναχὸς γέγονα, οὐκ ἦν κοινόβιον, ἀλλ' ἑκάστος τῶν ἀρχαίων μοναχῶν μετὰ τὸν διώγμον κατὰ μονὰς ἠσκεῖτο, καὶ μετὰ ταύτα ὁ πάτηρ ἡμῶν ἐποιήσε τούτο τὸ ἀγάθον παρὰ κυρίου. Even before Pachomius, a person by the name of Aotas (Ἀῶτας) made an attempt, but without success, to found some similar institution. Acta Sanctorum mens. Maj. T. III. in the Appendix, § 77.

[2] Vit. Pachom. § 15.

[3] Pallad. Lausiaca, c. VI. l. c. 909, also c. 38, f. 957. Hieronymi præfat. in regulam Pachomii, § 7.

[4] The first example of a like rule, which was introduced into the later congregations and orders of monks.

(the Hebrew and Syriac word for father;) or, as he was styled in Greek, the *archimandrite*;[1] and, at certain seasons, he made visitations to the several cloisters. The entire monkish society was distributed, according to the various degrees of progress which its members had attained in the spiritual life, into several classes, twenty-four in all, after the number of letters in the alphabet; and each of these classes had its own presiding officer, as to each also was assigned its particular labors. They employed themselves in the ordinary monkish avocations; such as weaving baskets, for which they made use of the rushes of the Nile, fabricating mats or coverings, (ψίαθοι,) not neglecting, however, other kinds of business, such as agriculture, and ship-building. At the end of the fourth century, each cloister possessed a vessel of its own, built by the monks themselves. Palladius, who visited the Egyptian cloisters about this time, found, in the cloister of Panopolis, — which also belonged to this association of monks, and contained within it three hundred members, — fifteen tailors, seven smiths, four carpenters, twelve-camel drivers, and fifteen tanners.[2] Each cloister had its *steward*, (οἰκονόμος,) who provided for the bodily wants of all, and with whom the fabrics, when finished, were deposited; and all these stewards were placed under a general steward of the whole association, (the μέγας οἰκονόμος,) who was stationed at the principal cloister. The latter had the oversight of the income and expenditure of the entire cœnobium; to him were given over all the products of monkish labor. He shipped them to Alexandria, where they were sold, to provide means for purchasing such stores as the cloisters needed; and whatever remained, after these wants were supplied, was distributed among the poor, the sick, and the decrepit, of this populous, though impoverished country. A part also was sent to the prisons.[3] Twice in the year, on the feast of Easter, and in the month *Mesori*, (about the season of our August,) all the superiors of the single cloisters met together in the principal cloister. At the last meeting, they brought in reports of the administration of their office. It was at this time, the reconciliation of all with God and with each other was celebrated.[4]

No person who wished to be taken into the society of the monks was admitted at once; but he was first asked, whether he had not committed a crime, and was not seeking refuge, among the monks, from civil penalties; whether he was his own master, and therefore warranted to decide on his mode of life; whether he deemed himself capable of renouncing his property, and everything he called his own. He must, in the next place, submit to a period of probation, before he could be received into the number of regular monks.[5] He was adopted, on pledging himself to live according to the monastic rules.[6] Pachomius also founded, at this early period, cloisters of nuns, which received the means of support from the cloisters of the monks.[7]

[1] From the word μάνδρα, the fold, flock. Vid. Nilus, l. II. ep. 52, μοναστήριον = μάνδρα.

[2] Lausiac. c. 39.

[3] Vit. Pachom. l. c. § 19, § 73, § 85. Hieronymi præfat. in regul. Pachom. Lausiaca, f. 957.

[4] Vit. Pachom. § 52. Hieronym. l. c. § 8.

[5] A novitiate, according to the earlier practice of the Essenes.

[6] The ὁμολόγησις, called afterwards the votum, *vow*, § 66. Hieronym. præfat. § 49.

[7] Lausiaca, f. 300.

The enthusiasm for the monastic life having spread with such violence; and vast numbers of men, possessing different dispositions, and utterly without the inward strength and tranquillity necessary to endure the solitary, contemplative habits of the cloister, having withdrawn into the deserts; it could not be otherwise, than that the sudden and uncalled-for adoption of the anachoret mode of life, the extravagances of asceticism, and its accompanying pride, should give birth to many wild sallies of the fanatical spirit, and many mental disorders. We find examples of anachorets, who were so persecuted by their tormenting thoughts, as to end their lives by suicide.[1] We hear of many who, after having pushed their abstinence and self-castigation to the utmost extreme, imagined they had reached the summit of Christian perfection, and might now soon dispense altogether with those means of grace which other weak Christians needed. They despised assembling with others for devotional purposes, and even for the communion. Finally, they imagined that they were honored with special visions and revelations. The end of it all was, that they fell into a state of complete insanity; or else what had hitherto inspired them appeared at once to be self-delusion. From the temptation to seek an entire estrangement from the ordinary feelings of humanity, into which they had forcibly wrought themselves, they sunk back to entire abandonment and vulgarity. The sensual impulses, which, in the intoxication of pride, they had succeeded, for a short time, wholly to suppress, broke forth with still greater violence.[2] They not only rushed back to their ordinary earthly pursuits, but now went to the opposite extreme of giving themselves up to every sensual enjoyment. Sometimes, after having been

[1] Examples of temptation to suicide, among the monks, amid their inward conflicts, occurred frequently. See that of Stagirius, to whom Chrysostom addressed his beautiful letter of consolation; — a young man of a noble family, who, feeling the emptiness of life in the high world, was so much the more strongly attracted by the ideal of the monastic order; but through the sudden change of life, which his mind was not mature enough to bear, was thrown into violent fits of mental disease, and so led to imagine himself tempted of Satan to commit suicide. Nilus, l. II. ep. 140, f. 182, says that many monks who could find no escape from the inward temptations which assailed them in their solitude, filled with desperation, plunged the knife into their bodies, or threw themselves headlong from precipices. Many fancied that in this way they should die martyrs. See Gregor. Nazianz. Carmen 47, ad Hellenium opp. T. II. f. 107:

Θνήσκουσιν πολλοῖς προφρονέως θανάτοις,
Αυτοὶ ὑπὸ σφετέρης παλάμης καὶ γάστρος ἀνάγκη,
(They died by voluntary starvation.)
Οἱ δὲ κατὰ σκοπέλων βένθεσὶ τ' ἠὲ βρόχοις
Μάρτυρες ἀτρεκίης· πολέμου δ' ἀπὸ καὶ στονόεντος
Χαιροῦσιν βιότου τοῦδ' ἀπανιστάμενοι.
(They rejoice to be redeemed from this inward conflict and this melancholy life.)

For the purpose of warning them against such dangers from the inward conflicts of the soul, the abbot Pachomius said to his monks: "If suggestions to blaspheme God present themselves to one who wants a truly prudent and collected spirit, they will soon plunge him to destruction. Hence many have destroyed themselves; some, bereft of their senses, have cast themselves from precipices, others laid open their bowels, others killed themselves in different ways: for it is something very bad, if one who understands the evil does not point it out to such persons ere it becomes rooted." Vit. Pachom. § 61.

[2] Hence Nilus, who was a man of large inward experience, gave to one who asked him why many of the monks had so sadly fallen, the following answer: "Priding themselves on their ascetic perfection, they lost, by their presumption, the protection of good spirits, and the evil ones became their masters." Καταβάλλουσι τὸν πεφυσωμένον εἰς πορνείαν ἢ κλόπην ἢ φονοκτονίαν ἢ μοιχείαν. Nil. l. I. ep. 326.

tossed to and fro, from one extreme to the other, they at length arrived, out of these hard trials, to the knowledge of themselves, and to a discreet piety.[1] We see a mark of true wisdom, in the practice of endeavoring to heal those who, through the pride of asceticism, had fallen, or were in danger of falling, into insanity, by forbidding them to engage in such efforts any longer, and obliging them to live after the manner of ordinary men.

The history of incipient Monachism is rich in remarkable phenomena, conveying the most important instruction on the subject of the development of religious morality, and on the manifold states of the inner life. We will here introduce a few examples, to illustrate the remarks which have just been made.

A monk, by the name of Valens, belonging to a monastic order in Palestine, had become proud of his great ascetic efforts. Some friends, perhaps according to a usual custom, having made a present of certain articles of food to the monks, the presbyter Macarius, who presided over the society, sent a portion to each in his cell. But Valens, with scornful language, bade the bearer carry it back to Macarius. The latter perceived the danger which threatened the sanity of Valens's mind. The next day he went to him, endeavored to bring him to a sense of his dangerous self-delusion, and entreated him to pray God that he might be healed. As he refused to listen to all advice, his case continually grew worse. He had visions, and imagined the Saviour himself had appeared to him, in a form of light, testifying his approbation of so holy a life. When, on the next day, the monks assembled to unite in participating of the holy supper, Valens refused to unite with them. "I need not the supper," said he, "for I have this day seen the Lord Christ himself." The monks found it necessary to bind the insane man. For the space of a year, they had recourse to prayer, and to a tranquil mode of life, directly opposed to his previous ascetic habits, for his recovery; proceeding on the principle, that one extreme must be cured by resorting to the other.[2]

Another, by the name of Heron, belonging to Alexandria, who was a member of the monastic society in the desert of Nitria, had carried the mortification of his senses to such extent, that he could travel thirty miles into the desert, under the scorching rays of the sun, without food or drink, repeating constantly, as he went, certain passages of the Bible from memory; and that he often lived, for three months, on nothing but the bread of the eucharist, and wild herbs. This man became so proud as to fancy himself superior to all others. He would be advised by no one; affirming that, as Christ had said, "Let no man on earth be called your master," it was men's duty to acknowledge no earthly superior. He also came, at length, to consider it beneath his dignity to take any part in the communion. Finally, he felt within him such a fire, such a restless fever, that he could no longer endure to remain in

[1] Which, in spiritual therapeutics, was designated by the name διάκρισις (discretio:) Διὰ τῶν πειρασμῶν δοκιμασθεὶς, ἐρχέται πρὸς τὴν πασῶν τῶν ἀρετῶν ὑψηλοτέραν διακρίσιν.

[2] Ἔνχαις καὶ ποικίλῃ ἀδιαφορήσει καὶ ἀπραγωτέρῳ βίῳ τὸ οἴημα αὐτοῦ καθελόντες, καθώς λεγέται· τὰ ἐναντία τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἰάματα. Laus. c. 31.

his cell.[1] He fled from the desert to Alexandria, and there plunged into a directly opposite mode of life. He was a frequent visitor at the theatre, the circus, and the houses of entertainment; he ran into all sorts of extravagance: these threw him into a severe sickness, in which he came to his senses, and was seized once more with the craving after the higher life he had lost. Afterwards he found a calm and cheerful death.[2]

Another, by the name of Ptolemy, settled down by himself on a spot lying beyond the Scetic desert in Egypt, known under the name of the "Ladder," (κλίμαξ,) where no man had ever dared to dwell, because the only spring which could provide water for this spot in the parched wilderness, lay fourteen miles distant. There he persevered to dwell alone, for fifteen years, collecting, in earthen vessels, during the months of December and January, the dew, which at this season plentifully covered the rocks in this country, and, with the moisture thus preserved, quenching his thirst. This unnatural mode of life was too much for his nature. The attempt at a proud estrangement from all human passions was the means of its own punishment. In striving to deny his human nature, he lost all firm hold of real existence; he grew sceptical about his own, about the existence of God, and of all things else;—everything appeared to him like a phantasm. The thought seized him, that the world had sprung into existence of itself, without any Creator; that it moved in a constant show, without any substantial ground of existing things. In desperate insanity, he forsook the desert, wandered about dumb from one city to another, frequented the places of public resort, and gave himself up to all manner of gluttony.[3]

Besides these individual examples of monks, whose spiritual pride led them into such self-delusion that they imagined themselves superior to the ordinary means of grace, and, by virtue of the extraordinary revelations and visions which they received, enabled to dispense with all human instruction and help from others, we see this spirit of fanatical pride carried to the pitch of self-deification, extending itself with Monachism in a widening circle, like a contagious disease, through Mesopotamia, Syria, and as far as to Pamphylia. Thus arose a sect, which, according to the expressed reports of the ancients, had its origin in the Syrian Monachism, and which, moreover, wears on its front the undeniable marks of its origin. This sect propagated itself from the second half of the fourth century down into the sixth, and, in its after effects, reached perhaps still further; that is, if we may suppose this sect stood in any outward connection with later appearances which bear, in many respects, a strong affinity to it.[4] They were called, some-

[1] This, too, was no unfrequent occurrence, that the monks, to escape their inward temptations, forsook their cells, and ran about from one place to another. Nilus says of a person of this description: "He will change his place, but not the anguish of his heart. He will rather nourish and increase his temptations. L. I. ep. 295.

[2] L. c. c. 39.

[3] Lausic. l. c. c. 33. Similar cases must have often occurred, as we may see from Laus. c. 95.

[4] In case the Euchites of the fourth century stood in any immediate connection with the Euchites of the eleventh century, and the so-called Bogomiles of the twelfth. Without question, the affinity may also be accounted for from an inward analogy,

times, after the name of those who at different times were their leaders, Lampetians, Adelphians, Eustathians, and Marcianists; sometimes after various peculiarities supposed to be observed in them; Euchites, (εὐχῖται) Messalians,[1] on account of their theory about constant inward prayer; also Choreutes, (χορευταί,) from their mystic dances;[2] Enthusiasts, (ἐνθουσιασταί,) on account of the pretended communications which they received from the Holy Spirit.[3]

Most probably, it was in the first place a practical error, without any tendency to theoretical heresies. They were monks who fancied themselves to have reached the summit of ascetic perfection; and, as they now enjoyed such intimate communion with the Holy Spirit, such complete dominion over sense, as to be no longer under the necessity of making the same efforts as before, supposed that, delivered from the yoke of law, they needed only to follow the impulse of the Spirit, without rule or discipline. They would allow nothing to disturb them in the purely contemplative repose, the state of inward prayer, which they represented as being the highest of attainments. They discarded all the occupations of common life,—all manual labor, by which the monks were used to provide for their own support and for the relief of others, but which *they* regarded as a degradation of the higher life of the spirit. They were for living by alms alone, and were *the first*[4] *mendicant friars*. From this practical error proceeded, by degrees, all the principles and doctrines peculiar to the Euchites.

which is found to exist between mystic sects of this sort. It is to be observed, however, that Theodoretus already describes the εὐχίτας ἐν μοναχικῷ προσχήματι τὰ μανιχαίων νοσοῦντας. Hist. religios. c. III. ed. Halens. T. III. p. 1146. To be sure, Theodoretus may also have held, on no good grounds, analogous doctrines of this monkish mysticism to be Manichean or Gnostic; or he may have, through mistake, confounded Manicheans who concealed themselves under the monkish garb, with the ordinary Euchites. The fact that the monks had their imaginations constantly busied with the images of evil spirits persecuting them, may have furnished ground for the introduction of the Manichean, as it did really give rise to the Euchitian doctrines. See, respecting the spread of Manicheism among the monks, Vita Euthymii, § 33. Coteler. monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, T. II. p. 227.

[1] Signifying the same, according to the Chaldee מְצַלִּין.

[2] Comp. vol. I. the Therapeutæ.

[3] All these different names are found in Timotheus de receptione hæreticorum, in Coteler. monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, T. III. The name μαρκιανίσται is from Marcian, an exchanger, under the emperors Justin and Justinian. The name *Eustathians* is worthy of notice. It might lead us to think of Eustathius of Sebaste, from whom, in fact, a fanatical monkish bent derived its origin; and the more, as Photius, Cod. 52, who had old synodal acts for his authority, calls this Eustathius, from whom they bore the name, αἱδέσιμος.

[4] Epiphanius says distinctly, h. 86, that it was the monkish spirit carried to excess, a misconception of what the gospel means by renunciation of the world, in fact the false notion lying at the bottom of the whole system of Monachism, pushed to the utmost extreme, which led to this error of the Euchites. Ἔσχον δὲ τὸ βλαβέρον τοῦτο φρονήμα ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμετρίας τῶν τινῶν ἀδέλφων ἀφελείας. This direction of the monkish spirit is attacked also by Nilus, in the Tractatus ad Magnam, § 21 and 22. He there very justly remarks that the faculties of sense, in men in the full vigor of age, being employed on nothing, they must operate so much the more powerfully to disturb and confuse the higher life; that consequently the prayer, which they used as a pretext, must in their case suffer the greatest interruption. He derives this false tendency from Adelphius of Mesopotamia, (the Euchite who has already been mentioned,) and from Alexander, who had been the author of disturbances for some time in Constantinople, (perhaps that Alexander who was the founder of a monkish order in which prayer and singing were kept up without intermission, day and night, the members of the order continually relieving each other. They were called Acœmetes, (ἀκοιμηται.)

Their fundamental principle was this, that every man, by virtue of his origin from the first fallen man, brings with him into this world an evil spirit, under whose dominion he lives. Here we recognize again the monkish theory about evil spirits that awaken in men the sensual desires. All ascetic discipline, all the means of grace in the church, are without power to deliver the soul from the tyranny of this evil spirit. These can only avail to check the single outbreaks of sin, while the man still remains under its dominion. He is, therefore, under the necessity of a continual struggle with sin; and stands trembling before it, under the discipline of the law. They combated the prevailing notions about a magical transformation by virtue of baptism, adhering, however, to the ordinary view in another respect. "Baptism," said they, "like shears, may, indeed, clip away the earlier sins, (procure the forgiveness of past transgressions,) but the root of the evil still remains behind, from which, therefore, new sins will continually germinate; for the evil spirit still retains, in fact, his dominion over the soul."[1] But what could not be brought about by any outward means, or by any ascetic discipline, might be effected, however, by the true inward prayer. Whoever attained to this, would thereby be delivered from the power of the evil spirit that had governed him from his birth, whose departure would be sensibly perceived; and he would enter, in a way sensibly manifest to his own feelings, into communion with the divine Spirit. He would put on the divine raiment, and at once become inaccessible to all temptations of sin. That freedom from the affections of sense, to the attainment of which others sought to fight their way through a course of severe ascetic discipline, *he* would *immediately* reach by this inward prayer. Hence, too, such a man was no longer under the necessity of fasting or of self-mortification. Freed from the law, he might abandon himself, with confidence, to all those exposures which others must avoid through the fear of temptation. Owing to the immediate divine revelation which he would now enjoy, such a person stood exempted from all further need of instruction from others, all further need of human guidance.[2] By this doctrine, the essence of the monastic life of that period, which was founded upon obedience and subordination, would necessarily be destroyed. For, of course, to the Euchites, their prayer supplied the place of all other modes of devotion and means of grace; and they looked upon themselves as exalted far above other Christians, who were still in bondage to sense, and under the yoke of the law. They were persuaded that the true spiritual sacrament of the supper was only among themselves; the outward ordinance of the church they represented to be a matter of indifference. Although they believed that they could derive no benefit from it, yet they joined in the celebration of it, in order that they

[1] Timoth. l. c. 2. Ὅτι τὸ ἁγίον βαπτίσμα οὐδὲν συμβάλλεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ δαίμονος τοῦτου διώξιν, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν ἱκανὸν, τὰς ῥίζας τῶν ἁμαρτίων τὰς συνουσιῶμενας ἀρχῆθεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐκτέμειν. Theodoret. hæret. fab. IV. 11. Ξύρου δίκην ἀφαιρεῖται τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὰ προτέρα, τὴν δὲ ῥίζαν οὐκ ἐκκόπτει τῆς ἁμαρτίας. By this we must supply what is wanting in the less accurate account of Theodoretus, hist. eccles. IV. 10.

[2] Theodoret. IV. 10, h. e. Timoth. de receptione hæreticor. § 9. Joh. Damascen. hæres. § 6.

might still be considered members of the Catholic church. They also discarded, in particular, sacred music; as their mystic tendency would naturally lead them to do.[1] That they sought after revelations in dreams, we may easily believe, according to the unanimous testimony of their opponents; since many indications of the tendency to that enthusiasm which looked for divine suggestions in dreams, is elsewhere to be found also in this period. Their adversaries, moreover, report of them, that they were, for this reason, much given to sleep; which is possibly an exaggeration, but it may also be true;[2] for it is easy to see, that such a monotonous direction of the soul, so much at variance with the essential constitution of human nature, must have often passed off into sleep and dreams.

The mystical bent of this sect led to various other errors, which are often found connected with similar appearances. In various ways, we see, connected with such appearances, the habit of confounding sensual with spiritual feelings, particularly sensual with spiritual love, — a habit which has often been attended with the most pernicious consequences. Thus, too, the Euchites compared the spiritual marriage of the soul to its heavenly bridegroom, in a grossly sensual manner, with an earthly union.[3]

The pride of the mystical sects, and the tendency of idealism to reduce everything to a subjective form, led frequently to a pantheistic self-deification. This seems to have been the case also with the Euchites. They asserted, that they had become partakers of the divine nature. The Deity was able to assume all possible forms, and did actually assume all forms, particularly for the purpose of communicating himself to such souls as were fitted to receive him. "The three hypostases of the Triad," they taught, "are nothing but different forms of revelation of the one divine Essence, — the Trinity resolves again into Unity."[4] Thus they were led to look upon the appearances of the angels in the Old Testament, upon the patriarchs and prophets, and upon Christ himself, as only different forms of the manifestation and revelation of the one divine Essence; and they were persuaded that, by virtue of their own spiritual perfection, all was concentrated in them.

[1] This is seen from a fragment of the tract of the monophysite Severus, written against the work of the Euchite Lampetios, which was entitled the *Testament*. We gather from the opposite position taken by the former, that the Euchites approved only of a *ὑμνειν ἐν καρδίᾳ*. See Wolf. anecdota Græca, T. III. p. 182; and this inference is confirmed by the acts of a synod held in opposition to the Euchites, cited by Photius, c. 52. Of this Lampetios, it is here said: *Ὅτι τούς τὰς ὥρας ψάλλοντας ἐξεμυκτηρίζε καὶ διέσυρεν, ὡς ὑπὸ νόμον ἔτι τυγχανόντας.*

[2] Cases at least occur elsewhere, of monks who, in despair from not being able to escape temptations in singing and prayer, sought relief in immoderate sleep. See Nil. III. ep. 224.

[3] Timoth. IV. *Τοιαυτῆς αἰσθάνεται ἡ ψύχη κοινωνίας γινομένης αὐτῇ παρὰ τοῦ οὐρανίου νυμφίου, οἵας αἰσθάνεται ἡ γύνη ἐν τῇ συνουσίᾳ τοῦ ἀνδρος.*

[4] Timoth. § 6. *Λεγούσιν ὁτι τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν ἀναλύονται καὶ μεταβαλλόνται, καὶ ὅτι ἡ θεία φύσις τρέπεται καὶ μεταβάλλεται εἰς ὅπερ ἀν ἐθέλῃ, ἵνὰ συγκράθῃ ταῖς ἑαυτῆς ἀξίαις ψύχαις*, c. XI. *Ἡ ψύχη τοῦ πνευματίκου μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν θείαν φύσιν.* The Euchites having propagated themselves for a long period, and mysticism being in its own nature an inconstant thing, it is quite possible that different parties may have arisen among them; and thus the party which asserted these things of the Trinity, may not have been the same with the one which taught that those who were enlightened by their prayer had a sensuous intuition of the Trinity.

If angel, patriarch, prophet, Christ himself, were named to such a person, his reply, in each case, was, "That am I myself."[1] Perhaps they were, likewise, by their mystical idealism, led to deny the reality of Christ's miracles, to explain them as only symbolical; since such facts in the sensible world seem to have been regarded by them as wholly unimportant to the religion of the spirit.[2]

It should be mentioned also, as among their peculiar opinions, that they considered fire as the creative principle of the universe,—an opinion of which we find many traces also in other theosophic sects.

It was sometimes objected to the Euchites, that they pushed their Antinomianism, and their mistaken freedom, to such an excess, as even to permit those who were called perfect to abandon themselves to every vice. True, we ought not to give too much credit here to the report of adversaries; yet it must be allowed, that this practical error did not, at least, lie so very remote from their principles and their spirit. Their presumptuous self-confidence, their defiance of the frailties of human nature, might thus, perhaps, meet with its own punishment; and we have, in fact, noticed above, in the case of the monks, many examples of transition from the extreme of ascetic severity to an unbridled licentiousness of morals.

As it was a principle held by the Euchites, in common with many similar sects, that the end sanctifies the means, and that it was right to conceal from common men, who were enslaved to their senses, the higher truths, which they were not yet prepared to receive, and to affect an assent to their opinions; it was, on this account, difficult to discover the members of this sect, and to seize upon any clue to their doctrines. Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, (after the year 381,) condescended to act according to the same principle, with a view to find them out, punish, and expel them. He managed to enter into a conference with their superior, Adelphius, as if he were entirely of the same opinion with him, and thus enticed him to a confession, which he then made use of against Adelphius himself, and his whole sect.[3]

A similar spirit of ascetic fanaticism threatened to spread far and wide, when, after the middle of the fourth century, the zeal for the monastic life was diffused by Eustathius, afterwards bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, through Paphlagonia, and the districts of Pontus; and there are, indeed, many indications which serve to show that some outward connection existed between the Euchites and the Eustathians,—a fact which the name *Eustathians*, given also to the Euchites, seems to confirm. The synodal writings, and the canons of the council of Gangra, the metropolis of Paphlagonia,[4] which was assembled for the pur-

[1] Epiphan. l. c.

[2] Yet this cannot be certainly inferred from the opposite position of Severus. Wolf. anecdota, T. III. p. 17.

[3] Theodoret. h. e. IV. 12.

[4] There are, in relation to this matter, two disputed points, viz. the question whether the Eustathians, (*οἱ περὶ Εὐσταθίον*,) against whom this council was directed, really sprung from Eustathius of Sebaste, and to what time the meeting of this council is to be assigned. The first question admits of being more easily settled than the last. All the facts are in favor of an affirmative answer to this question. Not only is the testimony of Socrates, II. 43, and of Sozomen, III. 14, to this effect, but the whole is in perfect accordance with the character of Eustathius, who was a zealous ascetic, and the first preacher of the ascetic life in the

pose of opposing these errors, furnish us the best means of informing ourselves with regard to their character; while they present, at the same time, a remarkable memorial of the healthful spirit of Christian morals, which set itself to oppose this one-sided tendency of asceticism. Wives forsook their husbands and children, husbands their wives, servants their masters, to devote themselves to the ascetic life.[1] Several, who had placed too great confidence in themselves, fell into immoral practices. They despised marriage and the domestic life. Those who wore the ascetic garb, fancied that at once they had become perfect Christians, and looked down with contempt on others who went about in their ordinary apparel. They refused to take any part in the sacrament of the supper, where married priests had consecrated the elements. Where, in the country, no churches had as yet been erected, and divine worship was held in private houses, they refused to join either in prayer or in the communion, because they held that no dwelling was holy enough for such purposes, the owners of which lived in wedlock. They celebrated their private worship in separate assemblies, ascribing to that worship a sacredness which was wanting to the church assemblies.[2]

As these fanatical tendencies, which grew out of the ascetic enthusiasm, threatened to be the cause of so much disturbance to the church life, it became necessary to devise some means of protecting it against this danger, and of guiding the ascetic life, which was highly prized, in a course of development which would be salutary to the church, and consistent with good order. For this purpose, in the first place, particular encouragement was given to the regular institution of the cenobitic life; and next, it was attempted to bring this into closer connection with the whole body of the church, and into a condition of greater dependence on the episcopal supervision in each diocese.[3] In the ceno-

countries around the Pontus, and had formed a whole school. See Basilii Cæsareens. ep. 223, (Here we find mentioned, in fact, the ascetic dress, to which the Eustathians, according to the report of the council of Gangra, ascribed a peculiar sanctity — the *ξένα ἀμφιάσματα*, that is, according to the letter of Basilius, *τὸ παχὺ ἱματίον, καί ἡ ζώνη καὶ τῆς ἀδεψήτου βύρσης τὰ ὑποδήματα*,) and ep. 119. Epiphanius, hæres. 75. We perceive also in the letters of Basilius, a trace of opposition to the new monastic spirit in the districts of the Pontus. At least at Neocæsarea, where the attachment to old usages prevailed, the spreading of the ascetic life among men and virgins was brought up as an objection against Basilius of Cæsarea. See ep. 207 ad Neocæsareens. § 2.

But the second question belongs among the most difficult of decision. If we suppose, with Pagi, who follows Socrates and Sozomen, the council to have been held A.D. 360, then there is something strange in the manner in which the council name Eustathius, since he was then bishop; unless we suppose that the council did not consider Eustathius, who by a party had been deposed, as really a bishop, and thought themselves justified to treat him contemptuously. But, if we assume that the council was held at some earlier date, it is singular again, that no allusion to it is to be found in the letters of Basil. Still the case may have been, that Basil, on account of the relation in which he stood with the party by whom this council was held, did not recognize it as a legal one.

[1] The same was the case among the Euchites. Joh. Damasc. p. 997.

[2] The same was true among the Euchites. Joh. Damasc. pag. 37.

[3] The examples of such men as Basil of Cæsarea, and Chrysostom, teach this. The life of Basil of Cæsarea, of Gregory of Nazianzum, and the doctrinal controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, show what divisions in the churches could grow out of the influence of the monks. The council of Chalcedon decreed, in its fourth canon, that no person should be allowed to found a cloister without permission of the bishop, and that the monks in town and country should be obedient to the bishop.

bitic life, everything was subjected to one guidance, after a regular plan; to each individual was assigned his particular place, and sphere of action; obedience and humility, the unconditional submission of the will of the individual to that of the superior, who should be obeyed, even to the utter sacrifice of one's own inclinations, — these stood in the highest rank of monkish virtues. Every extravagance was to be immediately checked, and reduced within proper limits, by the guidance of the superior. Whoever felt himself, in any way, restless and uneasy, was not only required not to conceal it from his leaders, but to disclose to them his whole heart, that, through their experience and wisdom, he might receive advice and consolation; lest the evil, concealed in his own breast, should spread wider, and at last become incurable. It must be admitted, that, in the monastic life, the essence of true humility, which has its foundation within, in a temper proceeding from the sense of dependence on God, was often misconceived, and *outward* humiliation before *men* substituted in the place of *inward* humiliation before God. A servile spirit grew out of this confusion of ideas. But it is not to be denied that order, strict discipline, subjection of the individuals to the laws of the whole, and wise guidance, were absolutely necessary to keep in the right course a multitude of men, of different humors, and often rude and uncultivated. Good and pertinent are the remarks of Basil of Cæsarea, respecting the advantages of the common life of the Cenobites over the solitary life of the Anachorets; while, at the same time, they furnish one example of a truly evangelical judgment on the subject of Monachism: — "The eremitical life conflicts with the essential character of Christian love, since here each individual is concerned only for what pertains to his own good; while the essence of Christian love prompts each to seek, not alone what serves for his own advantage, but also the good of others. Neither will such a person find it easy to come to the knowledge of his failings and deficiencies; since he has no one to correct him with love and gentleness. What is written in Ecclesiastes 4 : 10, applies to the case of such a person: 'Woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up.' In a society, many can work together, so as to fulfil the divine commands on different sides. But he who lives alone is ever confined to one single work; and, while this is being done, other works must be neglected. Next, if all Christians constitute together one body, under one Head, and stand related to each other as the members of one body; how can any such relation subsist, when they live thus separated from one another, each striving to be enough for himself? But if they do not find themselves standing in the right relation to each other as members of the same body, neither can they stand in the right relation to their common Head. In one society, the influence of the Holy Spirit in each individual passes over to all; the gifts of grace imparted to each become a common possession of all, and the gracious gifts of all redound to the advantage of each individual. But he who lives for himself alone, has, perhaps, a gracious gift; but he makes it unprofitable, since he buries it in his own bosom; — and whoever is

acquainted with the parable of the talents, must know how great a responsibility is thus incurred." [1]

A struggle now arose between the Cenobities and the *ascetics* who traced their origin back to an earlier period; inasmuch as the latter were unwilling to submit to the new rules of the monks, but wished to maintain their ancient independence. They were in the habit of living two or three together; and they built their cells, for the most part, in cities, or in the larger villages. They supported themselves, like other monks, by the labor of their own hands; and their very opponents, the adherents of the new order of the Cenobites, were constrained to acknowledge that they were diligent and industrious. The latter, who alone have left behind any accounts of these classes of ascetics, (known in Egypt under the name of Sarabaites, in Syria under that of Remoboth,) give, it is true, a very unfavorable description of them; and, as they could be no otherwise than hostilely disposed towards these adversaries of the new form of the monastic life,[2] what they have to say on this subject is, of itself, liable to suspicion; and many of their objections show at once that they originated in hatred, and were without any just foundation. Cassian, for example, accuses them of misappropriating to purposes of sensual indulgence, or covetously hoarding up, the surplus of their earnings.[3] Or even supposing this was managed by them in the best possible manner, still it was impossible for them to attain to the virtue of the monks. For the monks practised daily the same self-denial; but to the ascetics their very bounty to the poor was an occasion of pride, which daily received nourishment. Now we see here at once, what Cassian himself was unable to conceal, that the first of these charges could not, in so sweeping a manner, be laid against the Sarabaites; and, as it concerns the second, it is evidently a mere inference in the writer's own mind, from the false assumption that, without the outward and unconditional submission to another's will, without the servile obedience of the monks, there is no true humility. Bad qualities and good were, no doubt, to be found among these people, as among the Cenobites; but their enemies, of course, held up to notice the worst side. Jerome charges them with *hypocrisy;*[4] of which there was no lack, indeed, among many of the monks. He says of them, that they availed themselves of the outward show of sanctity, which they affected, to dispose of their wares at a higher rate than others; — which might be no less true of the monks.[5] He accuses them of *speak-*

[1] See Basil. regula fus. VII. II. 346. It is finely remarked also by Nilus, against the exaggerated estimate of the hermit-life, III. 73: "Whoever says, I become an anachoret, that I may have no one to excite my anger, is not essentially different from an irrational brute; for we see such also quiet when a man does not excite them to anger." And he quotes, as opposed to the anachoret life, the texts in Ephes. 5: 21, Pet. 4: 10, Pet. 2: 13, Philipp. 2: 4.

[2] In the rule of the Benedictines, c. I. it is also plainly evident, that they were particularly accused of a spirit of freedom unbecoming in monks, (sine pastore et lege vivere.) and to this same spirit every thing bad in them was attributed. In this very place, it is conceded that they were of a far better kind than the degenerate monks that strolled about through the country, (the Gyrovagi.)

[3] Collat. 18, c. VII.

[4] Ep. 22 ad Eustochium.

[5] Nilus himself objects to a class of the monks, that πᾶσαν ποριστίκην μετέρχεσθαι τέχνην. Ad Magnam, c. 30.

ing against the clergy. It may well be, that, as laymen, they were inclined to boast of their superiority to the clergy, on the score of their ascetic mode of life. It may be, that they opposed the pride of asceticism to that of the hierarchy; but it may also be, that, among these people, many pious laymen were led, by their zeal for the cause of religion, to attack the vices of a worldly-minded clergy. There may have been some grounds for the opinion, that most of the objections brought against them, as well as the quarrels of which they were the occasion, would have ceased, or never existed, had they subjected themselves to the same strict oversight which prevailed among the Cenobites.

We shall now proceed to contemplate Monachism in its various relations, during this period, to the Eastern church. As it commonly happens with historical phenomena of this kind, deeply grounded in the life of an age and pervading all its manifestations, that the best and worst qualities, springing from the Christian and the unchristian spirit, meet together, and are found in closest contact; so it happened in the case of Monachism. Some care, therefore, must be exercised here, in separating the opposite elements, if we would neither unjustly condemn, nor, through the influence of party feelings, without regard to historical facts, approve the phenomenon here presented; as, in truth, we may find abundant examples, in this very period, of both these equally partial and erroneous ways of passing judgment on Monachism.

And here, in the first place, it is necessary to distinguish the Anachorets from the Cenobites. To the former, it was objected, in this period itself, that they lived solely for themselves; were wanting in active charity;[1] — in defending them against which objection, Augustin observes that those who brought against them such complaints, did not reflect how useful those might be in a spiritual sense, who were not personally visible, by means of their prayers, and the example of their life.[2] Chrysostom, however, says that it were certainly better, if the Anachorets also could live together in a society, so as to manifest, in an outward manner, the bond of charity. Yet, in either case, he observed, the essential requisite of love might be present in the disposition; for love, assuredly, is not restricted to the limits of space. They had, in truth, many admirers; and these would cease to *admire*, if they did not *love* them: and, on the other hand, they *prayed for the whole world*, which is the greatest evidence of love.[3] Even those among the Anachorets who lived entirely secluded and separate from the world, were not therefore, by any means, excluded from all exercise of influence upon others. The greater the reverence they inspired by their strict eremetic life, the more they were sought out, in their grottos or cells, on their rocks or in their deserts, by men of every rank, from the emperor's palace to the lowest hovel, who visited them for counsel and consolation.[4] Men who, in the crowd of earthly affairs, in the dazzling

[1] Videntur nonnullis res humanas plus quam oportet deseruisse. Augustin. de moribus ecclesiæ catholicæ, l. I. § 66.

[2] Augustin. l. c. non intelligentibus, quantum nobis eorum animus in orationibus prosit et vita ad exemplum, quorum corpora videre non sinimur.

[3] Chrysostom. H. 78, in Joannem, § 4, opp. ed. Montf. T. VIII. f. 464.

[4] See the II. book of Chrysostom contra oppugnatores vitæ monasticæ.

glitter of the world, were not easily brought to think of any higher concerns, would approach one of these recluses in a state of mind which rendered them at once susceptible for higher impressions. A word spoken to them in that state of feeling, sustained by the whole venerable aspect of the recluse, might produce greater effects than long discourses under other circumstances.[1] Oftentimes these hermits, after having remained for years hidden from the eye of the world, appeared publicly, on the occurrence of great and general calamities, or as protectors of entire cities and provinces, who were dreading the heavy vengeance of some exasperated emperor. A spirit which, living by faith, was conscious of being free from the bondage of the world and independent of earthly things, gave *them* courage and power to speak boldly, where no other man dared to do so: their independence and their reverence for a higher power, which even the mightiest of the earth acknowledged, procured for them a hearing. When, after the insurrection at Antioch, A.D. 387, the emperor Theodosius, under the impulse of violent anger, threatened the whole city with destruction, the monk Macedonius, who for many years had not suffered himself to be seen in the world, came forth from his seclusion, hurried to Antioch, and put himself in the way of the two imperial commissioners, who had been sent for the purpose of holding the judicial trials. They dismounted respectfully from their horses, and embraced his hands and knees. He bid them tell the emperor, that he ought to remember he was a man, and possessed of the same nature with those who had done the wrong. "The emperor is thus angry," said he, "because the imperial images have been destroyed, which, however, may easily be restored; and he was intending, for this reason, to destroy men, who are the living images of God, and one hair of whose head it was beyond his power to restore."[2] The monks were frequently visited by the sick, who, when they failed of relief from medical skill, hoped to obtain a cure through the intercessions of these pious men. Those, especially, who were suffering under mental disorders, and supposed to be possessed of evil spirits, frequently applied to them; and it may be easily conceived that, in such states of mind, the immediate impression of a life so exalted above the world might produce extraordinary effects. Pious monks, rich in inward experience, might avail themselves of such opportunities, even where it was beyond their power to bestow what the unfortunate patients came in quest of, to leave on their minds, and on those of the attendants or friends who brought them, some salutary lesson. Women came to them, to ask for their intercessions with God, that he would send them children. Mothers brought their children, that they might bestow on them their blessing, and, at the same time, scatter in their youthful minds some seed of religious truth; as in the case of Theodoret, who often recurs to a salutary impression of this sort, which he had received in his childhood.[3] Monks were also called to pray in families, and could avail themselves of this opportunity of

[1] To such experiences Nilus refers, l. II. ep. 310.

[2] Theodoret. religios. hist. c. 13.

[3] Theodoret. hist. relig. pag. 1188 et 1214, T. III.

doing good.[1] Especially did the societies of monks form a striking contrast in the more or less remote neighborhood of such large cities as Antioch, which were seats of wealth, splendor, and luxury, and of dissolute manners. What an impression must it have produced, when, either from curiosity, or for the purpose of receiving the counsel and consolation or obtaining the intercession of these men, the citizens visited them from the midst of their busy pursuits, and, in a mode of life destitute of every sensual enjoyment and comfort, witnessed, amidst all these deprivations, a tranquillity of soul of which they had not even formed a conception! Easily may it be explained, why so many of the youth, of both sexes, should feel themselves constrained to exchange their affluence for this poverty! To the monks, those persons, in the Greek empire, often betook themselves, who, after an agitated and restless public life, through many political storms and reverses, either disgusted at the vain pursuits of the world and craving for repose, or driven by necessity to escape from some threatening danger, sought here a still retreat, where they might end their days; as in the case of that venerable monk Nilus, who, having retired from a station of trust and dignity in Constantinople to Mount Sinai, in the beginning of the fifth century, could write as follows:[2] "So great grace has God bestowed on the monks, even in anticipation of the future world, that they wish for no honors from men, and feel no longing after the greatness of this world; but, on the contrary, often seek rather to remain concealed from men: while, on the other hand, many of the great, who possess all the glory of the world, either of their own accord, or compelled by misfortune, take refuge with the lowly monks, and, delivered from fatal dangers, obtain at once a temporal and an eternal salvation." And in the monastic profession, might they now find a new inner life, and turn the treasure of experience they had acquired, to their own benefit, and that of others.

As to the difference between the solitary life of the Anachorets and the common life of the Cenobites, it is to be observed, that the same objection cannot be made against the ascetic mode of *living in common*, which might be brought against the insulated life of the Anachorets, viz. that the spirit of active charity was here wanting; for, as we have already remarked, judged on the principle of Christian love, the Cenobitic mode of life had the advantage over the other. The *cœnobiæ* formed, in fact, little communities, in which every kind of Christian activity and virtue found room for exercise, with the exception only of such as are strictly connected with the ties of family. Chrysostom says of this class, that they had fled from amidst the bickerings of the world, for the purpose of cultivating charity with less disturbance.[3] People of all ranks might here associate together, and find a suitable occupation, sanctified by the spirit of Christian fellowship. Every kind of employment not interfering with tranquillity and the other relations of the monastic life, was here pursued, and prosecuted with the

[1] Nil. l. II. ep. 46.
[2] Lib. I. ep. I.
[3] Ἐπείδη γὰρ ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων φιλονεικία πόλλας ποίει τὰς ἐρίδας· διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ μέσου γενόμενοι, τὴν ἀγάπην γεωργοῦσι μετ' ἀκριβείας πόλλης. H. 78, in Evangel. Joh. § 4.

feelings which ought to animate every Christian calling. Prayer, reading of the scriptures, sacred music, here alternated with, and accompained, bodily labor.[1] The bond of Christian fellowship here united together what was separated by the relations of the world. Slaves, on whom their masters had bestowed freedom that they might enter a cloister, here joined in brotherly fellowship with those who had sprung from the noblest families; and here they were trained for a higher life. It was the spirit of Monachism which gave special prominence to that Christian point of view, from which all men were regarded as originally equal in the sight of God; which opposed the consciousness of God's image in human nature, to the grades and distinctions flowing out of the relations of the state. Hence this spirit, where it was pure, not recognizing the distance which the earthly relations had fixed between slaves and freemen, plebeians and nobles, invited and admitted all, without distinction, to the fellowship of that higher life, which had respect only to the universal interests of humanity. The spirit of contempt for earthly show, the spirit of universal philanthropy, revealed itself in the *pure* appearances of Monachism, and in much that proceeded from it. Nilus says: "In raising recruits for the military service of this world, slaves are rejected; but into the ranks of the soldiers for piety, slaves enter with joy and confidence."[2] The same writer, citing the example of Job, chap. 31, gives special prominence to compassion for the race of slaves, whom a mastership of violence, destroying the fellowship of nature, had converted into tools.[3] Among the works of Christian piety, he names the redeeming of slaves from bondage to cruel masters.[4] Slaves, who were oppressed, fled for protection to pious monks; and the latter interceded for those in trouble with their masters. The abbot Isodore of Pelusium, writing in behalf of one of these to his master, observes: "I did not suppose that a man who loves Christ, who knows the grace which has made all men free, could still hold a slave;"[5] and to another he said: "The noble disposition frees those whom violence has made slaves; wherever this blame-

[1] In the greater monastic rule of Basilius, those occupations are permitted and recommended to the monks, which did not compel them to be too much separated from one another, as well in the labors themselves, as in the sale of the products of their industry; such occupations as subserved the necessary purposes of life, and not unseemly or hurtful passions; as, for example, the occupation of the weaver, of the shoemaker, so far as these trades did not administer to luxury. Architecture, the carpenter's trade, the smith, the cultivator of the soil, were not to be rejected on their own account, provided only they created no disturbance, and did not interrupt the life of the community. In this case, such occupations, agriculture especially, were to be preferred to many other employments. The views on this subject were not everywhere precisely the same. They differed according as the barely contemplative or the practical point of view in the monastic life predominated. Nilus, who proceeded on the former, is against the employment of monks in agriculture. See Nil. de monastica exercitatione, c. 21.

[2] Nil. IV. 4.

[3] Nil. Perister. sect. 10, c. VI. f. 165. Τὴν περὶ τὸ οἰκετίκον γένος συμπαθείαν, ὅπερ κατεδουλώσατο τεμούσα τὴν φύσιν ἡ δυναστεία.

[4] The question to the rich man who came to meet death without having used his property in accordance with the impulses of Christianity. Τίνα δεσπότων ὀδυρόμενον ὠμοτήτα τῆς σκλήρας δουλείας ἀπηλλάξας; L. c. sect. IX. c. I. f. 134.

[5] Οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι οἰκέτην ἔχειν τὸν φιλοχρίστον, εἰδότα τὴν χάριν τὴν πάντας ἐλευθερώσασαν. Epp. l. I. ep. 142.

less disposition was found, Paul knew no difference between bond and free."[1]

The cloisters, moreover, were institutions of education, and as such were the more distinguished on account of the care they bestowed on religious and moral culture, because education generally, in this period, as may be gathered from the complaints of Libanius and Chrysostom, had fallen into neglect. Vanity and the love of display were among the first lessons learned in the schools of the sophists; and, in the large cities, corruptions of all sorts threatened the tender age. Basil of Cæsarea, in his rules for the education of the cloister, gives the following directions: "Inasmuch as our Lord has said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' and the apostle praises those who from their youth had been taught the holy scriptures, and exhorts men to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, let it be understood that the earliest age is particularly well suited for being received into the cloisters. Orphan children should be received *gratuitously;* and those who have parents should be admitted, when brought by them in the presence of many witnesses. They should receive a pious education, as children belonging in common to the whole society of brethren. Separate buildings should be specially appropriated to their use; — a particular diet and mode of living, carefully adapted to their age, should be appointed for them; — the superintendence of their education should be entrusted to a person of years, experience, and well-tried patience, who understood how to manage them with parental tenderness. Every fault should be so punished, that the punishment might prove at the same time an exercise of discipline over the temper which had led to its commission. For example, if one indulged angry passions towards another, the fault should be punished by causing him to serve the other, according to the nature of the offence: greediness should be punished by fasting. From the beginning, they should obtain a familiar acquaintance with the holy scriptures; instead of the fables of the poets, they should commit to memory the narratives of the miracles; instead of the Gnomes, passages from the Proverbs of Solomon. Only at the stated hours of social prayer should the grown people and the children come together. As many handicrafts must be learned early, the boys should, in such cases, be allowed to spend the day with the master-workmen, but should sleep and eat with the others. They should not be permitted to take the monastic vow until grown up, and then only when they showed an inclination and aptitude for the monastic life: in the opposite case, they should not be bound to do so."[2]

The cloisters were distinguished for their hospitality and benevolence to the poor. The cloisters of Egypt, for example, provided means of subsistence for the unfruitful districts of Lybia: they sent ships, laden with grain and articles of clothing, to Alexandria, for distribution among the poor.[3]

[1] I. 306.

[2] Basil. reg. fus. § 15.

[3] See Cassian. institut. cœnob. l. 10, c. 22. Hist. Laus. c. 76. In this last place, it is also narrated, that a certain abbot and presbyter, named Serapion, under whose direction stood many cloisters and ten thousand monks, obtained and could distribute annu-

In the cloisters on the mountain of Nitria, there were seven bake-houses, which provided the Anachorets of the bordering Lybian desert with bread. Travellers who, after a weary pilgrimage, arrived here from the wilderness, were suddenly surprised by the sight of a large body of men at labor amidst prayer and spiritual songs; and they found among them a brotherly, hospitable reception: they were refreshed in body and mind. These monks were not prevented, by any ascetic scruples, from providing themselves with wine, for the refreshment of their guests. Every stranger might tarry with them as long as he pleased; but, if he remained longer than a week, they did not allow him to be idle, but required him either to join in the manual labors, or to occupy himself with a book.[1]

But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that many evils resulted from the monastic institution; which is to be attributed partly to its having degenerated, a necessary consequence of the excessive multiplication of the monks; partly to the tendency itself, so alien from the pure spirit of the gospel, which had first led to this form of Christian life, and which was then still more promoted by it. In respect to the first of these causes, the same thing happened here which so frequently occurs in connection with phenomena entering deeply into the life of a period, that numbers, without any special inner call, were hurried into the current by the general enthusiasm or the love of imitation; or, by some momentary shock which served to deceive them as to their own character, were impelled to withdraw from the world, without being in the least degree fitted for the tranquil, uniform life of Monachism. Others chose this mode of life on account of the imposing show of holiness with which it was invested, induced by the opportunity, which it promised them, of indolently gratifying their desires and passions under the mask of religion. People of the lower classes renounced no earthly enjoyment by entering upon the monastic life, but, under the appearance of renouncing the world, secured earthly goods, on which they never could have reckoned.[2] What must have been the result, when rude people of the lowest class set themselves up all at once as leaders of monkish societies? Yet Nilus complains, that a man who was but yesterday a water-carrier at an inn, might to-day make himself pass as an abbot; and Isodore of Pelusium, that shepherds and runaway slaves founded cloisters,[3] — for all which, indeed, the bishops were answerable, since it showed a want of oversight over the whole diocese of the church; unless the truth was, that the swarms of monks had now become too powerful even for the bishops. Uneducated men, of rude and savage character,[4] who brought their restless spirit with them into the seats of quiet, were eager to seize on every occasion which gave employment to their pas-

ally at the harvest, in the Nomos of Arsenoe in Egypt, such a quantity of grain, that not only no poor person in the whole country suffered want, but he found it in his power also to support the poor in Alexandria.

[1] Hist. Laus. c. VI.

[2] Nil. Tractat. ad Magnam, pag. 297. Οὐτὲ καταλιπόντες τὶ καὶ ἃ μὴ εἶχον κτησαμένοι, ὥσπερ ἐμπορείας οὐ φιλοσοφίας ὑποθέσιν τὸν μονάδικον βίον πεποιήμενοι.

[3] Nilus de monastica exercitat. c. 22. Isidor. Pelus. l. I. ep. 262.

[4] As Isidorus of Pelusium writes: Στίφη καὶ φάλαγγες οὐ μοναχῶν, ἀλλὰ μάλλον μαχητῶν.

sions. Hence the troops of wild zealots, who raved against pagans and heretics, demolished and plundered temples; who often took so mischievous a part in doctrinal controversies; who were eager to be employed as tools of fanaticism, and of the ambition of those who stood leaders of the church party. Add to this, that to such men, who constantly moved in one narrow circle of intuitions and feelings, and who were in no sense in a condition to step beyond this narrow range, that to such, every deviation from their own accustomed modes of thought and expression easily appeared as a departure from the essentials of Christianity itself. It was persons of this class who led the Heathens, men like Libanius and Rutilius,[1] to draw up such unfavorable pictures of the monastic institution, about which they formed their judgment from such spurious off-shoots. Distinguished, on the other hand, for moderation and love of truth, is the judgment which Synesius, while yet a Pagan, pronounces on Monachism, when he says: "Such men as Amus of Egypt, with whom intellectual intuition supplied the place of scientific culture, might be allowed to discourse of divine things, without scientific preparation; but the case was different with the great crowd of those who wished to pass judgment on spiritual matters without the spiritual sense, especially with such as had not been led to adopt this mode of life by any original inclination of nature, but, sprung from different classes of society, had seized upon it merely on account of the peculiar consideration in which it was held, — people whom their necessities alone had brought together."[2]

Out of Monachism sprang the most heterogeneous tendencies of the religious spirit. It was the case with many, that the incessant struggles with their own nature, and the large and various inward experience thus acquired, opened to them a profound knowledge of themselves, as well as of the remedy which alone can secure to man the healing of his moral evil, and give him inward peace and repose. They became satisfied, from their own experience, of the vanity of the righteousness which is founded on works; while, in reliance on the grace of redemption, in child-like submission to God, they found a spring of comfort, of peace and power, which they could never have found in all the discipline of asceticism. Thus there occasionally sprung up out of Monachism, a warm and living Christianity, having its seat in the heart, and exerting its influence there; — a Christianity directly opposed to the opus operatum of asceticism. We see this in the example of Chrysostom, who was trained up under the influence of the monastic life; in that of Nilus, who, in his letters on trusting in works which cannot stand, often points away from this, to trust in the Redeemer alone;[3] and in the

[1] See his poetical description of his travels.

[2] Synesii Dion. *Οὓς οὐχ ἡ πρώτη φύσις ἐπὶ τόνδε τὸν βίον ἐξώρμησεν· ὥσπερ δὲ ἄλλο τὶ τῶν εὐδοκιμούντων, τὴν γενναίαν αἱρέσιν ἐζηλώκασι παντοδάποι τὲ ὄντες τὰ γένη καὶ κατὰ χοείαν ἑκάστοι συνιστάμενοι.*

[3] For instance, in his beautiful exposition of Rom. 2: 15, l. III. ep. 284. "We shall be our own accusers in the day of judgment, if our own conscience condemns us. What other defence or help shall we then find, in that state of anxiety, besides reliance on our most compassionate Lord, Christ alone? Like a benevolent, peace-bringing, friendly angel, the remembrance of Christ, our dearly beloved Master, presents itself to us in the midst of our despondency, and the deep-rooted, unshaken faith in him has banished trembling and shame,

example of their contemporary, Marcus.[1] Nor were *all* those who exercised themselves in subduing the power of sense by the severest abstinence, therefore governed by the delusive notion that the essence of Christian perfection consisted in such works of renunciation and mortification of self, and that it was possible, in this way, to obtain especial merit in the sight of God. The monk Marcianus, who lived towards the close of the fourth century, in a desert of Syria, and was famed for the rigid austerity of his life, furnishes a remarkable example to the contrary. Attracted by his universal renown, Avitus, an aged monk, came from another desert to visit him. Marcian, out of his scanty means, had provided himself with the best meal which could be procured. Having conversed awhile with each other, and united in prayer about the third hour after noon, the hermit served up his meal in a dish, and invited Avitus to partake of it. But the latter declined, saying, that it was not his custom to eat before evening, and that he often fasted two and even three days together. "Well, then," said Marcian, "to oblige me, deviate a little to-day from your usual habits; for I am ill, and cannot wait till evening." As this representation of the case, however, made no difference with his guest, who was determined not to relax in the least from his austere rule, Marcian said: "I am very sorry you have come so far in the expectation of seeing a man of strict self-control, and that you must be disappointed of your hopes, since, instead of that, you have found in me a person who indulges himself." At hearing this, Avitus was troubled, and declared he would prefer rather to eat flesh, than allow any such thing to be said. Then said Marcian: "I also lead the same life as you do, and am accustomed to eat only when night approaches. But we know that love is better than fasting; for the former is a divine law, while the latter, on the contrary, is a rule which we impose on ourselves of free choice."[2]

But, on the other hand, there also sprang up, out of Monachism, the spirit of self-righteousness on the ground of works; a legal morality separated from all connection with the inward essence of the gospel, and tending especially to keep back the consciousness of the need of redemption; the spirit of a slavish self-mortification, at war with the essence of Christian liberty; the spirit of a pharisaical, ascetic pride. Many, who felt the ungodly impulses in human nature, were persecuted the more by impure thoughts, the more they gave heed to them, instead of employing their minds on other subjects capable of tasking their utmost powers. Many, who would violently suppress the purely human impulses of their nature, as if they were a hindrance to the

filled the heart with joy, and brought back the wanderer from God to union and fellowship with him."

[1] See, e. g. in his smaller tracts, the section *περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι.* Bibl. patr. Galland. T. VIII. f. 13. He says, for example: "Some suppose they possess true faith, without keeping the commandments; but others, who keep them, expect the kingdom of God as a reward, which God is bound to bestow on them: both are far from the kingdom of heaven. If Christ died for us according to the scriptures, and we live not to ourselves, but to him who died for us and rose again, we are assuredly pledged to serve him, even till death. How can we, then, look upon our adoption by God as a reward which he is bound to confer on us?"

[2] Theodoret. religios. hist. c. 3.

striving after moral perfection,[1] and yet could not wholly stifle the voice of nature, as we saw above in the example of Anthony, — many of these tormented themselves in vain; they devised the strangest expedients for the crucifixion of self and the mortification of their nature; yet without advancing a step in true inward holiness. The legal, slavish spirit of Pharisaism; fear of malignant fiends and of the evil one; fear of the dreadful images of divine wrath, came in place of the child-like, free, cheerful, God-trusting spirit of Christian love. We are here presented with appearances which remind us rather of the spirit of the self-torturing Saniahs of India striving to unman themselves, than of the temper of child-like love, resignation and cheerfulness, which the gospel brings with it. A few examples will illustrate this.

Eusebius, a monk in Syria, employed another, by the name of Ammianus, to read to him from the gospels. But certain countrymen, who happened to be ploughing in a neighboring field, drew off his attention, so that a portion, which he had not distinctly understood, must be read over a second time. To punish himself for this, he took a vow, that he would never go in any other way or direction, than one narrow path that led to the church. And, to compel himself always to look to the earth, he fastened about his loins an iron girdle, riveted to his neck a heavy iron collar, and by a chain connected this collar to his girdle; thus bringing himself into such a bending posture, that he must always look to the earth. Being asked for what useful purpose he was submitting to so painful a constraint, which allowed him neither to look up to heaven nor around on the fields, he replied: it was a stratagem he was employing against Satan; thus confining his conflict with Satan to such trifling matters, where he had but little to lose nor Satan much to gain, and where if the latter was overcome, still the victory would appear to be not worth the contest. This, to be sure, was reducing the struggle against sin, and the work of sanctification, from the interior of the heart to a mere outward play with mechanics! Another, who had invented a refined species of torture for the castigation of himself, assigned as a reason for it, that, conscious of his sins and the punishment they deserved, he was seeking, by means of these self-inflicted pains, to lessen the severer punishment which threatened him in hell.[2] Here, in the obscuration of the Christian consciousness of redemption, we find the germ of the whole unevangelical theory respecting penance, as a volun-

[1] Even those who were influenced more by the spirit of pure Christianity, yet suffered themselves to be so far misled, by the false notions of the monks respecting estrangement from the world, by seeking after likeness to God in the renunciation of their own human nature, as to mistake altogether, on this point, the essential character of Christianity, which would adopt into itself all the pure feelings of humanity, aiming simply to inspire into them a new life, to sanctify and ennoble them. Thus Nilus himself requires of the monk, that he should suppress within him all remembrance of earthly relationships, reckoning this a part of the duty of becoming dead to the world; so entirely did he misapprehend the nature of Christian renunciation of the world, which has reference to the world only as opposed to God and his kingdom; to that which is ungodly. In like manner, he requires of the monk, that he should show acts of kindness to his necessitous relatives, in precisely the same way as to the poor who are entirely strangers. See Nil. l. III. ep. 290.

[2] Hist. religios. c. 28.

tary satisfaction paid to divine justice; out of which grew the doctrine of indulgences, and many other superstitious notions.

In this way arose the class, called the Stylites, who spent whole years standing on lofty pillars. Thus Simeon, for example, who was the first of this order, and lived about the beginning of the fifth century, finally established himself on a column which measured six and thirty ells, or sixty feet from the ground. We have already spoken of the impression produced by this extraordinary spectacle, and of its effects in leading to the conversion of rude pagan tribes.[1] Simeon is said to have been the instrument of much good, also, by the exhortations to repentance which he gave from his pillar, and by settling disputes and restoring peace between enemies. To these benevolent labors of the man, Theodoret appeals, in endeavoring to defend him from the reproach with which he might, not without reason, be charged, for expending the energies of his will upon so frivolous a thing. Divine grace — so he supposes — had thus operated through him, in order to arrest, by such an extraordinary phenomenon, the attention of men who were not to be instructed except through their senses, and to bring them, by this means, to the divine doctrine itself. His language deserves notice: "As princes, after certain periods, change the emblems on their coins, choosing sometimes the lion, at others, stars or angels, for the die, and endeavoring to give a higher value to the gold by the striking character of the impression; so God has made piety assume these novel and varied forms of life, like so many new characters, to awaken the admiration, not only of the disciples of the faith, but also of the unbelieving world."[2] Doubtless he was right in supposing, that the spirit of Christian piety, although ever one and the same, is yet capable of exhibiting itself in manifold forms of life, as these vary with the changing forms of culture; yet this spirit, nevertheless, cannot take such forms as contradict, and threaten to suppress or to render indistinct, its own essential character. Christian piety needed not to be stamped with a form so foreign from its own nature, and adapted to excite the wonder of rude men, in order to prepare the way for exerting its appropriate influence. The divine power within it operates by its own energy, though not always in so sudden and surprising a manner, yet the more deeply and thoroughly, just because it operates, not on the senses and the imagination, but on that which affines to God in human nature. Had Simeon planted himself down among those rude men, and labored among them, by preaching the gospel in words and works, by a life animated by the spirit of self-sacrificing love, he would not perhaps have so speedily induced thousands to submit to baptism; but, what is far more, he would have gradually introduced the power of the gospel into their hearts, and, by its means, brought about a new creation. On the other hand, after so sudden an impression, which was, in all respects, agreeable to the taste of the natural man, who looks after the godlike in outward appearances, men were easily led to form their conception of Christianity accordingly, as a religion designed to com-

[1] See p. 118.

[2] Hist. religios. c. 25, T. III. pag. 1274.

municate to their previous modes of feeling and thinking — as we so often find it in the case of conversions produced after this manner — a different form, much rather than a different spirit. The natural man, under which scriptural name we include alike the rude and the wrongly educated, is, beyond question, more easily impressed by that which strikes the eye as something superhuman, than by the appearance of the truly godlike which lies concealed under the cover of the purely human form; but that impression, too, will be far more likely to lead men to deify that which has produced such an effect on the senses, than to worship Him who alone is to be worshipped. And of this we have an example in the present case; for the images of this Simeon were regarded with a sort of superstitious veneration, and the figure of him, as Theodoret informs us, presented under the form of a protecting spirit, was set up, as a species of amulet, at the entrance of the shops in Rome.

Many a person might, doubtless, be prompted by ambition to subdue and bring under his sensuous nature, even to as great an extent as this Simeon did; and still be very far from presenting the vastly more difficult offering of inward self-denial, which was not to be done by such artificial modes of discipline.[1] That truly devout and pious monk, Nilus, rightly directs the attention of one of these Stylites to the very point where he failed, to the radical evil within, which, in this partial victory itself over the flesh, found such means of nourishment: "Whoever exalts himself," he writes to him, "shall be abased. You have done nothing worthy of praise, in having stationed yourself on a lofty pillar; and yet you wish to obtain the greatest praise. But look to it, lest for the moment you be extravagantly praised here by mortals, but be obliged hereafter, contrary to your hopes, to appear wretched before the eternal God; because you were intoxicated here by the undeserved praise of men."[2]

There were, in fact, monks who carried dehumanization to such an extreme, as to divest themselves of every attribute which gives dignity to humanity, and to become mere brutes. As if without consciousness, and as if deprived of their senses in broad day, they wandered about, like wild animals, in deserts and on mountains, supporting their wretched existence on the herbs with which nature supplied them.

[1] The story perhaps may be true, although there was nothing supernatural in it, but only what may be very naturally explained, that Simeon had a vision, which at first he was tempted to consider as real, — a vision which presented before the much-admired man the reflected effervescence of his own spiritual pride, and which he subsequently recognized as an outward temptation of the devil, but which he might, in a more salutary way, have recognized as a temptation arising out of inward corruption. He once imagined he saw an angel appear before him with a chariot of fire, who wanted to transport him to heaven like Elijah, because the angels and blessed spirits were longing after him; and he was already on the point of mounting into the chariot with his right foot, which was therefore sprained, when, as he made the sign of the cross, the phantom of Satan vanished. See acta sanctorum mens. Januar. T. I. f. 271. If this is not a true story, yet the inner truth at least reflected itself in this legend.

[2] L. II. 114. The same writer warns one of these Stylites, l. c. ep. 115, to take heed lest, while he raised his body aloft, his soul should grovel on the earth, and with its thoughts be far removed from heavenly things. Before, he had conversed with men, whom admiration had drawn around him; now he addressed himself particularly to women.

[3] According to an apt similitude, the monks that grazed like animals, the *βόσκοι*. See Sozomen, VI. 33.

While Monachism must be regarded as an institution which properly originated in the Eastern church, and which corresponded particularly to the climate, no less than to the spirit of the East; it was, on the other hand, an institution which found little to favor it in the ruder and more variable climate, and in the more active spirit, of the West. Hence, too, it was a longer time before this product of the East could find its way from that quarter into the Western districts; and, in the first instance, it met here with a more strenuous resistance than in the East. Athanasius was the first, who, during his residence at different times when banished from the East, among the Western people, introduced among them a better knowledge of the Oriental Monachism. His biographical account of the monk Anthony, which was early translated into the Latin, had a great influence in this matter. Besides, respectable bishops of the West, who had been banished to the East during the Arian controversies, brought back with them, on their return, the enthusiasm for the monastic life; as for instance, Eusebius of Vercelli. Men possessing such great influence as Ambrose of Milan, Martin of Tours, the Presbyter Jerome, contributed subsequently, in the course of the fourth century, still further to awaken and diffuse this tendency of the Christian spirit in Italy and in Gaul. Men and women of the highest rank in Rome were impelled by the ascetic spirit which was spread by Jerome during his residence in that city, to retire from the great world, in which they had shone, and devote themselves, in Palestine or elsewhere, to the monastic life. But Jerome created for himself, by this very influence, a multitude of enemies at Rome, whose attacks induced him to leave that city; and we need not doubt, that the extravagances into which this man was so easily hurried with regard to everything which he undertook to advocate, contributed rather to injure than advance the cause of Monachism which he espoused. Augustin, who softened the exaggerations of Jerome, endeavored to diffuse Monachism in North Africa. He opposed it to the licentious spirit of the strolling, wildly fanatical, Donatist ascetics (the Circumcelliones;) and, beyond question, it had here become quite evident that the ascetic spirit, which had continued to prevail in these districts ever since the spread of Montanism by Tertullian, needed a more rigid discipline and restraint, to keep it from breaking out in those sallies of wild fanaticism, into which it was so apt to be betrayed when left to itself. In the mind of Augustin, Monachism was associated with the ideal, which even before his conversion had floated before a soul so smitten with the craving after the divine; and first, in a form which adapted itself to the Platonism to which he was then devoted. While living, during that memorable period of his life in which the great crisis with him was preparing, in high intellectual society with his friends at Milan, he was seized with the idea of an association of like-minded men, who, united by one spirit, renouncing the cares of the world, and throwing up all worldly property, should live together in the common striving after the contemplation and knowledge of divine things, (in the *συμφιλοσόφειν*;) all the means of the individuals being thrown into a common fund, out of which the common wants should be supplied. In his then existing state

of mind, this ideal, with which the passions and desires that still governed him were in conflict, could serve no other purpose than to bring him to the consciousness of his own moral impotency. But when afterwards he obtained through the gospel the power of bringing his ideal nearer to a realization, the image of that Platonic association was supplanted in his mind by the idea of that primitive apostolical community at Jerusalem, which he strove after, and which, when he became acquainted with Monachism, he supposed he found there once more restored. From this starting point was unfolded in his mind the idea of a spiritual seminary, which he founded. After this model, he planned, when he afterwards became bishop, the canonical community of his clergy.

But he was aware, also, of the corruptions which grew out of the monastic life, and sought to counteract them, and to purify Monachism from the bad influences which were connected with it. To this end, he wrote his work on the obligation of the monks to labor, (de opere monachorum,) which he dedicated to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage; hoping, through his authority and influence, to effect a change for the better. Augustin observes that, in these countries, the majority of the monks consisted of persons from the lower ranks of society; — slaves, to whom their masters had for this object either given, or been willing to give, their freedom,[1] or persons who came from the cultivation of the soil, or from the workshops.[2] It would be a grievous sin, in his opinion, not to admit such persons; for from the ranks of such many truly great men had proceeded; since it is by that which is inconsiderable and vile in the estimation of the world, that God is used to produce the greatest effects, 1 Corinth. 1 : 27. But he rightly feared the danger of idleness and too great freedom, in the case of men who had been accustomed to severe corporeal labor and to rigid restraint. Many were there, who would be right well disposed to exchange a needy, sorrowful, and laborious life, for one free from all care, exempt from labor, and, at the same time, looked up to with universal respect. They who discarded the obligation to manual labor, ventured, in defending their principles, to pervert many passages of the New Testament. When that precept of the apostle Paul, in 2 Thessal. 3 : 12, was objected to them, they appealed, on the other hand, to those misconceived passages in the sermon on the mount, in which all care for the wants of the morrow, hence all labor to acquire the means of sustenance for the morrow, were forbidden. Christian perfection was made to consist in this, — that men should expect, without laboring for their support, to be provided for by the hand of God, like the fowls of the air. This precept of Christ, they contended, Paul could not mean to contradict; the laboring, accordingly, as well as the eating, in those words of Paul, must be understood, not in the literal, but in a spiritual sense, — as referring to the obligation of communicating the nourishment of the divine word, which men had themselves received, to others also, — an example of the perversion of scripture, worthy to be noticed.

[1] See above.

[2] Nunc autem veniunt plerumque ad hanc professionem et ex conditione servili, vel etiam liberti, vel propter hoc a dominis liberati sive liberandi, et ex vita rusticana et ex opificum exercitatione et plebeio labore.

Augustin, in this work, also describes the mischievous consequences which had arisen from the abuse of their liberty, and from idle habits among the monks in the West. In the monkish garb, which made them respected, they were accustomed to stroll about in the provinces trading in reliques, which were something trumped up for the occasion, or pretending that they had parents or relatives in this or that country, whom they were going to visit: they everywhere took advantage of the outward impression of their sanctity to extort money, and oftentimes their hypocrisy was exposed by the vices in the indulgence of which they were surprised.[1]

In the early times of the fifth century, John Cassianus, who became president of a cloister in Massillia, (Marseilles,) introduced the monastic institutions of the East into the South of France, where he made them known by his works on the rules of the cloisters, (institutiones cœnobiales,) and his sketches of the spiritual conversations of the Oriental monks.[2] The cloisters of Southern France became the seats of a practical, Christian spirit, which, amid the distractions and devastations which came over this country during the marauding incursions of barbarous tribes, proved a great blessing to the people; as for instance the cloister on the island of Lerina, (Lerins,) in Provence, in particular. These cloisters became also spiritual seminaries, which sent forth the bishops most distinguished for their self-sacrificing and pious labors; such as Faustus of Riez, (Rhegium, Rheji,) and Cæsarius of Arles. Yet Monachism would perhaps have been unable to withstand the destructive influences which, in this and the next following times, were spreading far and wide, and the irregularities prevailing in the spiritual order would have become more widely diffused in Monachism, which had a still laxer constitution, had not a remarkable man introduced into the monastic life a more settled order and a more rigid discipline, and given it that shaping and direction by which it became so influential an instrument particularly for the conversion and the culture of rude nations by Christianity. This remarkable man was *Benedict*. And since he contributed so much, by the spirit and form which he gave Monachism, to the Christian education of the western nations, we must endeavor to become better acquainted with the history of the formation of his character, and with the work which proceeded from him, in its earliest development.

It is to be lamented, however, that we possess so little that is trustworthy and precise relative to the education, the life and labors of this individual; the oldest source of information — namely, the narrative of the Roman bishop, Gregory the Great, though derived, according to his account, from disciples of Benedict — being so distorted by exaggerations, and the effort to give the whole story a miraculous air, that the facts at bottom do not, in many cases, admit of being any longer ascertained; and in the general type of the wonder-working saint, as seized and delineated in the colors of that age, it is the less possible to find out what in fact were the peculiar characteristics of the man.

[1] § 36. [2] Collationes.

Benedict, born A.D. 480, sprang from a respectable family in the Italian province of Nursia. His parents sent him to Rome, for the purpose of obtaining a literary education. But well might the ingenuous disposition of the young man be only shocked at the dissolute morals by which, at that time, he must have found himself surrounded at Rome. He had probably heard and read about the lives of the Anachorets of the East; and these holy examples possessed so much the more attraction for him, as they were contrasted with the impure exhibitions of character which he saw everywhere around him. He longed for solitude, and left Rome, accompanied, for the first twenty-four miles from that city, by the nurse whom his parents had sent with him as an attendant to Rome, and who, from affection, was unwilling to leave him. But Benedict, following his ascetic bent, deserted her also; and proceeding eight miles further, finally came to a deserted country lying on a lake, which hence bore the name of Sublacus, (Subiaco.) Here he fell in with a monk, named Romanus, to whom he made known his purpose. Struck with admiration at the glowing zeal of the young man, Romanus promised him his assistance and protection. To this person alone, Benedict discovered the grotto in which he had taken up his residence. The cloister of Romanus was near by, and he could therefore provide the young hermit, who was here destitute of all means of subsistence, with bread, by sparing what he brought him from his own daily allowance. A steep rock lying between the cloister and the grotto of Benedict, he had agreed with the latter, that he should let down the bread from the top of the rock, by means of a long rope. To the rope was attached a bell, by the sound of which, Benedict might be directed to the spot where the rope was let down.

After having spent three years in this grotto, he was discovered by some shepherds who were pasturing their flocks in this region; and the story soon spread abroad about the hermit who had here been found. He was shortly held in great veneration through the whole country around, and numbers eagerly pressed forward to supply him with the means of support. His fame became at once so great, that, the place of abbot having fallen vacant in a neighboring convent, the monks conferred the office on him. He told them, it is true, beforehand, that he would not be able to endure their savage manners. Yet he suffered himself to be over-persuaded. The degenerate monks, displeased with his severity, sought to take his life: he told them they might choose themselves an abbot that suited their own disposition, and retired again to his former solitude. But he continually became an object of more general attention, both on account of his contests with the wild monks, and on account of his deliverance from the dangers which threatened him, which tradition afterwards magnified into a miracle. The disturbance of all existing earthly relations, which followed as one of the consequences resulting from the migration of the nations, would at that period impel men to seek the more, and cling firmly to, that which was independent of and superior to all earthly vicissitudes, and could secure them peace and shelter amid the storms of the world. Hence multitudes thronged *to him*, for the purpose of training themselves under his

guidance to the way of life which promised such a refuge; which taught men how to adopt from choice and to love these deprivations, to which many were driven by the necessity of the times. Men of consideration at Rome placed their sons with him, that he might educate and train them for the spiritual life. He was enabled to found twelve cloisters; and to each he distributed twelve monks under a superior. Some he retained under his own guidance. Even *Goths* of the lower ranks came to him: he employed them in such labors as were adapted to their physical powers and stage of culture, as agriculture, and the removal of the wild vegetable growth where gardens were to be planted.[1]

To get rid of the disputes with Florentius, a neighboring priest, Benedict left this district also, after he had distributed his monks into different cloisters under suitable superiors. He himself, accompanied by a few of his followers, retired to the ruins of an ancient castle, which lay on a high mountain, called Castrum Cassinum, where he laid the foundation of one of the most famous of monastic establishments, out of which sprang afterwards the rich abbey of Monte Cassino. Amid the revolutions of these times, Paganism had still been able to maintain itself here among the country people, or to spring up and extend itself anew. He found standing here a grove and temple dedicated to Apollo, in which the peasants made their offerings. He conducted the people, by his preaching, to the faith of the gospel, and induced them to cut down the grove and demolish the temple. In place of the latter, he erected a chapel, consecrated to St. Martin. Even Totila, the king of the Ostro-Goths, evinced his respect for Benedict; and the latter spoke to him with freedom. The labors of this man were a fore-type of the labors of his successors, who, like himself, were occupied mainly in preaching the faith, destroying Paganism, educating the youth, and cultivating the land, and by these means were enabled to accomplish so much. But the monastic rules of which he was the author, are particularly worthy of notice, as an enduring monument of his own spirit, and of the new shaping which, through his instrumentality, was given to the Monachism of the West.

Benedict aimed to counteract the licentious life of the irregular monks,—who roamed about the country, and spread a corrupting influence both on manners and on religion,— by the introduction of a severer discipline and spirit of order. The abbot should appear to the monks as the representative of Christ; to his will, every other will should be subjected; all were to follow his direction and guidance unconditionally, and with entire resignation. No one was received into the number of the monks, until after a year's novitiate, during which he had often been reminded of the strict obligations of the monastic rule, and had withstood many trials. Then he was obliged to place himself under a solemn vow, which moreover was recorded by himself in writing, that he would remain constantly in the cloister,[2] live in all respects according to the rules, and obey the abbot. But the rules admonished the abbot to temper the severity necessary for discipline, by the spirit of

[1] Vita Benedicti, c. VI.

[2] The votum stabilitatis as opposed to the Gyrovagi.

love: He was to let mercy prevail over rigid justice, that he might himself find mercy. He should love the brethren, while he hated their faults. Where he was obliged to punish, he should do it with prudence, and beware of going to excess. His own fallibility should be ever present to his mind, and he should remember that the bruised reed ought not to be broken. Not that he should give countenance and encouragement to vice, but that he should endeavor to extirpate it with prudence and love, just as he should see it would be salutary for each individual; and he should strive rather to be loved than to be feared. He should not be restless and over-anxious. In no affair whatever should he be inclined to extremes and obstinate. He should not be jealous, nor too suspicious; since otherwise he never could find peace. In his commands, even where they related to worldly employments and labors, he should proceed with foresight and reflection. He should discriminate and moderate the labors which he imposed on each individual. He should take for his pattern the example of prudence presented in the words of the patriarch Jacob, Gen. 33 : 13 : "If men should overdrive them one day, all the flock will die." With that discretion which is the mother of the virtues, he should so order all things as to give full employment to the enterprise of the strong, without discouraging the weak. True, humility was too much confounded with slavish fear, and too much importance was attached to the outward demeanor. The monk was to let his humility be seen in the postures of his body; his head should be constantly bowed down with his eyes directed to the earth, and he should hourly accuse himself for his sins; he should ever be in the same state of mind as if he were momently to appear before the dread judgment-seat of God. But all this, however, Benedict represented to be only a means of culture, whereby the monks were to attain to the highest end of love, that makes men free; respecting the nature of which, he thus beautifully expresses himself: "When the monk has passed through all these stages of humility, he will soon attain to that love of God, which, being perfect, casteth out fear, and through which he will begin to practise naturally and from custom, without anxiety or pains, all those rules which he before observed not without fear. He will no longer act from any fear of hell, but from love to Christ, from the energy of right habits, and joy in that which is good."

Benedict was doubtless aware, that the ascetic severity of many of the monastic orders in the East was unsuited to the rude men of the West, and also to the more unfriendly climate. Hence he did not require of his monks many of the mortifications which were sometimes imposed upon those of the East, and allowed them in several indulgences, which were there sometimes forbidden; as, for example, the use of wine in a prescribed quantity.[1] As the monks, in addition to their devotional exercises and spiritual studies, were also to be employed at hard labor in the field or in their different trades, and in some

[1] C. 40. Licet legamus, vinum omnino monachorum non esse, sed quia nostris temporibus id monachis persuaderi non potest; and c. 73, he explains himself that his rule was to lead only ad honestatem morum et initium conversationis, not ad perfectionem conversationis — that the latter must be learned from the rules of the fathers.

seasons of the year, particularly seed-time and harvest, might be exposed to severe toil, the prudent Benedict[1] was careful not to prescribe any particular measure of food or drink, which was never to be exceeded. The abbot was at liberty to deviate from the general rule, according to the labors which devolved on the monks, and according to the season of the year. In like manner, it was strictly enjoined on the abbot, that he should have respect to the necessities of the sick and the feeble, of old men and of children, in the regulation of their diet, and of their occupations. He doubtless foresaw that the monks might settle down in rough and savage countries, as they afterwards often did, where they would not find even that measure of food and drink which he had allowed them. Reckoning on this, he exhorted them to submission: even *then* they should praise God, and not murmur.[2] Worthy of notice, too, is the pains he took to avoid all appearance of the love of gain; laying it down as a rule, that the monks should always sell the products of their industry at a somewhat lower price than was given for other worldly fabrics, so that in all things God might be praised.[3]

The same circumstances of the times by which so many were induced to apply to Benedict for the purpose of being formed and disciplined under his guidance for the spiritual life, tended also to promote the enthusiasm for the monastic life which proceeded from Benedict's disciples, and to further the rapid spread of this form of it by means of his disciples, such as Placidus and Maurus, in Sicily and in Gaul.

3. *The different Tendencies of the Religious Spirit in their relation to the Monastic Life and to Asceticism.*

We will now once more cast a glance at the relation of Monachism to the different tendencies of the religious spirit in this period. There was a very narrow and bigoted enthusiasm for the monastic life, proceeding from the same narrow ascetic tendency which first gave birth to Monachism, and which was greatly promoted by it; — a tendency which, while aiming to exhibit Christian perfection in the monastic life, caused the dignity and elevation of the universal Christian calling to be misapprehended, and contributed very much to lower the standard of piety in the subordinate positions of the ordinary Christian life. This distinction betwixt Christian perfection in Monachism,[4] and the ordinary Christianity of the world and of social life, was taken advantage of by many worldly men, particularly in large towns, who excused their want of Christian earnestness and zeal, and the many stains of their lives, with the plea that they were no monks, but persons living in the midst of the world.

But, along with the fanatical enthusiasm in favor of Monachism, there arose also a blind zeal of another kind in *opposition* to it. Certainly it cannot be denied that the many worthless individuals, who only abused

[1] Who seems to have possessed himself the donum discretionis.
[2] C. 40. Benedicant Deum et non murmurent.
[3] C. 57.
[4] The φιλοσοφία, as it was commonly denominated.

Monasticism to cover up their own wickedness under the show of sanctity, and, under this deceptive veil, to gratify their own worldly passions, mainly contributed to bring the monastic life into hatred and contempt. True, Salvianus, who lived about the middle of the fifth century, brings as a proof of the rude and trifling worldly taste which prevailed at that time in Carthage, that, when monks visited that place from the cloisters of Egypt or Jerusalem, they were received in the streets with jeers and curses;[1] — and there may have been some ground for his complaint. But Nilus, the monk and the zealous friend of Monachism, himself accuses the worthless monks, who roamed about in the cities, pestered families by their impudent mendicancy, and, hiding all wickedness under the mask of their seeming holiness, often robbed their hospitable entertainers. It was owing to such men, that the once universally respected mode of life had become an abomination, and even the true virtue of the monk looked upon as no better than hypocrisy;[2] — that those who were once regarded as the censors of manners, were expelled from the cities as introducers of corruption;[3] — that the monks — which doubtless is an exaggeration — were objects of universal ridicule.[4]

Yet there were many who, instead of detesting this degenerate species of Monachism, rather took advantage of the monstrous births in which this degeneracy was seen, to bring into disrepute this whole mode of life; and who hated, in Monachism, not those excesses which ran in the direction alien from the spirit of Christianity, but precisely those qualities which were most truly and profoundly Christian in this mode of life; — who, with no friendly feelings, felt themselves rebuked and disturbed in their frivolous pursuit after pleasure by such Christian seriousness and strictness of Christian life. The blind zeal of this party for their convenient, worldly Christianity flamed out with the most violence on those occasions when the view of the monastic life, or the influence of pious monks in noble families themselves, had served to awaken there a more earnest and elevated sense of religion; when they witnessed in these cases a change of life extending itself which was entirely opposed to their inclinations.[5] Especially when young men of noble birth were induced by sudden impressions, exciting them to a more serious turn of life, or through the influence of pious mothers, to pass over to the monks, not only was the opposition between worldly-minded husbands and their Christian wives, on such occasions, often more strongly expressed, but kinsmen and friends took a lively interest in the matter: they considered it a disgrace to the noble family, that young men who

[1] Salvian. de gubernatione Dei, l. 8, pag. 194, ed. Baluz. Si quando aliquis Dei servus aut de Ægyptiorum cœnobiis aut de sacris Hierusalem locis aut de sanctis eremi venerandisque secretis ad urbem illam officio divini operis accessit, simul ut populo apparuit, contumelias, sacrilegia et maledictiones accipit.

[2] Nilus de monastica exercitatione, c. 9. Ὁ περιποθήτος βίος ἐγένετο βδελύκτος καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀληθῶς κὰτ' ἀρέτην βιούντων κτήσις, (it should read perhaps ἀσκήσις,) ἀπάτη νενομίσται.

[3] L. c. Ὡς λυμεώνες ἀπελαύνονται τῶν πολέων οἱ ποτὲ σωφρονισταί.

[4] C. 22. Παρὰ πάντων χλευάζονται.

[5] Thus, in the times of cardinal Richelieu and Louis the Fourteenth in France, it was assuredly not the free spirit of the gospel, but the frivolous, worldly temper, the Christianity of politics, the ceremonial religion of Jesuitism, which is doubtless reconcileable with them both, which set itself to oppose the effects which flowed from the glowing, ascetic zeal of an abbe St. Cyran and his followers.

might one day rise to the most splendid posts, should betake themselves to the mountains and the deserts, go about in the squalid dress of the monks, weave baskets, cultivate the soil, water gardens, and employ themselves in other such menial occupations.[1] The whole party who detested Monachism, but with it also every other form of earnest Christian life, was roused to activity on such occasions. When the emperor Valens, in 365, promulgated a law which, perhaps not without good grounds, was aimed against those who, under the pretext of religion, but really for the sake of indulging their indolent propensities and ridding themselves of the burdens of the state, had withdrawn themselves into the monkish fraternities;[2] the party above mentioned availed themselves of this opportunity to institute persecutions against the monks. Chrysostom, who was at that time himself a zealous monk, felt himself called upon, on this occasion, to write his three books on Monachism.

But between these two extremes there was a more moderate party, which, while they recognized all that was truly of worth in Monachism, opposed on evangelical grounds the one-sided over-valuation of this, and the under-valuation of every other form of life which should equally be pervaded with the Christian spirit. This tendency is apparent in the council of Gangra, already mentioned. Here the ascetic and unmarried life was admitted to be, in itself considered, and so far as it proceeded from a pious disposition, a good thing; but the married life also, and life in the ordinary civil and social relations, together with the use of earthly goods, were represented as capable of being sanctified by a right temper; and sentence of condemnation was pronounced on the proud ascetic spirit that despised the common relations of life. This tendency particularly characterizes Chrysostom. Although himself greatly indebted to Monachism for the character of his inner life; although everywhere inclined to place a very high value on the victorious power of the will over the sensuous nature, where it was enlivened by the spirit of love; although enthusiastically alive to the ideal of holy temper and holy living in Monachism; yet he was too deeply penetrated by the essence of the gospel, not to be aware that the latter should pervade *all the relations of life*. And his large experience, gained at Antioch and at Constantinople, had led him to see how mischievous the delusive notion that men could not strive after the ideal of the Christian life amid ordinary earthly relations, must be, and had actually been, to practical Christianity. This delusion, therefore, he sought in every way to counteract. After having described, in one of his discourses, the various means of grace which Christianity furnishes, he supposes the objection to be raised: "Why say you this to us, who are no

[1] See Chrysostomus adversus oppugnatores vitæ monasticæ, l. I. § 2. Ἀνθρώπους ἐλευθέρους καὶ εὐγενεῖς καὶ δυναμένους ἐν τρόφῃ ζῆν, ἐπὶ τὸν σκληρὸν τοῦτον ἀγομένους βίον.

[2] Cod. Theodos. l. 12, Tit. I. l. 63. Quidam ignaviæ sectatores desertis civitatum muneribus captant solitudines ac secreta, et specie religionis cum cœtibus monazontôn congregantur, — they should be drawn forth from their lurking-places, and compelled to take on them the burdens of the state; or they should, like the clergy, (see vol. II. sect. 1, p. 139,) give up their property to others.

monks?" And he answers, "Do you put this question to me? Ask Paul, when he says, 'Watch with all perseverance and supplication,' Ephes. 6: 18, and 'Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ,' Rom. 13: 14; for surely he wrote these words, not for monks only, but for all inhabitants of cities. Except in relation to marriage, there ought to be no distinction between the secular and the monk; everything else the former is bound to do equally with the latter. And Christ, in the sermon on the mount, confines not his benediction to the monk. Enjoy the marriage estate with due moderation, and you shall be first in the kingdom of heaven, and entitled to all its blessings."[1] And in another place, where he is speaking of the prophetic visions of Isaiah:[2] "Would you know how the prophet saw God? Be yourself, too, a prophet. And how is this possible, do you ask, since I have a wife, and must provide for the bringing up of my children? It is possible, if you do but will it; for the prophet also had a wife, and was the father of two children; but none of these things was a hindrance to him." In expounding the first words of salutation in the epistle to the Ephesians, he lays particular stress on the circumstance that to men who had wives, children, and servants, Paul nevertheless applies the appellation of saints. Although Chrysostom — which may easily be accounted for in a man of such predominant and lively feelings — did not always express himself after the same manner; yet when he had become acquainted, from his own experience, with the corruption of the church, he often declared himself with great energy against the want of Christian love among the better disposed, who in solitude lived only for their own improvement, instead of employing the gifts bestowed on them for the good of others. "Behold what perverseness now reigns," says he in one passage. "They who possess some of the joy of a good conscience dwell on the tops of mountains, and have torn themselves from the body of the church, as if it were inimical and alien to them; something not their own."[3] Thus, too, he complains, in his *sixth* homily on the first epistle to the Corinthians,[4] that they in whom there were still some remains of the old Christian wisdom, had forsaken the cities, the market, and the intercourse of life, and, instead of forming others, took possession of the mountains. "How shall we conquer the enemy," he exclaims, "when some have no care for virtue, and those who are interested for it, retreat to a distance from the order of battle?" And in another discourse he very justly refers to the parable of the talents, as a proof that there can be nothing truly good, the advantage of which does not extend also to others; and he goes on to say: "Though you fast, though you sleep on the ground, though you eat ashes and mourn perpetually, but without benefiting any other individual, you will not bring much to pass. Though you exercise the highest perfection of the monk, but give yourself no concern that others are going to ruin, you cannot maintain a good conscience in the sight of God.[5] Neither vol-

[1] Hom. VII. Hebr. § 4.
[2] Homilia in Seraphim, § 1. Montfaucon, VI. f. 138.
[3] Hom. VII. Ephes. § 4.
[4] Hom. VI. ep. I. ad Corinth. § 4.
[5] Κἂν τὴν ἄκραν φιλοσοφίαν ἀσκῇς, τῶν δὲ λοίπων ἀπολλυμένων ἀμελῇς, οὐδεμίαν κτήσῃ παρὰ θεῷ παῤῥησίαν.

untary poverty, nor martyrdom, nor anything else we may do, can testify in our favor, if we have not attained to the crowning virtue of love."[1]

As we here perceive, Chrysostom attacked the exaggerated opinion of Monachism, by assuming for his position the consciousness of the universal Christian calling, the sense of the principle of holy living, which he recognized as belonging in common to all true believers; but he was still too much influenced by the prevailing views of his time to be able always to carry out and apply that position with logical consistency. It is apparent here, as it often is in his case, that on one side he was confined by the prevailing spirit of his age; while, on the other, by his profound insight into the essence of the gospel, he rose above it, and was thus betrayed into self-contradiction. On the other hand, there arose in the Western church, at Rome, another man, who had the courage and freedom of spirit to express and apply that fundamental principle, in direct opposition to the prevailing views of the time, and, from this main position, to attack the whole ascetic way of estimating moral worth. This was the monk Jovinian, who flourished near the end of the fourth century. It may appear singular, that this reäction against Monachism should proceed from Monachism itself; but this was a natural reäction springing from the inner Christian life, which in many was roused into action by Monachism — a phenomenon which often occurred. Thus we saw already the indications of such a reäction in the case of a Nilus and of a Marcus.

Jovinian, the protestant of his time, went on the principle, "that there is but one divine element of life, which all believers share in common; but one fellowship with Christ, which proceeds from faith in him; but one new birth. All who possess this in common with each other — all, therefore, who are Christians in the true sense, not barely in outward profession — have the same calling, the same dignity, the same heavenly blessings; the diversity of outward circumstances creating no difference in this respect." Accordingly he supposes an opposition altogether universal, admitting of no intermediate link, no grade of difference, between those who find themselves in this state of grace, and those who are shut out from it. Hence he derives the conclusion, that the life of celibacy or that of marriage, eating or fasting, the using or forbearing to use earthly goods, all this can make no difference between Christians, where the same one ground of the Christian life is present. Everything depends on the inward Christian life, on the temper of the heart, not on the outward forms of life and on outward works by themselves considered, in which forms and works the temper which makes the Christian only reveals itself. Of course, the whole theory respecting a loftier, ascetic stage of Christian perfection, respecting the difference between the counsels which Christ gave to those only who strove after that stage of perfection, and the ordinary duties incumbent on all Christians, respecting the merit of certain outward works, fell to the ground. "Virgins, widows, and married women," said he, "who have been

[1] Epist. I. ad Corinth. H. 25.

once baptized into Christ, have the same merit, if, in respect to works, there is otherwise no difference between them.[1] The apostle Paul says, 'Know ye not, that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost?' He speaks of one temple, not in the plural number, to denote that God dwells after the same manner in all. And as the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God, so should there be also but one people in them, John 17 : 21, that is, his dear children, who are partakers of the divine nature.[2] The apostle John makes no other distinction than one, between those who are born of God and sin not, and those who are not born of God. Christ makes no other separation than that between those who stand on the right and those who stand on the left hand, the sheep and the goats."

Jovinian did not allow himself to be hurried on by an inconsiderate zeal unconditionally to condemn fasting, the life of celibacy, Monachism, considered purely by themselves, though, in other respects, he seems to have been inclined to extremes in polemical matters. Estimating the power and worth of Christianity only by its influence on the temper, it was therefore the temper only which he attacked in the present case; the presumption and arrogance which attributed to the unmarried and ascetic life, a peculiar merit beyond the other tendencies of the Christian life generally. Hence he continued to live as a monk himself, and so refuted the charge that he had devised such doctrines merely for the sake of liberating himself from a yoke which was irksome to him. "It amounts to the same thing," said he, "whether a person abstain from this or that food, or partakes of it with thanksgiving. I do thee no injustice," he remarked, addressing those who lived in celibacy; "if thou hast chosen the unmarried life on the ground of a present necessity, be careful only not to exalt thyself. Thou art a member of the same church to which the married also belong." He merely sought to show, that men were wrong in recommending so highly and indiscriminately the life of celibacy and fasting, though he was ready to admit, that both, under certain circumstances, might be good and beneficial.

In respect to marriage, he appealed in its defence to the fact, that so great worth was ascribed to it immediately at the creation; and that it might not be said that this had reference to the Old Testament alone, the same testimony had been confirmed by Christ, Gen. 2 : 24; Matth. 19 : 5. He adduced the example of the married saints, from the Old Testament, to defend himself against the common objection, that this applied only to the early infancy of mankind, when the multiplication of the race was particularly necessary; and added such proof passages from the New Testament as 1 Timoth. 5 : 14; Heb. 13 : 4; 1 Corinth. 7 : 39; 1 Timoth. 2 : 14.[3] He pointed to the fact, that Paul required

[1] Virgines, viduas, et maritatas, quæ semel in Christo lotæ sunt, si non discrepant cæteris operibus, ejusdem esse meriti.

[2] Et quomodo Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus unus Deus; sic et unus populus in ipsis sit, hoc est quasi filii carissimi, divinæ consortes naturæ.

[3] It is worthy of notice, that Jerome (l. I. § 30, contra Jovinian) cited the whole book of Solomon's Song as an evidence in favor of marriage. From this we might infer, that he rejected the mystical interpretation of that book, which was then common; and in this case we should have here another

of the bishop and deacon only that each should be the husband of one wife, that he accordingly sanctioned the marriage of the clergy. In respect of fasts, he cited Rom. 14 : 20; 1 Timoth. 4 : 3; that, according to the declaration of Paul, to the pure all things are pure; that Christ was pronounced by the Pharisees a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners; that he did not disdain the banquet of Zaccheus, and that he attended the marriage-feast at Cana.[1] Christ chose the wine for the sacrament of the supper, the wine as a holy symbol.[2] He says, justly, that those mortifications could not be possessed of any peculiar Christian character, since they were practised also among the Pagans in the worship of Cybele and of Isis.[3] But it must have been an extremely contracted notion of final ends, which led him to understand the proposition, that all other creatures are made for the use of man, in the sense that they were intended only *to subserve man's sensual wants*. Accordingly he reckoned up a number of animals, which, if they were not to serve as food for man, were created by God to no purpose, and he inferred that therefore it must have been the Creator's design that man should eat flesh;[4] a conclusion which Jerome found it quite easy to refute.

Not merely in reference to the outward works of *asceticism*, but also in other respects, Jovinian took a decided stand against that false direction of the moral spirit of his age, which looked to external works alone, instead of looking only at the temper of the heart; as was seen, for example, in the exaggerated opinion entertained of martyrdom, solely on the ground of the outward suffering. He expressed himself as follows: "A person may be burnt, strangled, beheaded, in a time of persecution, or he may flee or die in the prison. These are indeed different kinds of conflict; but there is only one crown of victory."

The false direction of morals against which Jovinian took his stand, having its ground in the fact that men did not apprehend the Christian life on the side of its inward connection with faith, it came about for this very reason, that to outward works was ascribed a meritoriousness of various degrees; and the fear of future punishment, the aspiration after the higher stages of blessedness, were employed as incentives to moral and ascetic exertions. Jovinian, on the other hand, went on the principle that the true Christian, who by faith has become partaker of

proof of the more liberal, inquiring spirit of the man. But the language which he employs respecting the church, (Jerome, l. II. § 19,) sola novit canticum Christi, seems, notwithstanding, to point to a mystical interpretation of Solomon's Song. In the present case, we can understand the argumentation of Jovinian only as follows: The holiest of things, the union of Christ with his church, would not have been represented here under such images, so carried out, if the union betwixt the two sexes were not a sacred thing.

[1] Jovinian's manner is characteristically presented in the words: Porro aliud est, si stulta contentione dicitis, eum isse ad prandium jejunaturum, et impostorum more dixisse: hoc comedo, illud non comedo, nolo vinum bibere, quod ex aquis creavi.

[2] In typo sanguinis sui non obtulit aquam, sed vinum. From the fact that the word "typus" is here employed, it cannot be directly inferred, that he ascribed to the sacrament of the supper only a symbolical significancy; for this name is given to the external symbols, as such, even by those who attached other notions to them; for example, by Cyril of Jerusalem.

[3] Quasi non et superstitio gentilium castum matris Deum observet et Isidis.

[4] Quis usus porcorum absque esu carnium? Quid capreæ, cervuli, etc. Cur in domibus gallina discurrit? Si non comeduntur, hæc omnia frustra a Deo creata sunt.

a divine life, is already certain of his salvation. He has nothing higher to aspire after, than that which is already secured to him by faith: he needs only to preserve what he has received, to seek to persevere in the state of grace in which he has once been placed;—and this can be done only in the progressive life of holiness. "If you ask me," said he, "wherefore the just man should be actively exerting himself, whether in times of peace or of persecution, when there is no progress, when there are no greater rewards; I answer, he does this, not that he may deserve something more, but that he may not lose what he has already received."[1]

Wherever there is a living faith, there, according to Jovinian, is fellowship with the Redeemer; there is divine life; and wherever this is, there it comes off victorious, by its own intrinsic power over all evil; there sin can find no entrance. The good tree can bring forth only good fruit; the evil tree must bring forth evil fruit. He who is born of God, doth not commit sin. Hence it also followed, that whoever had, by regeneration, received the divine life, could not any longer live in that slavish fear of sin to which the monastic asceticism had linked itself, together with its preventive remedies and cunningly devised tricks for foiling Satan. See above. In opposing this painful asceticism, Jovinian remarked, "He who is baptized, cannot be tempted of the devil." As he proceeded on the principle of referring *the inward life* to Christ as its source, he must have understood here by baptism, not so much an outward baptism operating with the power of a charm, as the inward baptism growing out of faith, the baptism of the Spirit. "In those who are tempted," says he, "it is seen, that, like Simon Magus, they have received only the water, not the spiritual baptism. The spiritual baptism they only have received, who have been baptized with the genuine faith by which regeneration is obtained."[2] The first of the above-cited passages might be so understood, as if Jovinian considered the state of the regenerate to be one beyond the reach of all temptations; in which view he might justly be charged with teaching a practically mischievous error. But this assuredly could *not* be his meaning; for otherwise he could not have spoken of the moral efforts of the just man. See above. And moreover, he himself clearly explains how he understands the phrase "to be tempted," in that proposition, when he says, that such a person cannot be overcome by Satan in temptations, cannot be plunged into guilt.[3]

Without doubt, however, Jovinian must have supposed, according to this assertion, that he who had been once really regenerated, could not

[1] As we have remarked already, that the views of Jovinian are not to be considered as wholly insulated from all other phenomena of the age, but as connected with a more general reäction of the Christian spirit excited by Monachism itself; so we may observe in the present case a remarkable analogy between Jovinian's expressions and those of the monk Marcus; for also Marcus says: "We who have been deemed worthy of the laver of regeneration, offer good works, not for the sake of a reward, but to preserve the purity which has been imparted to us." Ὅσοι τοῦ λούτρου τῆς παλιγγενεσίας ἠξιωθήμεν, τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἔργα οὐ δι' ἀνταπόδοσιν προσφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ φυλακήν τῆς δοθείσης ἡμῖν καθαρότητος. Bibl. patr. Galland. T. VIII. f. 14, § 22.

[2] Plena fide in baptismate renati.

[3] Eum a diabolo non posse subverti. According to Jerome, in the beginning of his first book against Jovinian.

again fall from the state of grace; — that whenever one who appeared to have been baptized, to believe, was surprised into sin, this was evidence that he did not as yet possess living faith, had not as yet been really renewed.

As it is extremely easy for a man, in combating one error, to fall into another of an opposite kind, so it seems to have happened with Jovinian. We noticed how, in opposition to the over-valuation of a certain species of outward works, and to the theory of a certain loftier, ascetic Christian perfection, he gave prominence to the unity of the divine life in all believers. Again, Jovinian attacked the arbitrary theory, grounded on a misconception of the passage in 1 John, 5: 17, according to which sins were classified, by reference solely to the outward act, into mortal (peccata mortalia) and venial sins, (peccata venialia,) a division by which the number of sins excluding from eternal life was often extremely limited. In opposition to such a theory, he maintained that the gospel required, and brought along with it, a new, holy disposition, with which every sin, of whatever kind it might be, stood directly opposed; that the new man, the new life from God, excluded everything sinful; that as all goodness springs out of the same disposition of love to God, so, too, all sin, however different it might be in outward appearance, proceeded from the same fountain, manifested the same ungodly life. Christ says: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." As Christ then dwells in us without any grade of distinction whatever, so we also dwell in Christ without any degree of difference. "If a man love me," saith the Lord, "he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." Whoever is righteous, loves, and whoever loves, to him come the Father and Son, and they dwell in his tabernacle. But where such an inhabitant is, there I think nothing can be wanting to the owner of the dwelling. The gospel presents five virgins that were foolish, and five that were wise: the five who had no oil, remained without; the other five, who had prepared themselves with the light of good works, entered with the bridegroom into the bride-chamber. The righteous were saved with Noah, the sinners were destroyed together. In Sodom and Gomorrah, no other distinction was made account of than that between the righteous and the wicked. The just were delivered, all the sinners were consumed by the same fire. One salvation for those that were saved, one destruction for those that remained behind. Lot's wife is a witness, how no allowance can be made for swerving from righteousness, even in the least respect. Whoever says to his brother, "Thou fool, and Raca," is in danger of hell-fire. And whoever is a murderer or an adulterer, is in like manner cast into hell-fire. So, too, he maintained that it was the same thing whether a man became converted early or late. The moment men entered through faith into fellowship with the Redeemer, there was no longer any difference between them; they all possessed the same. "Between the brother who was always with the father, and him who was received afterwards because he had repented, there was no difference. The laborers of the first, the third, the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh hour,

received each alike one penny; and that you may wonder the more, the payment begins with those who had labored the shortest time in the vineyard." But Jovinian did not here consider that although the divine life, as a common property of all who believe, is one and the same, yet different stages are to be found in its development, and in the degree in which man's nature is assimilated and pervaded by it; that, along with the divine life, the principle of sin still continues to linger in believers, which may more or less prevail, or be overcome and suppressed by the divine principle of life; and that in this respect it is assuredly right to speak of a *more or less*, of a distinction of degrees, as well with regard to goodness as to sin.[1] This error lies at the root also of Jovinian's mode of expression, whereby he represents sanctification as a mere preserving of that which had been once received,[2] but not as a progressive development of it.[3]

If, then, in connection with this doctrine, he maintained that a person once regenerated could not be drawn into sin, and if he allowed of no distinction between the outward manifestations of sin; the consequence necessarily follows, that the regenerate individual might indeed be tempted to sin, but could never be so overcome by temptation as to be led into actual sin. Thus his theory would unquestionably conduct to a result contradictory to the universal experience of Christians, which could only be adhered to by a system of self-deception. How far he was really involved in this his one-sided theory, plainly appears from the extremely tortuous methods of explanation by which he seeks to

[1] Excellent are the remarks which Lücke takes occasion to introduce respecting Jovinian, in his beautiful commentary on the epistles of John, for which, certainly, many will join me in thanking him. P. 166. "Jovinian stood at the same ideal position with John; and his ethico-critical efforts, in the spirit of a reformer, were aimed especially in opposition to the mock holiness, the externality, and half-way character of the Christian life of his time, to reässert, in its full clearness, precision and truth, the fundamental moral conception and ideal of the gospel." I could only wish to say in addition, that Jovinian, in opposing the ideal standard of Christianity to that which, having regard barely to the manifestation, and hence overlooking its connection with the idea, respected the mere appearance, failed to distinguish sufficiently between the ideal position, and that of the manifestation; — a distinction which John was careful to observe. Thus he was led in a certain sense to confound the two positions with each other.

[2] Undoubtedly this expression, in itself considered, may admit also of being understood in an altogether faultless sense, so far as all pure development may be regarded as a preserving, securing, and maintaining in its purity of the original principle; and so, too, all progressive sanctification may be considered as the preserving of the divine life imparted by regeneration; as the preserving of the state of innocence into which man has entered through justification. Yet, at the same time, it seems to me to follow necessarily from the whole connection of ideas to be found in the rest of Jovinian's writings, that he gave such undue prominence to the notion of constancy, as was inconsistent with the notion of progressive development in the Christian life.

[3] In the case above cited, where Jovinian remarks that there is no difference between virgins, widows, and married women, provided only they do not differ in respect to their other works, the passage might, to be sure, be so understood as if he meant to assert a possible difference in respect to good works, and accordingly would admit the existence of distinctions in the estimation of moral character. But according to the connection of his ideas as elsewhere exhibited, with which this assertion would otherwise clash, we must conceive, unless we are willing to suppose him inconsistent with himself, that he understood his own position in the following sense: provided only they did not so differ in respect to their other works, as that some of them manifested by their conduct the true baptism of the Spirit, while the others showed by their conduct that they had not received any such baptism, but only the outward baptism of appearance.

bring the passages of scripture, adduced against him by the other party, into harmony with that theory.[1]

We must notice too, by the way, a point which belongs strictly to the evolution of the idea of the church, but which we bring in here on account of the connection in which this point stands also with Jovinian's whole mode of thinking. As he begins and proceeds, in his entire theory, by immediately referring the inner life of each individual, through faith, to Christ, without presupposing any external medium of communication; as, in his way of thinking, the notion of fellowship with Christ had precedence of the notion of the church; so this latter notion, too, must, in his system, take an altogether different position. The notion of the invisible church, as a community of believers and redeemed sinners, spiritually united, was by him made far more prominent than the notion of the visible church, derived from outward tradition. "The church, founded on hope, faith, and charity, is exalted above every attack. No unripe member is within it — all its members are taught of God. No person can break within its enclosure by violence, nor creep in by fraud."[2] It is plainly evident that Jovinian could only have understood by the church, here, the *invisible* church. So, too, in the following predicates which he applies to the church: "The titles bride, sister, mother — and whatever other names you may think of — refer to the community of the one church, which is never without her bridegroom, without her brother, without her son. She has one faith, and within her there arise no schisms by means of erroneous doctrines. She ever remains a virgin to whom the Lamb goes; him she follows, and she alone knows the song of Christ." Of course he can understand by the church, here, only the community of true believers.

Jovinian's reasons against the worth of the unmarried life found admittance among the laity, monks and nuns, in Rome.[3] But it was natural that the Roman bishop Siricius, with whom we have already become acquainted, as a zealous opponent of married priests, should declare strongly against the doctrines of Jovinian. At a Roman synod, held

[1] Thus when, in objection to his views, the parable was cited of the different measure of increase from the scattered seed, according to the different quality of the soil on which it fell, Matth. 13. Luke 8, Mark 4, he maintained that the only point to be held fast here was the difference between the good and the bad ground. All the rest belonged not to the matter of comparison, but to the decoration of the figure; and in favor of this explanation he urged the absurd argument, that the difference of numbers could be of no importance here, because Mark pursued the reverse order in his enumeration. Numerum non facere præjudicium, præsertim quum et evangelista Marcus retrorsum numeret. To defend himself against the application of the words in John 14: 2, "In my Father's house are many mansions," which in fact could be employed by his adversaries in favor of their own side only in a way running directly counter to the connection in which they are found, he opposed it by another interpretation no less contradictory to the connection of the passage, maintaining that by the different mansions were to be understood simply the *different* church communities on earth, which still constituted, however, but one church of God. Non in regno cœlorum diversas significat mansiones; sed ecclesiarum in toto orbe numerum, quæ constat una per septem (h. e. in septem ecclesiis apocalypsêos nonnisi una ecclesia.)

[2] Scimus ecclesiam spe, fide, caritate, inaccessibilem, inexpugnabilem; non est in ea immaturus, omnis docibilis, (scil. a Deo, as the Vulgate translates the term θεοδιδάκτος,) impetu irrumpere vel arte eludere, (it should read perhaps, *illudere*, enter in by trick, by deception,) potest nullus.

[3] Augustin. Hæres. 82, Retract. II. 22.

in 390, he pronounced, in the harshest and most unjustifiable language,[1] sentence of condemnation on Jovinian and eight of his adherents.[2] Jovinian betook himself to Milan, and there perhaps sought to shelter himself under the protection of the emperor then residing in that place. But here he was opposed by the mighty influence of the bishop Ambrose, who had already been made acquainted with the affair by the synodial letter of Siricius, and who, as a zealous promoter of the ascetic tendency and of Monachism, could be no otherwise than a zealous opponent of Jovinian. In his reply to Siricius, written in the name of a synod held at Milan, he declared his agreement with the judgment pronounced by the latter. Jovinian and his friends were banished from Milan. But perhaps the silent working of his influence continued to be felt there, if it were not the case that, independent of him, a similar reäction proceeding out of Monachism itself called forth there an opposition to the spirit of monkish morality.

Ambrose must also witness the influence of these principles among his own monks at Milan. Two persons of this order, Sarmatio and Barbatianus, attracted notice, who, like Jovinian, disputed the peculiar merit of the unmarried life.[3] Not being allowed freely to express their principles in the cloister, they released themselves from that yoke.[4] Next they repaired to the church at Vercelli, where perhaps, as the church happened at that time to be without a bishop, they hoped to find a better reception, and to be able to propagate their principles with less danger of disturbance. But the bishop Ambrose immediately sent warning of them in a letter, which he addressed to the church.[5] He accused them of spreading such doctrines, as that the baptized needed not concern themselves about striving after virtue; that excess in eating and drinking could do them no harm; that it was foolish in them to abstain from the enjoyments of life; that virgins and widows ought to marry. But, in a statement of this sort, it is easy to see the distorting influence of passion. Taking these charges in connection with the doctrine of Jovinian and the other positions held by these men, it becomes probable, that with Jovinian they intended merely to affirm: "Whoever received the baptism of the Spirit, possessed means enough for overcoming sin, and needed not to have recourse to a painful asceticism."

As to the rest, Jerome, the warm opponent of Jovinian, by the exaggerated statements into which he continually fell in conducting his attacks, served rather to place the cause which he defended in an un-

[1] He calls Jovinian luxuriæ magister.

[2] Incentores novæ hæresis et blasphemiæ divina sententia et nostro judicio in perpetuum damnati. For the rest, even Siricius witnesses of the spread of these doctrines, when he says: Sermo hæreticorum intra ecclesia cancri more serpebat.

[3] When Ambrose accuses them besides of asserting: Delirare eos, qui jejuniis castigent carnem suam, ut menti subditam faciant, — this may perhaps be a consequence of his own drawing.

[4] Ambrose intimates himself, that nothing could be objected to them as long as they were at Milan. He points to the reason which chiefly induced them to leave the cloister, when he says: interdicta ludibriosæ disputationi licentia. But it was an ungrounded inference of his own making, when he accuses them of having left the cloister, because they could not indulge, as they wished, in riotous living, nullus erat luxuriæ locus.

[5] Lib. 10, ep. 82, ed. Basil.

favorable light, and to further that of his opponent; for it seemed, according to the statements of the former, that his opponent was right in asserting that men could not extol the life of celibacy without depreciating the state of marriage, which Christ has sanctioned, and thereby outraging the common sense and feeling of Christian men. Augustin, perceiving this, was led to write his book *de bono conjugali*, in which he sought to to do away the above-mentioned objection, by acknowledging the worth of marriage, and yet ascribing a still higher stage of Christian life to the state of celibacy, when chosen out of a right temper of heart. In this tract he distinguishes himself, not only for his greater moderation, but also for a more correct judgment of the ascetic life in its connection with the whole Christian temper; as it is in fact the great merit generally of his mode of apprehending the Christian system of morals, that, like Jovinian, he opposed the tendency to set a value upon the outward conduct, outward works, as an opus operatum, without regard to their relation to the disposition of the heart. By giving prominence to the latter, Augustin approached Jovinian; and he would have come still nearer to him, had he not been on so many sides fettered to the church spirit of his times.[1]

Among the opponents of the ascetic spirit and of Monachism, should be noticed, also, a person respecting whom we shall have occasion to speak again, as an antagonist of the prevailing tendencies of the church spirit, — the presbyter *Vigilantius*. He probably believed that the words of our Lord to the rich young man were misapprehended, (see above,) when taken, as they were by many, in the sense of an invitation to give all they possessed, at once, to the poor, and to retire among the monks. *They*, he maintained, who managed their own property, and distributed its income gradually among the poor, did better than those who gave away the whole at once. It behoved each individual to provide rather for the wants of the poor of his own neighborhood, instead of sending his money to Jerusalem, for the support of the poor who were there, (the monks.) "Should all retire from the world, and live in deserts," said he, "who would remain to support the public worship of God? Who would exhort sinners to virtue? This would be not to fight, but to fly."

But such individual voices could effect nothing of importance against a tendency of the church which was so decided, nor could they counteract a form of church life which had already become so prevalent. Monachism, in fact, was to be preserved; furnishing, as it did, so important a means for the diffusion of Christianity and of Christian culture in the succeeding centuries.

[1] Thus Augustin, as well as Jovinian, says, that true martyrdom consists in the disposition of the mind; and that a man who had no outward call to become a martyr, yet, in the temper on which all moral worth depends, might be quite equal to the martyrs. Thus it was also with regard to abstinence. So Abraham, although he lived in marriage because this was agreeable to the then stage of the development of God's kingdom, might, in the Christian virtue of abstinence and self-denial, be fully equal to the Christians who led a life of celibacy in a holy temper. Continentiæ virtutem in habitu animi semper esse debere, in opere autem pro rerum et temporum opportunitate manifestari.

II. Christian Worship.

1. *Relation of Christian Worship to the whole sphere of the Christian Life.*

As the consciousness of the universal Christian priesthood was gradually supplanted by the idea of a class of men particularly consecrated to God, whose peculiar business it was to devote their time and thoughts to divine things; so, too, the original relation, grounded in the essence of Christianity, of the common worship of Christians to the whole circle of Christian life, respecting which we spoke in the preceding period, was continually becoming obliterated. Men forgot that Christian worship is not confined to any particular place, times, or actions, but was meant to embrace the entire life, consecrated to God. Yet the more distinguished church-teachers, such as Chrysostom and Augustin, well understood, that living Christianity could proceed only out of that original Christian consciousness, to which the whole Christian life presented itself as a worship of God in spirit and in truth; and they labored to revive this consciousness, — to counteract, in every way, that delusive notion, which placed the essence of Christianity in the opus operatum of joining in outward acts of worship, and to introduce the point of view into practical life, that instruction in divine truth, reading of the Holy Scriptures, and prayer, were not to be confined solely to the church assemblies, but should be diffused through the whole of the Christian life. Accordingly Chrysostom, in his sixth discourse against the confounding of Christianity and Judaism,[1] observes, that "God permitted the single temple at Jerusalem to be destroyed, and erected in its stead a thousand others of far higher dignity than that; for the apostle declares, 'Ye are the temple of the living God.' Adorn *this* house of God, drive from it all wicked thoughts, so that you may be a temple of the Spirit, and make others do so too." "Christians," he remarks in another discourse, "should not merely celebrate one single day as a feast; for the apostle says, 1 Corinth. 5 : 8: 'Let us keep the feast, not with old leaven,' &c. We are not to stand by the ark of the covenant and by the golden altar, — we, whom the Lord of all existence himself has made his own dwelling, and who continually hold converse with him by prayer, by the celebration of the holy supper, by the sacred scriptures, by alms, and by the fact that we bear him in our hearts. What need therefore of the sabbath, to him who celebrates a continual feast, who has his conversation in heaven? Let us, then, celebrate a continual feast, and let us do no sin; for *this* is the keeping of the feast."[2] In opposition to those who thought themselves righteous because they regularly attended church, he says: "If a child daily goes to school and yet learns nothing, would that be any excuse for him? — would it not rather serve to aggravate his fault? Just so it is with us; for we go to the church, not merely for the sake of spending a few moments there, but that we may go away with some great gain in spiritual things. If we depart empty, our very zeal in attending the sanctuary will re-

[1] Adv. Judæos, VI. § 7, T. I. 661. [2] H. 39, in Matth. § 3, ed. Montf. T. VII. f. 435.

dound to our condemnation. But that this may not be the result, let us, on leaving this place, friends with friends, fathers with their children, masters with their servants, exercise ourselves in reducing to practice the lessons we have here learned. This momentary exhortation cannot extirpate every evil; the husband should hear it again at home from his wife, the wife from her husband."[1] And in another discourse:[2] "When you have sung together two or three Psalms, and superficially gone through the ordinary prayers, and then return home, you suppose this suffices for your salvation. Have you not heard what the prophet, or rather what God, through the mouth of the prophet, says: 'This people honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.'?" He was ever pressing this point, that every house should be a church; every father of a family, a shepherd for his household; that he was equally responsible for the welfare of all its members, even for that of the domestics, whom the gospel placed on a level with all other men in their relation to God.[3] He complains that, whilst in the early Christian times the house was by the love of heavenly things converted into a church, the church itself was now, through the earthly direction of thought in those that visited it, converted into an ordinary house.[4] Augustin, likewise, says to the members of his community: "It is your business to make the most of your talent: each man should be a bishop in his own house; he must see to it, that his wife, his son, his daughter, his servant, (since he is bought with so great a price,) persevere in the true faith. The apostolical teaching placed the master above the servant, and bound the servant to obedience towards his master; *but Christ has paid one ransom for both.*"[5]

In respect particularly to prayer, Chrysostom often took ground against the delusive notion, which grew out of that Jewish tendency, that unevangelical distinction of secular and spiritual things, which we must so often allude to, as though this duty might not and ought not to be performed in every place, and during the ordinary business of life, which indeed should be sanctified thereby, as well as in the church. "When Christ came," says he, "he purified the whole world; every place became a house of prayer. For this reason, Paul exhorts us to pray everywhere with boldness, and moreover, without doubting. 1 Timoth. 2: 8. Mark you, how the world has been purified? As it regards the place, we may *everywhere* lift up holy hands; for the whole earth has become consecrated, more consecrated than the holy of holies."[6] After having remarked that all the works of the frail earthly life should flow from prayer, and find support in the same, he supposes it objected by a worldly man of those times: "How can a man of business, a man tied to the courts of justice, pray and resort to the church thrice in a day?" And he replies: "It is possible and very easy; for, if you cannot easily repair to the church, you may at least pray before

[1] H. V. de statuis, § 7, T. II. f. 71.
[2] Hom. XI. in Matth. § 7.
[3] Hom. VI. in Genesin, § 2. Ἐκκλησίαν ποιήσόν σοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὑπεύθυνος εἰ καὶ τῆς τῶν παιδίων καὶ τῆς τῶν οἰκέτων σωτηρίας.
[4] In Matth. H. 32, § 7. Τότε αἱ οἰκίαι ἐκκλησίαι ἦσαν, νῦν δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία οἰκία γέγονεν.
[5] S. 94.
[6] Homil. I. de cruce et latrone, § 1, T. II. f. 404.

the door, and that even though you may be tied to the courts of justice: for it needs not so much the voice, as the disposition of the heart; not so much the outstretched hands, as the devotional soul; not so much this or the other posture, as the mind." He then goes on to say: "It is not here as in the Old Testament. Wherever you may be, you still have the altar, the sacrificial knife, and the offering by you; for you yourself are priest, altar, and sacrifice. Wherever you are, you may raise an altar, by simply cherishing a devout and serious temper. Place and time are no hindrance. Though you bow not the knee, though you beat not the breast, though you stretch not your hands to heaven, but only manifest a warm heart, you have all that belongs to prayer. The wife, while she holds in her lap the spindle and spins, can with her soul look up to heaven, and call with fervency on the name of the Lord. It is possible for this man to offer a fervent prayer, while he is on his way alone to the market; for that other to lift up his soul to God, who sits in his shop and sews leather; and the servant who makes purchases, goes errands, or sits in the kitchen, has nothing to hinder him from doing the same thing." [1]

To this period also was transmitted from the primitive Christian times the right, closely connected with the consciousness of the universal Christian priesthood, and belonging to all Christians, of instructing and edifying themselves by going directly to the fountain of the divine word. Hence manuscripts of the Bible were multiplied, and exposed for sale.[2] It was regarded as the chief part of a pious Christian education, both in men and women, to become early familiar with the holy scriptures. Thus Jerome notices it of Læta, a noble Roman lady, that she taught her daughter, from early childhood, to cultivate a love for the sacred scriptures instead of jewelry and silks;[3] that she learned patience from the example of Job; that she never suffered the gospel to be out of her reach.[4] Among both women and men, of whatever rank in society, it was regarded as the characteristic mark of those with whom Christianity was a serious concern of the heart, that they were much occupied with the study of the Bible; — as the examples of Monica and Nonna show. The rhetorical preacher who pronounced the funeral discourse on the younger Constantine, mentions it to his praise that he constantly nourished his soul out of the sacred writings, and formed his life by their precepts.[5] This, perhaps, may be regarded as nothing more than empty eulogy; but it enables us nevertheless to see what was reckoned in this age as belonging to the qualities of a pious prince. When Pagans who were inquiring after the truth, found difficulties in the Christian doctrines, they did not repair at once, as a matter of course, to the clergy, but oftentimes to their friends among the Christian laity. These sought for a solution of the questions pro-

[1] De Anna S. IV. § 6, T. IV. f. 738.

[2] Scriptura venalis fertur per publicam. Augustin. in Ps. 36, S. I. § 2.

[3] Ep. 107, § 12. Pro gemmis et serico, divinos codices amet.

[4] In Job virtutis et patientiæ exempla sectetur, ad evangelia transeat, nunquam ea positura de manibus. Comp. above, the examples from the rule of Basil, and what Gregory of Nyssa says respecting the education of Macrina.

[5] Anonymi monod. in Constantin. jun. p. 7, ed. Morell. Ἐντεῦθεν καὶ βίον ἐκόσμει καὶ ἦθος ἐῤῥύθμιζε.

posed to them in the holy scriptures; and when they met with difficulties there too hard for them to solve, Augustin invites them not so much to seek instruction from their spiritual guides, as to pray for light from above.[1] For those who were awakened by the public worship of God to more serious reflection on divine truth, or who were desirous of studying the scriptures in a more quiet way, rooms were provided and furnished with Bibles in the galleries of the church, (φροντιστήρια,) to which they could retire for the purpose of reading and meditation.[2] Jerome complains of it as an evil that men and women all thought themselves competent to discourse, however deficient their knowledge, on the right interpretation of the sacred volume.[3]

The clergy were not the first to derive from the unevangelical theory respecting a distinct priestly caste the inference which lay not very remote, that the fountain of the divine word was to be approached only by themselves; that the laity must depend for all their instruction in divine things simply on the clergy, without being entitled to go to the original source itself: but it was the altogether worldly-minded laity, who, as they had taken advantage of the distinction between a spiritual and a secular class, to set up for themselves a convenient Christianity, subservient to their pleasures, so made use of the same pretext as a reason for avoiding all intercourse with the divine word, and an excuse for their indifference to higher interests, alleging that the study of the Bible was a business properly belonging to ecclesiastics and monks. But distinguished church-teachers, such as Chrysostom and Augustin, contended strenuously against this way of thinking. The former denominates the excuses: "I am a man of business; I am no monk; I have a wife and children to provide for,"[4] cold and exceedingly censurable words; and maintained, on the contrary, that just those persons who were in the midst of the storms of the world and exposed to its many temptations, stood most of all in need of those means of preservation and safety which the holy scriptures furnish — more even than those who led a life of silent retirement, far from all strife with the outward world.[5] Frequently, both in private conversation and in his public discourses, he exhorted his hearers not to rest satisfied with that which they heard read from the scriptures in the church, but to read them also with their families at home;[6] for what food was for the body, such the holy scriptures were for the soul, — the source whence it derived substantial strength.[7] To induce his hearers to study the scriptures, he was often accustomed — when there was as yet no set lesson of the

[1] Ad ipsum Dominum pulsa orando, pete, insta. Sermo 105, § 3.

[2] Paulinus of Nola, ep. 321, T. I. p. 209.

Si quem sancta tenet meditanda in lege voluntas,
Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris.

[3] Sola scriptura ars est, quam sibi omnes passim vindicant, hanc garrula anus, hanc delirus senex, hanc sophista verbosus, hanc universi præsumunt, lacerant, docent, antequam discant. Alii adducto supercilio grandia verba trutinantes, inter mulierculas de sacris literis philosophantur, alii discunt a feminis quod viros doceant. Ep. 53 ad Paulinum, § 5.

[4] Ἀνηρ εἰμι βιωτικός· οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμον, γράφας ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἀποταξαμένων.

[5] H. III. de Lazaro, T. I.

[6] Καὶ ἐπὶ οἰκίας σπουδαζώμεν τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῶν θείων προσέχειν γραφῶν. Hom. 29, in Genes. § 2.

[7] Ὅπερ ἡ σωματικὴ τρόφη πρὸς τὴν σύστασιν τῆς ἡμετέρας ἰσχυος, τούτο ἡ ἀνάγνωσις τῇ ψυχῇ γινέται. L. c. T. IV. f. 281.

sacred word prescribed for every Sunday — to give out for sometime beforehand the text which he designed to make a subject of discourse on some particular occasion, and to exhort them, in order that they might be better prepared for his remarks, in the meantime to reflect upon it themselves.[1] In like manner, Augustin says: "Do not allow yourselves to be so immersed in present, earthly things, as to be obliged to say, I have no time to read or to hear God's word."[2] Among the characters of the zealous Christian, whom he describes under the figure of the ant, as one that treasures up from the divine word that which he may have occasion to use in the time of need, he places the following: "He goes to church and listens to God's word; he returns home, finds a Bible there, and opens and reads it."[3] Often does Chrysostom trace the corruptions of the church as well in doctrine as in life, — the spread of error and of vice, — to the prevailing ignorance of the scriptures.[4]

Two hindrances to the general reading of the Bible might then for the first time unquestionably have been removed, had Christianity been directed also to multiply and diffuse the means of general mental cultivation, and by associations formed in the spirit of love, to supply what individuals could not obtain for themselves. These two hindrances were, first, the fact that but few knew how to read, and second, the high price of manuscripts.[5]

In respect to this second hindrance, of poverty, which forbade the purchase of a Bible, Chrysostom reckoned it among those pretexts which would certainly give way to real earnestness and zeal about Christianity. "As many of the poorer class," said he, "are constantly making this excuse, that they have no Bibles, I would like to ask them, can poverty, however great it may be, hinder a man when he does not possess, complete, all the tools of his trade? What, then! is it not singular that in this case he never thinks of laying the blame to his poverty, but does his best that it may not hinder him; while, on the other hand, in a case where he is to be so great a gainer, he complains of his poverty?"[6]

As to those who were prevented from studying the scriptures themselves, the reading of the scriptures in the church, as Chrysostom explains in the passage last referred to, and in other places, was to serve as a remedy for this want; for on these occasions not single passages merely, but entire sections and whole books of the Bible, were read in

[1] This he describes as his method in the discourse on Lazarus, referred to in the preceding note. T. I. f. 737.

[2] Non mihi vacat legere. In Psalm. 66, § 10.

[3] Audire sermonem, audire lectionem, invenire librum, aperire et legere. In Psalm. 66, § 3.

[4] E. g. Proœm. in epist. ad Rom. T. IX. f. 426.

[5] Cyrill of Jerusalem adduces as a reason why all could not read the Bible, "ignorance and the pressure of business," *οὐ πάντες δύνανται τὰς γράφας ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν ἰδιωτεία, τούς δὲ ἀσχολία τις ἐμποδίζει.* Cateches. V. § 7. Augustin makes a distinction between the book of creation and the book of the sacred writings: In istis codicibus non ea legunt, nisi qui litteras noverunt, in toto mundo legat et idiota. In Psalm. 45, § 7. Augustin was in want of a Bible, when the desire first arose in his mind at Milan to become more accurately acquainted with the divine doctrines: Ubi ipsos codices quærimus? Unde aut quando comparamus? Confess. l. VI. § 18. A difficulty which, to be sure, he could easily surmount, when he was in right earnest about the matter.

[6] Hom. XI. in Johan. § 1.

connection. Hence many who could not read had still been able, by a constant attendance at church, and by carefully listening to the portions read in each year, to treasure up in their memories a familiar knowledge of the sacred scriptures.[1]

2. *Relation of Public Worship to Art. Church Buildings; their Embellishments; Images.*

We remarked in the preceding period, that the primitive Christian way of thinking was averse to the employment of art, as being a heathen practice. This stern opposition to art would naturally cease as the opposition to the now constantly declining Paganism relaxed. Christianity might, and indeed by its very nature should, appropriate to its own use, purify, ennoble, and sanctify even art: but the danger now threatened, that the artistic element would become too predominant for the healthful development of religious morals; that external splendor and ornament would supplant the simple devotion of the heart; that sense and the imagination would be called into exercise more than the mind and the affections. Yet it is evident, nevertheless, that the primitive evangelical temper, directed to the worship of God in spirit and in truth, maintained the struggle with this new tendency which threatened to turn devotion away from the inner essence of religion.

As, in the preceding period, the whole outward form of the church and of church life betokened a community propagating itself in opposition to the dominant power, a community persecuted and oppressed; so, in the present, the altered situation of this community manifested itself in its whole external appearance. The churches destroyed under the Dioclesian persecution were again rebuilt in greater magnificence; the Christian emperors emulated each other in erecting splendid structures, and in embellishing and enriching them in every way. Wealthy and noble laymen followed their example; and the delusive notion insinuated itself, that, in so doing, men performed a work of peculiar merit and of the highest service to religion. Many believed that by thus contributing to adorn the churches, by presenting them with costly vessels, mounted with gold, silver, and precious stones, they could atone for their sins. Hence Chrysostom felt himself constrained to say: "God forbid that we should believe it is enough for our salvation, if *we* rob widows and orphans, and present to the altar a golden chalice, set with precious stones! Wouldst thou honor the offering of Christ? Then present him thy own soul as an offering, for which he himself has offered up his life. Let this become a golden one; for the church is not a storehouse of gold and silver manufactures, but it is the community of angels; hence we ask for souls; for even this (donation made to the church) God accepts only for the sake of souls.[2] The pious and en-

[1] As was done by Parthenius, afterwards bishop in Lampsacus, in whose youth, it is related, literarum imperitus, sanctarum autem scripturarum vel maxime valens memoria. See his life, which seems to be at least not without a genuine foundation. Acta Sanctorum mens. Febr. T. II. f. 38.

[2] Chrysost. in Matth. h. 50, § 3. So also he says in his 80th homily on Matthew, § 2: "Instead of presenting to the church splendid vessels, and expending large sums in ornamenting the walls and the grounds of the church, it would be better to provide first for the support of the poor." There

lightened abbot, Isidorus of Pelusium, in a beautifully written letter, complains of his bishop, that he superfluously decorated, with costly marbles, the outward structure of the church; whilst he persecuted the pious, and thus destroyed the true church consisting of the community of believers. He admonishes him to be careful, and distinguish between the church building and the church itself; the latter being composed of pure souls, the former of wood and stone.[1] In the time of the apostles, said he, church buildings did not as yet exist; but the church consisting of the communities was rich in the gifts of the Spirit. Now, the church structures were resplendent with marbles; but the church itself was barren of those gifts of the Spirit.[2]

Magnificent public buildings, already erected, and pagan temples, were also occasionally presented as gifts to the churches, and were consecrated and altered for the purposes of Christian worship. Yet it might well be that, in the provincial towns, the more simple places of assembly, which bore the impress of Christian antiquity, continued for a long time to form a striking contrast with the splendid church edifices in the large cities. Zeno, bishop of Verona, (who lived after the middle of the fourth century,) labors to show, in one of his discourses, that the distinguishing mark of Christianity, as compared with Judaism and Paganism, could not consist in the beauty of its outward buildings, in which it was excelled by both those religions; but what constituted the peculiarity of Christianity, what it had in preference to both these religions, was the spiritual being of the church, the community of believers, God's true temple. The living God would have living temples. In this discourse he remarks, that no Christian churches were to be found, or at least but very few, which could be compared with the ruins of the neglected heathen temples.[3] Doubtless this language is not to be taken as literally true. We must make allowance for what should be attributed to rhetorical exaggeration, or explained as too general a conclusion from individual examples.

The Christian churches were planned after the pattern of the temple at Jerusalem; and this threefold division was closely connected with the whole peculiar form of worship, as it had sprung out of the idea of a Christian priesthood, corresponding to the Jewish, and of a New Testament sacrificial service corresponding to that of the Old Testament. The three parts were, *first*, the front court,[4] where all the unbaptized, Pagans, Jews, and Catechumens, could stand and hear the sermon and the reading of the scriptures; the place assigned to all the uninitiated: *next*, the proper temple, the place assigned to the community of laymen, believers and baptized persons:[5] *finally*, the sanctu-

were, on the other hand, to be sure, bishops like Theophilus of Alexandria, (who hence bore the surname of *λιθομάνης*,) that were very willing to deprive the poor of what was their due, and expend it on the erection of splendid buildings.

[1] Ὅτι ἀλλὰ ἔστιν ἐκκλησία καὶ ἀλλὰ ἐκκλησιαστήριον, ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀμώμων ψυχῶν, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ λίθων καὶ ξύλων οἰκοδομεῖται.

[2] See lib. II. ep. 246.

[3] Lib. I. Tract. XIV. Quod aut nullum aut perrarum est per omnem ecclesiam Dei orationis loci membrum, quod possit quavis ruina in se mergentibus idololatriæ ædibus nunc usque aliquatenus comparari.

[4] Πρόναος, *νάρθηξ*, ferula, so called from its oblong form.

[5] The *νάος*, the *ἱερον* in the more restricted sense of the term; called from its shape *ἡ ναῦς* or navis ecclesiæ, (the nave,) where

ary,[1]—the place appropriated to the offering of the New Testament sacrifices, and to the priests who presented them, and therefore separated by a veil[2] and railing[3] from the other parts of the church. Here stood the altar: here stood the θρόνος, the chair (cathedra) of the bishop; and in a semicircle around it were seats for the clergy. The clergy alone had the privilege of receiving the holy supper within the limits which separated the altar from the other parts of the church.[4]

The consecration of new churches was celebrated with great solemnity. It was a popular festival, which such bishops as Theodoret courteously invited even Pagans to attend; and the day of the year in which this consecration had been made, was likewise solemnized. The unevangelical notion which, like so many other errors of church life, grew out of the confusion of outward things with spiritual, was already becoming fixed, that by this consecration the churches acquired a peculiar sanctity of their own; although, as may be gathered from what has already been said, an evangelical tendency of spirit which placed the essence of the church rather in the communion of hearts, and derived all true consecration and holiness solely from the direction of the spirit, opposed itself to this error.[5] Chrysostom represents the benefit of prayer in the church to consist, not in *the holiness of the place*, but in the *elevation of the feelings by Christian communion*, by *the bond of love*;[6] although the very men who, *on the one hand*, under the impulse of their purely Christian consciousness, uttered so many noble thoughts in opposition to the sensuous and Judaizing tendency of the spirit of those times, were nevertheless urged on by that spirit, unconsciously, to warrant and confirm many a practice which was at war with that purely Christian consciousness. Thus Chrysostom, for example, who, as is evident from the proofs already given, understood so well how to distinguish and hold apart the New Testament point of view from that of the Old, yet, for the purpose of showing the superiority of the church to the temple of the Old Testament, mentioned, among other things, the higher virtue of the sacred lamp in the church, compared to that in the temple; since, by the oil of the former, miraculous cures had been wrought by

also was the chancel, from which the holy scriptures were read, and occasionally the sermon was delivered, (ἄμβων, pulpitum, suggestus.) Usage was not always alike in this respect. Sometimes the sermon was preached from the steps of the altar, sometimes from the tribune, βῆμα, or exedra of the bishop.

[1] Τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, τὰ ἄδυτα, sanctuarium, βῆμα metonymice.

[2] Ἀμφιθύρα.

[3] Κίγκλιδες, cancelli.

[4] As in this distinction of the clergy is exhibited the false notion of the priesthood, so the Byzantine spirit, which tended to drag into the church even the distinctions of worldly rank, is betrayed in the circumstance that an exception was made in this case with regard to the emperors, who were also permitted to take their place within the limits of the sanctuary. Ambrose is reported to have been the first to make a change in this respect in favor of the emperor Theodosius: he assigned the latter a place at the head of the church, immediately in front of the limits, (πρὸ τῶν δρυφάκτων.) Sozom. hist. eccles. VII. 25.

[5] The term "church," says Chrysostom, is a designation of fellowship,—ἐκκλησία συστήματος καὶ συνόδου ἐστιν ὄνομα. In Psalm. 149, T. V. f. 498. The church is not wall and roof, but faith and life—ἡ ἐκκλησία οὐ τοίχος καὶ ὄροφος, ἀλλὰ πίστις καὶ βίος. Sermo in Eutrop. T. III. f. 386.

[6] Ἐνταῦθα ἐστι τὸ πλέον, οἷον ἡ ὁμονοία, καὶ ἡ συμφωνία, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ὁ σύνδεσμος. It is true, he adds, on the false principle of the priesthood, by which he too was fettered: καὶ αἱ τῶν ἱερέων εὐχαι. De incomprehensibili, T. I. f. 469, § 6.

those wno used it in the exercise of true faith.[1] It was charged as a high misdemeanor on Athanasius, that on the Easter festival he had assembled the community, whom the other churches had not room enough to accommodate, in a large edifice recently founded by the emperor Constantine, before it had been consecrated according to the usual form. Prayer and worship, it was alleged, ought never to be offered on any unconsecrated spot. Athanasius met his accusers with the words of our Lord, that he who would pray should shut himself in his chamber: no place therefore was, in itself considered, too profane for prayer.[2]

As it regards the decoration of churches with representations of religious objects, it is necessary first to distinguish here, from other images, the symbol of the cross, the sign of the victory of Christ over the kingdom of evil, the token of redemption. From the actions of daily life, in which this sign was everywhere customarily employed, and which were thus to be consecrated and sanctified, the sign probably passed over, at an early period, to the places where the Christian communities assembled for worship,[3] although other symbols were still kept away from them as savoring of Paganism. A true and genuine Christian feeling lay at the basis of the practice, when this symbol was employed not only in the consecration of all ecclesiastical transactions, as in baptism, clerical ordination, the ordinance of the supper, the religious celebration of marriage, but also in other transactions of life, whether of a more sorrowful or joyful kind; the feeling, that the Christian's whole life, in sorrow and in joy, should be passed with one constant reference to the redemption, and sanctified thereby. But with most, this resort to the sign of the cross had become a mere mechanical act, in performing which they either were not conscious themselves of the ideas thus symbolized, or else transferred to the outward sign what should have been ascribed to faith and to the temper of the heart alone, and thus fell into a superstitious veneration of the symbol itself. The cross, hitherto simple and destitute of all ornaments, was now gorgeously decorated, as the altered condition of the church was thought to require, with gold, pearls, and precious stones. The universal use of this symbol is thus described by Chrysostom: "The sign of universal execration, the sign of extremest punishment, has now become the object of

[1] Hom. 32, Matth. § 6. Ἰσάσιν ὅσοι μετὰ πιστέως καὶ εὐκαιρῶς ἐλαίῳ χρισάμενοι νοσήματα ἔλυσαν.

[2] Athenas. apologia ad Constantium, § 17. To what profanation of holy things that superstitious reverence for the external signs of the holy was capable of leading, this example may show. Two bishops in Lybia, about the year 420, were engaged in a quarrel about the possession of a place, which may have been of some importance as a fortified place of refuge from the incursions of the barbarians. To secure this spot for his church, one of them resorted to the following stratagem. He pressed his way in by force, caused an altar to be brought, and consecrated upon it the sacrament of the supper. Now in the opinion of the superstitious multitude, the whole place was consecrated, and could no longer be used for any ordinary purpose of social life. Very justly was it remarked by the bishop Synesius, complaining of this transaction to Theophilus, patriarch of Constantinople, that in this way the holiest ordinances could be abused for the accomplishment of the vilest purposes. He said it was not the manner of Christianity, to exhibit the divine as a thing which could be charmed with magical necessity by certain formulas of consecration; but as something that had its dwelling in the pure and godlike temper of mind: Ὥστε παρεῖναι ταῖς ἀπάθεσι καὶ ταῖς οἰκείαις τῷ θεῷ διαθέσεσιν. Synes. ep. 67 ad Theophilum.

[3] See vol. I. sect. 2, p. 509.

universal longing and love. We see it everywhere triumphant: we find it in houses, on the roofs and the walls; in cities and villages; on the market place, the great roads and in deserts; on mountains and in valleys;[1] on the sea, on ships; on books and on weapons; on wearing apparel, in the marriage chamber, at banquets, on vessels of gold and of silver, in pearls, in pictures on the walls, on beds; on the bodies of brute animals that are diseased;[2] on the bodies of those possessed by evil spirits;[3] in the dances of those going to pleasure, and in the associations of those that mortify their bodies."[4] Men like Augustin denounced the mere mechanical practice of making the sign of the cross, and, on the other hand, gave prominence to that which it was designed to indicate, the inward bent of the affections, to that which should have a living existence in the temper of the heart. The sign of the cross was to remind believers of the nature of the Christian calling, of their destination to suffer for the cause of God, and through sufferings to follow Christ to glory. God wanted not such as described this sign on their foreheads, but such as practised what this sign denoted in their daily lives, such as bore the imitation of Christ's humility in their hearts.[5]

It was a somewhat different case, where *representations of the human form were employed with religious allusions.* That tendency of the Christian spirit, of which we spoke in the preceding period, still expressed, at the beginning, its opposition to such representations. But as Christianity gradually pressed its way into popular and domestic life, the cases must continually become more frequent, where, in place of the objects of pagan worship, those would be substituted which were dear to the faith and feelings of Christians. Besides this, a change had now taken place in the views and in the taste of the Christians. Those who, at an earlier period, had shrunk from the outward splendor of religion as savoring of Paganism, as opposed to the idea so often mentioned of Christ's appearance in the form of a servant, were, by the altered condition of the church, led rather to wish to see Christianity emblazoned by external pomp; and the conversion of many was of such a kind, that in truth their tendency to materialism in religion merely took another shape and turn. They would fain have, in Christianity too, a religion presented under images of sense. This tendency, the

[1] Also on windows, — 54 in Matth. § 4. Ἐπὶ τῶν θυρίδων; pavements too were laid with signs of the cross; a practice forbidden by the second council of Trulla, 691, c. 73.

[2] See above, the account of the rhetorician Severus.

[3] It being the intention to expel evil spirits by the power of the cross.

[4] See the homily on Christ's divinity, § 9, T. I. f. 571. We frequently find it mentioned also, that Christians wore *the sign of the cross on their foreheads*, effingere crucem in fronte, ἐκτυποῦν ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ, portare crucem in fronte; — and in several places, we are to understand by it, or at least may without hazard understand by it, that they frequently made the sign of the cross with the finger on their foreheads. But there are also several places where this explanation does not suffice, and which perhaps can be understood in no other sense, than that Christians actually imprinted in some way or other, or hung the sign of the cross on their foreheads. Augustin. in Psalm. 73, § 6. Jam in frontibus regum pretiosius est signum crucis, quam gemma diadematis. In Ps. 32, Enarrat. III. § 13, compared with what Chrysostom says, Exposit. in Ps. 109, p. 6, T. V. f. 259. Πάντες ἐπι τοῦ μετώπου τὸν σταυρὸν περιφέρομεν, οὐ μὲν ἰδιῶται μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοι οἱ τὰ διαδήματα περικείμενοι ὑπὲρ τὰ διαδήματα αὐτον βαστάζουσι.

[5] Augustin. p. 302, § 3, p. 32, § 13.

imperial family of the Constantines certainly had to a remarkable degree, and in many things they gave the tone to others. As a substitute for the remains of old pagan art, Constantine lavished on the public monuments with which he embellished the new imperial city, the representations of religious objects taken from the circle of the Old and New Testaments; as, for example, Daniel in the lion's den, Christ under the image of the Good Shepherd.[1] The sister of this emperor, Constantia, the widow of Licinius, petitioned the bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea for a figure of Christ.

It was not the church-teachers, then, nor the leaders and heads of the communities, but the great mass of the Christians, with whom we reckon also the lofty ones of the earth, that introduced the use of religious images. At Rome, the names of the apostles Peter and Paul being often coupled together as martyrs, and the memory of both celebrated on the same day, it came about, that the figure of Christ, attended by these two apostles, was painted on the walls; a fact by which many of the heathen were misled to suppose that Paul had been chosen among the apostles by Christ during his earthly lifetime.[2] Images of martyrs, venerated monks,[3] and bishops, were dispersed far and wide. The Antiochians had the likeness of their deceased bishop Meletius engraven on their signets, and painted on cups, goblets, and on the walls of their chambers.[4] The figure of Abraham offering up Isaac was a favorite subject of Christian art.[5] Among the rich and noble men and women in the large cities of the Byzantine empire, Christianity was affected even in the mode of dress; and, as often happens, it was supposed the corrupt inclinations which remained essentially the same, were sanctified by the seemly show of a Christian outside. When it was the fashion for men and women of rank to wear garments on which the whole representation of a chase was embroidered in gold and silver threads, they who made pretensions to piety, on the other hand, chose the representation of the marriage feast at Cana; of the man sick of the palsy, who took up his bed and walked; of the blind man restored to sight; of the woman with the issue of blood; of the Magdalene who embraced the feet of Jesus; of the resurrection of Lazarus. Bedizened with such figures, they supposed — as Asterius, bishop of Amasia, in Pontus, in the last half of the fourth century, asserts — that their dress must be well approved in the sight of God.[6] This excellent church-teacher advises them rather to dispose of such garments for as much as they would bring, and use the avails to honor the *living* images of God: instead of carrying about the sick of the palsy on their garments, rather to look up the actually sick and relieve them; instead of wearing on their bodies a kneeling penitent in embroidery, rather to mourn over their own sins with a penitent spirit.[7]

[1] Euseb. de v. C. III. 49.

[2] Christus simul cum Petro et Paulo in pictis parietibus. Augustin. de consensu Evangelistarum, l. I. § 16.

[3] As for example, Simeon the Stylite. See above.

[4] Chrysostom. Homil. in Meletium, T. II. f. 519.

[5] See Gregor. Nyss. orat. in Abrah. T. III. opp. Paris. 1638, f. 476. Comp. Augustin. c. Faustum. l. 22, c. 73, tot locis pictum.

[6] Asterius de divite et Lazaro: *Ταῦτα ποιοῦντες εὐσέβειν νομίζουσιν, καὶ ἱματία κεχαρισμένα τῷ θεῷ ἀμφιεννῦσθαι.*

[7] See above.

At the same time, we should take pains to distinguish the different points of view in which images were regarded by individual church-teachers. If they opposed the use of images in the church, because they feared it would degenerate into an idolatrous veneration; if they strove to elevate the religion of the senses to that of the spirit; if they especially rejected the images of Christ on the score of some particular principle of doctrine, yet we are not warranted for these reasons to conclude that they condemned, in general, *all* representations of religious objects.

Against images of Christ in particular, there might be the more decided opposition, inasmuch as the whole tradition of the church witnessed that no genuine likeness of Christ existed: in fact, the very reason why men resorted so much to symbolical and parabolical representations, in reference to the Saviour and his work, was, that they were conscious of possessing no genuine image of his person.

The strongest to declare himself against images, was Eusebius of Cæsarea, in his letter in reply to Constantia's request for an image of Christ. On the one hand, we observe, still manifesting itself in Eusebius, that aversion to images which was closely connected with the more ancient Christian view of Christ's appearance, and with that sterner opposition to every thing bordering on Paganism; not less, too, the by no means ungrounded anxiety, lest the devotion of the princess, taking too sensuous a direction, might be turned wholly aside from the essence of Christianity: on the other hand, along with these common traits of Christianity, we see a great deal besides, derived from the peculiar notions in Origen's system of faith, which Eusebius was inclined to favor. "What do you understand, may I ask, by an image of Christ?"—says Eusebius. "You can surely mean nothing else but a representation of the earthly form of a servant, which, for man's sake, he for a short time assumed. Even when, *in this*, his divine majesty beamed forth at the transfiguration, his disciples were unable to bear the sight of such glory; but now the figure of Christ is become wholly deified and spiritualized,—transfigured into a form analogous to his divine nature.[1] Who, then, has power to draw the image of such a glory, exalted above every earthly form? Who, to represent in lifeless colors the splendor which radiates from such transcendent majesty?[2] Or could you be satisfied with such an image as the Pagans made of their gods and heroes, which bore no resemblance to the thing represented? But if you are not seeking for an image of the transfigured godlike form; but for one of the earthly, mortal body, so as it was constituted before this change, you must have forgotten those passages in the Old Testament, which forbid us to make any image of that which is in the heavens above or on the earth beneath. Where have you ever seen any such in the church, or heard of their being there from others? Have

[1] Πῶς δὲ τῆς οὕτω θαυμαστῆς καὶ ἀλήπτου μορφῆς, εἴγε χρὴ μόρφην ἔτι καλεῖν τὴν ἐνθεον καὶ νοεράν οὐσίαν, εἰκονα τίς ζωγραφήσειεν; We recognize the Origenist. Comp. vol. I. sect. 3, p. 1069. Τῆς τοῦ δούλου μόρφης τὸ εἶδος εἰς τὴν δεσπότου καὶ θεοῦ δόξαν μετεσκευάσθη.

[2] Τίς δ' οὖν τῆς τοσαυτῆς ἀξίας τε καὶ δόξης τὰς ἀποστιλβούσας καὶ ἀπαστραπτούσας μαρμαρυγάς οἷος τὲ ἂν εἴη καταχαράξαι νεκροῖς καὶ ἀψύχοις χρώμασι καὶ σκιογραφίαις.

not such things (images, therefore, of religious objects) been banished far from the churches over the world?"[1] He said he once saw in a woman's possession, two figures of men in the garb of philosophers, which she pretended were Christ and Paul. But he made her give them up, lest some scandal might result from them either to herself or to others; lest it might seem that the Christians, like idolaters, carried about their God in an image.[2] Paul, he observed, exhorts all Christians to cleave no longer to the things of sense,[3] saying: "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him thus no longer." The godless sect of the Simonians had an image of Simon Magus; and he himself had seen among the Manicheans a figure of Mani. "But we," he concludes, "who confess that our Lord is God, we must let the whole longing of our hearts be directed to the intuition of him in his divine character; we must therefore cleanse our hearts with all earnestness, since none but the pure in heart can see God. Still, should any one be anxious to see an image of the Saviour, instead of beholding him face to face, what better could he have, than that which he himself has drawn in the sacred writings?"[4] Thus, a truer image of Christ could be found in the exhibition of his life, as recorded in the gospel history, than in the representation of his bodily form. The manner in which Eusebius speaks, in his church history, concerning the busts of Christ, which it was said the woman cured of the issue of blood at Cæsarea Philippi had made, as a memorial of her gratitude to Christ; and the manner in which he there speaks of other ancient images of Christ and of Paul, perfectly accord with the views expressed by him in the present letter: for in this latter passage also, he considers it as a pagan way of expressing reverence to the benefactors of mankind.[5]

In respect to Asterius, his polemical attacks were directed, as may be gathered from the passages already cited, not so much against the use of religious images generally, as against that pomp and display, which, to the injury of active Christian charity, followed in its train. Yet even he expressed his disapprobation on the same grounds with Eusebius, particularly of images to represent Christ; and maintained that men ought not to renew and multiply the servant-form which Christ once, during the days of his flesh, voluntarily assumed for the salvation of mankind. "Bear," said he, "the Logos, who is a spirit, in a spiritual manner, within your souls."[6] In these views of Eusebius and Asterius, there was manifestly, however, something of a one-sided character.

[1] Οὐχὶ δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐξώρισται καὶ πόρρω τῶν ἐκκλησίων πεφυγαδεύται τοιαύτα;

[2] Ἵνα μὴ δοκῶμεν δίκην εἰδωλολατρούντων τὸν θέον ἡμῶν ἐν εἰκονι περιφέρειν.

[3] Παύλου τὲ ἀκούω ἡμᾶς παιδεύοντος, μήκετι τοῖς σαρκίκοις προσανέχειν.

[4] A fragment of this letter is preserved among the transactions of the council of Iconoclasts at Constantinople, A.D. 754; and from these it has been adopted into the sixth action of the seventh œcumenical council, or of the second council of Nice, A.D. 787. More of it has been published by Boivin in the remarks on the second volume of Nicephorus Gregoras, f. 795.

[5] Ὡς εἰκὸς τῶν παλαίων ἀπαραφυλάκτως οἷα σωτῆρας ἐθνικῇ συνηθείᾳ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς τούτον τιμᾶν εἰωθότων τὸν τρόπον. Euseb. VII. c. 18.

[6] Ἀρκει γὰρ αὐτῷ ἡ μία τῆς ἐνσωματωσέως ταπεινοφροσύνη, ἣν αὐθαιρετῶς δι' ἡμᾶς κατεδέξατο. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς σου βαστάζων νοητῶς τὸν ἀσώματον λόγον περίφερε. Respecting the connection of these views with the peculiar form of his system of faith, see below, in the fourth section.

They betray, in part, the restricted notions, peculiar to the earlier Christian period, of Christ's servant-form; and in part they show a certain Neo-Platonic contempt of the body. The earthly human nature of Christ was not recognized here in the profound meaning which it must and should have for the Christian feelings: for to these, everything that pertains to the purely human nature, even now, in its present earthly form, has been sanctified and ennobled by Christ; and on this side, the universal Christian feeling would naturally plead in favor of the images of Christ against their opponents: although, on the other side, the truly evangelical direction of these latter, which points away from the sensible to the spiritual Christ, communicating himself in spiritual fellowship, is not to be mistaken. With this tendency, Asterius could nevertheless approve of the pictures of suffering martyrs, and speak with lively interest of the impression which a picture of this sort had made on himself.[1]

In the same sense in which Asterius spoke against those who were in the habit of displaying on their dress the representation of sacred stories as a mark of piety, in this same sense another church-teacher, near the close of the fourth century, Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium in Phrygia, rebuked those whose piety consisted in multiplying dead images of the saints, instead of copying their example in the practice of Christian virtues.[2] Thus, too, Chrysostom agrees with Eusebius in disclaiming all knowledge of a sensuous image of Christ, but ever speaking of Christ's moral image alone in the copying of his holy walk, or pointing away to the intuition of Christ glorified in the eternal life. In respect to the former, he remarks: "Teach the soul to form a mouth which is like the mouth of Christ; for she can form such a one if she will. And how is this to be done? By what colors? By what materials? By no colors, no materials; but only by virtue, by meekness, and humility. How many are there amongst us who wish to see his form? Behold, we can not only see him, but also be like him, if we are really in earnest."[3] And with regard to the latter he says, after having spoken of the majesty of Christ's appearance: "Perhaps you are now seized with the desire of beholding that image. But if we *will*, we may see a far better one."[4] The same spirit is manifest also in Augustin, as when he says: "Let us hear the gospel with such a mind, as if we saw the Lord present before us; and let us not say to ourselves, 'Blessed are they who could see him;' since many among those who saw him have perished; but many among us who have not seen him, believe on him. The Lord is above; but here, too, in the very midst of us, is the Lord of truth."[5]

In the course of the fourth century, men began, by degrees, to decorate the churches also with images — a practice, however, which did not become general until near the close of this century.[6] Men of wealth

[1] See his discourse on the martyrdom of Euphemia.

[2] Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σάρκικα προσώπα τῶν ἁγίων διὰ χρωμάτων ἐπιμελὲς ἡμῖν ἐντυποῦν, ὅτι οὐ χρῄζομεν τουτῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτῶν δι' ἀρέτης ἐκμιμεῖσθαι. See this fragment in the VI. act. of the second Nicene council.

[3] In Matth. H. 78, vel 79, § 4.

[4] In Matth. H. 27, vel 28, § 2.

[5] In Evang. Joh. Tract. 30, § 4.

[6] In the sermons delivered by Chrysos-

and rank who founded churches, wished them to be set out with all the embellishments of art, and so, too, with the rich ornament of pictures; and, in particular, the churches dedicated to the memory of martyrs were adorned with the representations of their sufferings, and with pictures from the historical parts of the Old and New Testaments. When, on the festivals of the martyrs, great multitudes of the people flocked to these churches, these paintings were to serve the purpose of entertaining, touching, edifying, and instructing the rude and ignorant, who could not be instructed and edified by means of books.[1] Still, many influential voices were heard objecting to the superfluity of picture ornaments; and others, against the use of them at all in the churches. A respectable man at Constantinople, who wished to erect a church in memory of the martyrs, conceived the plan of ornamenting it with various pictures from nature, which perhaps were to have some symbolical meaning, and also with many signs of the cross. But the pious monk Nilus, a worthy disciple of Chrysostom, to whom he communicated his design, advised him to be sparing of picture ornaments: it was a childish thing, said he, to dissipate the eyes and attention of the faithful by such objects.[2] Instead of this, he should erect in the sanctuary, and in each compartment of the nave of the church, a single cross, and decorate the church with paintings of stories from the Old and New Testaments; so that those who could not read the sacred scriptures themselves might be reminded, by looking at the paintings, of those examples of piety, and thus excited to imitate them. He ought to abstain from all superfluities, and seek rather, by fervent prayer, by steadfast faith, by invincible hope in God, by alms, humility, *study of the* holy scriptures, compassion towards his fellow-men, kindness to *servants*, and observance of all the commandments of the Lord, to adorn and to preserve himself and all his family.[3] When the aged bishop, Epiphanius of Salamis, or Constantia, in the isle of Cyprus, in making a visit to Jerusalem, came to a church in one of the neighboring villages, and there found on a curtain a human image, whether it was of some representation of Christ or of a saint, he immediately rent the cloth, expressing great indignation. It was contrary, said he, to the authority of holy scripture, that the image of a man should be hung up in a Christian church.[4] The cloth would be in better use to shroud the body of some poor man. This arbitrary proceeding having excited dissatisfaction, after his return he sent to the parish priest of the church another curtain, to replace the one he had

tom at Constantinople, as well as at Antioch, there is not to be found — though he frequently alludes in his figures, metaphors, and comparisons, to the manners and customs of his time — any reference to images in the churches. Montfaucon, indeed, supposed that he found such an allusion in the H. X. Ephes. § 2, but wrongly; for, in this place, Chrysostom is speaking, not of the visible, but of the invisible church, — of the pillars in this according to a spiritual sense; and in truth he there compares the invisible church, not with a splendid *church edifice*, in which case unquestionably we should find an allusion here to images in the churches, but with the palace of a lord, which is ornamented with columns and statues.

[1] See Paulinus of Nola, carmen IX. et X. de S. Felicis natali.

[2] Νηπιῶδες καὶ βρεφοπρέπες, τὸ τοῖς προλεχθείσιν περιπλανῆσαι τὸν ὀφθάλμὸν τῶν πίστων.

[3] Nil. l. IV. ep. 61.

[4] Detestatus in ecclesia Christi, contra auctoritatem scripturarum, hominis pendere imaginem.

torn down, and called upon the bishop John of Jerusalem to see to it that for the future no such church-hangings, so contradictory to the Christian religion, should be used.[1] We see in this the pious, indeed, but impatient and narrow zeal which characterized this man generally. Had he better understood the spirit of the Old-Testament command, and been capable of duly distinguishing from each other the Old and the New-Testament economies, he would not have been so greatly excited by what he saw. Still, however, it was the way of thinking of the ancient church, which he followed out in this case; and at all events it is to be remarked that it was not the *principle*, as it seems, on which he proceeded here, but simply his arbitrary *mode* of proceeding, which excited opposition.[2] But, without much question, this zeal of pious men is justified, when we reflect how easily the prevailing spirit of piety, which was directed on sensible and outward things, might betray the rude multitude, who were to be gradually weaned from Paganism, to the superstitious veneration of images; especially, as the excessive reverence paid to saints would soon be transferred also to their pictures, and as reports of the marvellous effects produced by the images which men were accustomed to regard with peculiar veneration, as also by the reliques of the saints, soon became widely spread.

Augustin, as early as the last times of the fourth century, was forced to complain of the fact that many worshippers of images were to be found among the rude Christian multitude[3] — which worship of images the Manicheans laid as a reproach against the whole church; but he reckoned those image-worshippers as belonging to the great mass of nominal Christians to whom the essence of Christianity was unknown.[4]

In the Western church this moderate tendency, between unconditional opposition to images and image-worship, maintained itself till late into

[1] Quæ contra religionem nostram veniunt. See ep. 51, Hieronym. ejusd. opera ed. Vallarsi, T. I. f. 252.

[2] The council of the Iconoclasts at Constantinople cited several writings of Epiphanius against images, in which he maintained that they ought to be used neither in the church, nor at the cemeteries of the martyrs, nor in private dwellings; but the genuineness of these pieces is extremely liable to suspicion. As well the enemies as the friends of images indulged themselves in fabricating writings under ancient venerated names, in favor of their respective principles. The friends of images appealed to the fact that these writings, ascribed to Epiphanius, had remained hitherto unknown to every body. And though this cannot be considered a decisive proof against their genuineness, yet these fragments bear on their face many marks of having been fabricated. The first cited words of Epiphanius (Concil. Nic. II. actio VI. Concil. ed. Hardain. T. IV. f. 390) correspond in fact too nearly with the ordinary modes of expression among the enemies of images in the period. Next occurs a letter of Epiphanius to the emperor Theodosius, f. 391, in which he writes to him, that he had often called on his colleagues to abolish the images, but they would not listen a moment to his representations. It is hardly probable, however, that at this early period Epiphanius would have found any occasion for resorting to the authority of an emperor against the images; and this very incident with John, bishop of Jerusalem, renders it improbable that Epiphanius, in his declarations against the images, could have found at that time so violent a resistance. It should rather seem that the enemies of images in the eighth century fabricated, in this case also, occurrences of an earlier period, corresponding to what was done in their own time. Probably that single incident in the life of Epiphanius which has been related, was the occasion of such writings being forged in his name.

[3] Novi multos esse picturarum adoratores. De moribus ecclesiæ catholicæ, l. I. § 75.

[4] Professores nominis Christiani nec professionis suæ vim aut scientes aut exhibentes.

the following period; as we see, for example, in the case of the Roman bishop, Gregory the Great, with whom we shall begin the next following period.

But this moderate tendency did not so maintain itself in the Eastern church. Here the progress was rapid from one step to another. The spirit of the East, prone to excess in the expression of feelings; its more lively, warm imagination; its confounding of the sign with the thing represented; its predominant artistic sense; all this brought it about at an early period in the Oriental church, that not only *the multitude* passed from the use of images to the worship of them, but even the church-teachers suffered themselves to be carried along by the prevailing spirit, and sought to defend their course on scientific grounds. In the course of the sixth century, it was already a ruling custom in the Greek church for persons to prostrate themselves before images as a token of reverence to those represented by them (the προσκύνησις.) Already did the Jews lay hold of this prevailing worship of images to accuse the Christians of apostacy from the divine law, which forbade the use of images in religion, and of idolatry. Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in the isle of Cyprus, who, near the end of the sixth century, wrote an apology for Christianity and for the Christian church, against the accusations of the Jews, was forced already to pay particular attention to these charges. What remains to us of this writing[1] is of importance, as giving us information respecting the character of the veneration paid to images in this period, and respecting the light in which this practice was regarded by those who expressed with consciousness the prevailing spirit of the times.

He maintains, against the Jews, that the Mosaic law was not directed unconditionally against all devotional use of images, but only against the idolatrous use of them; since, in fact, the tabernacle and the temple both had their images. But from the idolatrous adoration of images, the Christians were assuredly far removed. They showed, in the sign of the cross, their love and reverence towards Christ, who was represented by it, in accordance with a principle grounded in human nature. As affectionate children, whose father is on a journey, if they do but see his coat, his chair, or his mantle in the house, embrace every such article and kiss it with tears, so, too, we believers, out of our transcendent love to Christ, reverence everything which he did but touch; and for this reason we represent the symbol of his passion in churches, in houses and shops, in the market place, on the articles of clothing; so that we may have it constantly before our eyes, and may be reminded of it, and not forget it, as the Jews have forgotten their God. He argues that in the Old Testament the ceremony of prostration sometimes occurs as a mark of respect even to men, and therefore could not by any means imply the notion of idolatry. He refers to the cures said to have been wrought on energumens by means of images; — and indeed, it may easily be conceived that the impression made on the imagination and feelings by the sight of such objects might, in the case of

[1] The fragments in the fourth action of the second Nicene council. Harduin. Concil. IV. f. 194.

diseases of this sort, arising from the peculiar nervous system and disposition of the individual, produce extraordinary effects. In the same manner may be explained also what he says about the sudden conversions wrought by the sight of images, as evidence of the virtue residing in them; — that, in almost every part of the world, abandoned men, murderers, robbers, profligates, idolaters, were every day, by the sight of the cross, awakened to conviction, and not only so, but led to renounce the world and practise every virtue. All which, though rhetorically over-wrought, yet cannot be pure fabrication, but was probably drawn from some few individual examples in which rude minds, by the sight of the cross or of other images, were suddenly overpowered, and quit a life wholly abandoned to sin for penitence in Monachism. But it may indeed be a question whether the crisis to which men were brought by sudden impressions of this sort had not been prepared long beforehand, and whether the effect produced was of a permanent character. To that which really occurred, the ready imagination of the East now added a great deal that never happened. Thus arose the stories about miraculous images, from which blood had been seen to trickle. Such facts also Leontius adduces in defending the worship of images.[1] Summing all together, he says: "The images are not our gods; but they are the images of Christ and his saints, which exist and are venerated in remembrance and in honor of these, and as ornaments of the churches."[2] We see here how closely the veneration paid to images was connected with the whole Oriental mode of intuition; how this expression of reverence by no means amounted to so much, at the beginning, among the Orientals, as the same ceremony would have done among the people of the West, whose colder temperament was less inclined to any violent expression of the feelings. So much the more dangerous, however, would this tendency of the Oriental spirit to sensualize everything threaten to become to Christianity, if the prevailing spirit of Christianity had not opposed to it, as it did at the beginning, a sufficient counterpoise. Yet even in this century there are still to be found the vestiges of an opposition, growing out of the purely Christian spirit, against the spreading superstition. The respectable Monophysite church-teacher, Xenayas, or Philoxenos, bishop of Hierapolis, in Syria, in the early times of the sixth century, decidedly opposed the representations of angels in the human form, and the representation of the Holy Ghost in the shape of a dove; doubtless led to it by the rude sensuous notions which were attached to these symbols. He said men should not think they honored Christ through the images of Christ; no worship was pleasing to him but the worship in spirit and in truth. Such images, with which a superstitious reverence had probably become connected, he removed from the churches.[3]

[1] Πολλάκις αἱμάτων ῥύσεις ἐξ εἰκόνων γεγόνασι.

[2] Πρὸς ἀναμνήσιν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ εὐπρεπείαν ἐκκλησίων προκείμενα καὶ προσκυνούμενα.

[3] So relates the monophysite historian, John the Schismatic, Ἰωάννης ὁ διακρινόμενος, in his church history, from which a fragment has been preserved in the fifth action of the second Nicene council. Harduin. Concil. IV. f. 306.

We now proceed to consider the seasons for divine worship and the festivals.

3. *Seasons for holding Divine Worship and Festivals.*

Although the habit of confounding the Old and New Testament points of view had already, in various ways, as we have seen in the earlier sections, struck deeply into the church life, yet the most distinguished church-teachers of this period continued still to express the purely Christian idea of the relation of the festivals to the whole Christian life, which, as we remarked in the preceding period, had first grown out of Christianity in its opposition to Judaism. Thus Jerome asserts,[1] that, considered from the purely Christian point of view, all days are alike: every day is for the Christian a Friday, to be consecrated by the remembrance of Christ crucified; every day a Sunday, since on every day he could solemnize in the communion the fellowship with Christ though risen. But festivals and meetings for divine worship, at stated seasons, were instituted for the good of those who were not yet capable of rising to this position, who were not yet so minded or so disciplined as, every day of their life, before engaging in the business of the world, to offer God the sacrifice of prayer. Chrysostom delivered a discourse at Antioch, in which he showed that those who never attended church, except on the principal festivals, adopted the Jewish point of view; that, on the other hand, the Christian celebration of festivals was not necessarily restricted to certain times, but embraced the whole life grounded in faith; and that this was so, he endeavored to demonstrate from the nature and design of the principal Christian festivals. "Our first feast," said he, "is the feast of Christ's appearance, (the Epiphany, τὰ ἐπιφάνια.) What, then, is the object of this feast? To show that God appeared on earth and dwelt with men; that the only-begotten Son of God was with us. *But he is ever with us.* We may, then, every day, celebrate the feast of Christ's appearance. What is the meaning of the feast of the passover? We then announce the Lord's death. But this, too, we do not signify merely at one stated season; for, when Paul would free us from being confined to stated times, he showed that it was possible continually to celebrate the passover, and said, 'As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death.' And what is the import of the feast of Pentecost? That the Spirit has visited us. Now as *Christ* is ever with us, so the Holy Spirit, too, is ever with us: we may, then, continually celebrate also the feast of Pentecost."[2] In like manner, the church historian Socrates remarks, that Christ and the apostles, conformably to Christian freedom, gave no law respecting feasts, but left everything open here to the free expression of the feelings. The diversity that existed in the celebration of festivals among the Christian churches of different countries, he traces to this very fact — that every thing here had, from the beginning, with perfect freedom and by slow degrees, spontaneously shaped itself after different ways.[3] In the principle lying at the basis

[1] L. II. ep. ad Galat. c. IV. ed. Martianay, T. IV. f. 272.

[2] In Pentecost. h. I. § 1, T. f. 458.

[3] Socrat. V. 22.

of the state laws on this point, and from which many of the arrangements of the Roman church proceeded, we do, indeed, perceive already the predominance of Jewish notions, which had repressed the original Christian consciousness.

The reference to Christ crucified, arisen, and glorified, continued to be, as in the preceding period, the central point of the weekly and of the yearly festivals and fast-days. The celebration of the *dies stationum*, of Wednesday and of Friday, respecting the origin of which we have spoken in the preceding period, passed over into this, but was observed only in several of the churches, and in these not after the same manner. Socrates mentions it as a peculiarity of the Alexandrian church, that, on Wednesday and on Friday,[1] the holy scriptures were there read in the church and expounded by homilies; and in general the whole service conducted as on Sunday, the celebration of the communion excepted. This custom probably vanished by degrees in most of the churches;[2] only Friday continued to be consecrated to the memory of Christ's passion. The emperor Constantine, as Sozomen relates,[3] enacted a law, that on Friday as on Sunday, there should be a suspension of business at the courts, and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion.[4] At Antioch, the communion was celebrated on Friday, as well as on Sunday.[5] Also at Constantinople, Friday was observed by the more serious Christians, as a day of penitence and fasting, consecrated to the memory of Christ's passion;[6] and the sacrament of the supper was distributed. It is true, the great mass of the citizens took no concern in it; as we learn from a discourse of Chrysostom's,[7] complaining of the people, because, while he, with a few who had met with him, were rendering thanks to God, on a Friday, for deliverance from threatening famine, most of them had flocked to the public games of the circus.

We noticed, in the preceding period, the origin of the difference which prevailed as to the celebration of the Sabbath. The custom, derived from the Jews, of paying a certain respect to the Sabbath, still continued to be handed down in the *Oriental* communities.[8] In several

[1] On the τέτρας and on the παρασκεύη. Respecting the service which was held at Alexandria on Friday morning, see Athanas. hist. Arianor. ad monachos, § 81. Συνάξις τῇ παρασκεύῃ.

[2] Yet Epiphanius, in his exposit. fid. cathol. c. 22, still mentions fasting on the τέτρας and on the προσάββατον as a universal custom of the church. Also in the churches of Milan, it seems to have been the custom to assemble on these days about noon, sing together, and partake of the communion, and with this terminated the fast. Ambros. expositio in Psalm. 118, § 48, in case we are to understand the plerique dies in this passage, as we probably should, to refer to the dies stationum. According to Epiphanius, these assemblies convened about three o'clock in the afternoon.

[3] 1, 8.

[4] This may have stood in the law, which has not been preserved to our times, by which Constantine ordered this in respect to Sunday already before the year 321. See cod. Theodos. l. II. Tit. 8, l. 1.

[5] See Chrysostom. Hom. V. in epist. I. ad Timoth. § 3.

[6] Chrysostom. H. in the sermon first published by Montfaucon, T. VI. f. 272, § 1. Ἥμερα, ἐν ᾗ νηστεύειν καὶ ὁμολόγειν ἔδει.

[7] The one just referred to.

[8] In the apostolic constitutions, II. 59, the Sabbath is particularly mentioned along with Sunday as a day for the assembling together of the church: VIII. c. 33, that on the Sabbath and on Sunday the slaves should rest from their labors, and attend church with the rest to hear the sermon. L. V. 15, that, the Easter Sabbath excepted, there should be no fasting on the Sabbath, when God rested from the work of creation. The 66, among the apostolic

of the Eastern churches, the Sabbath was celebrated nearly after the same manner as Sunday. Church assemblies were held, sermons delivered, and the communion celebrated on this day.[1] The direction given by the council of Laodicea deserves to be noticed,[2] viz.: that on the Sabbath, the gospels should be read along with the other parts of the holy scriptures. It may be, that the new arrangement which this council designed to introduce by the above-cited canon, was simply that the scriptures generally should be read in church on the Sabbath in the same manner as on Sunday. And in this case, we must suppose, the council wished to restore the custom, formerly observed, of assembling for worship on the Sabbath as well as on Sunday, which had now become obsolete in many of the Eastern churches. Or this ordinance may be understood as simply indicating the design of the council, that, in the meetings for divine worship on the Sabbath, the gospels should be read together with other parts of the holy scriptures; whence we might infer, that, as the celebration of the Sabbath had been taken from the Jews, it had been the custom also to make use of the *Old Testament only* on this day, in the church lessons.[3] In many districts, a punctual Jewish observance of the Sabbath must doubtless have become common: hence the council of Laodicea considered it necessary to ordain, that Christians should not celebrate this day after the Jewish manner, nor consider themselves bound to abstain from labor.[4] It was a general rule in the Eastern church, that there should be no fasting on the Sabbath: hence the Sabbath also, as well as Sunday, was excepted from the period of fasting before Easter.[5] But in many of the Western churches, particularly in the Roman and the Spanish, opposition to the Jews and Judaists[6] had led to the custom of observing the Sabbath rather as a day of fasting.[7] They who were truly enlightened by the gospel spirit, and knew how to distinguish essentials from non-essentials in religion, such men as Ambrose of Milan, Jerome, and Augustin, sought to avoid all controversy on matters of this sort, which had not been decided by divine authority, and which had no particular connection with the essence of faith and of sanctification. They held it as a principle, that, in such matters, each individual should follow the custom of his own church, or of the country in which he resided, and strive that

canons, excludes from the fellowship of the church those who fasted on the Sabbath and on Sunday.

[1] As it concerns the last at Antioch, see the passage referred to above respecting Friday.

[2] C. 16. Περὶ τοῦ ἐν σαββάτῳ εὐαγγελία μετὰ ἑτέρων γράφων ἀναγινωσκέσθαι.

[3] It is an objection to the last interpretation, that both εὐαγγελία and ἑτέρων γράφων stand without the article; accordingly, do not express here any antithesis; but the whole of the sacred writings, according to their different parts, seems to be indicated here generally. Moreover, if such an antithesis had been intended, instead of ἑτέρων γράφων, the phrase παλαίας διαθήκης would doubtless have been used. But the difficulty with the first interpretation is, that the customary celebration of the Sabbath is every where presupposed by this council, and they considered themselves bound rather to moderate the Judaizing tendency to carry this celebration to an extreme.

[4] C. 29. Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ χριστιανοὺς ἰουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν.

[5] Hence, by the decrees of the council of Laodicea, c. 49 and 51, the communion and the commemoration of the martyrs might be celebrated, during the period of fasting, on the Sabbath as well as on Sunday.

[6] See vol. I. p. 296.

[7] See Cassian. institut. cœnobial. l. III. c. 9 et 10. Hieronym. ep. 71 ad Lucinium, § 6.

the bond of charity might not be broken by differences in such unimportant matters, and that occasion of offence might not be given to any man. Ambrose, when questioned on this point, replied that at Rome he was accustomed to fast on the Sabbath, but in Milan he did not. Augustin rightly applies the rules given by Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, to this diversity of practice. He complains, that weak minds were disturbed by the controversial obstinacy or the superstitious scruples of many, who would insist on that practice as being the only right one, for which they supposed they had found certain reasons, no matter how weak, or which they had brought with them as the ecclesiastical usage of *their own* country, or which they had seen in foreign lands; although neither the holy scriptures, nor the universal tradition of the church, decided any thing as to the point, and although it was a matter of perfect indifference as to any practical advantage.[1] But that rigid hierarchical spirit of the Roman church, which, from a very early period, required uniformity in things unessential, would, in this case also, put a restraint on religious freedom. In the Roman church, it was affirmed that this custom came down from Peter, the first of the apostles, and hence ought to be universally observed. The idle tale was there set afloat, when the origin of that custom from the old opposition between the originally pagan and the originally Jewish communities was no longer known, that the apostle Peter instituted a fast on the Sabbath in preparing for the dispute with Simon Magus.[2] The Roman bishop Innocent decided, in his decretals addressed to the Spanish bishop Decentius, (at the very time that men like Augustin expressed themselves with so much liberality on this difference,) that the Sabbath, like Friday, must be observed as a fast day.[3] In defence of this rule, he offered a better reason at least than those monks; viz.: that, in its historical import, the Sabbath necessarily belonged to the period of sorrow which preceded Sunday, the joyful day of the feast of the resurrection; since on both the former days the apostles were plunged in grief, and on the Sabbath had hid themselves for fear.

As to the celebration of Sunday, the custom, which had long prevailed in the church, of consecrating this day in a special manner to relig-

[1] Ep. 54 ad Januarium, § 3. Sensi sæpe dolens et gemens multas infirmorum perturbationes fieri per quorundam fratrum contentiosam obstinationem vel superstitiosam timiditatem, qui in rebus hujusmodi, quæ neque scripturæ sanctæ auctoritate, neque universalis ecclesiæ traditione, neque vitæ corrigendæ utilitate, ad certum possunt terminum pervenire, (tantum quia subest qualiscunque ratiocinatio cogitantis, aut quia in sua patria sic ipse consuevit, aut quia ibi vidit, ubi peregrinationem suam, quo remotiorem a suis, eo doctiorem factam putat,) tam litigiosas excitant quæstiones, ut, nisi quod ipsi faciunt, nihil rectum existiment. To this point of dispute, the two beautiful letters of Augustin relate, the one just cited, and ep. 36 ad Casulanum.

[2] That Roman spirit expresses itself after a characteristic manner in the following language of a treatise which was probably composed by some member of the Roman clergy, and was intended to procure the general recognition of the Roman custom: Petrus, apostolorum caput, cœli janitor et ecclesiæ fundamentum, extincto Simone, qui diaboli fuerat, nonnisi jejunis vincendi figura, (that Simon Magus could be vanquished by Peter only through fasting, was represented as a typical allusion to the fact, that Satan also, whom Simon Magus represented, could be conquered only by fasting,) id ipsum Romanos edocuit, quorum fides annuntiatur universo orbi terrarum.

[3] § 7. Sabbato jejunandum esse ratio evidentissima demonstrat.

ious employments, and of abstaining from all worldly business, was established by a synodal law, the twenty-ninth canon of the council of Laodicea, yet with this restriction, that all Christians should abstain from their worldly business if they were able.[1] A collision betwixt this ecclesiastical ordinance and the relations to the state, which must have arisen in the earlier situation of the church, could now be easily removed, when the state itself recognized the church as such, and endeavored to uphold her in the prosecution of her principles and the attainment of her ends. We have already said, that the emperor Constantine, in a law enacted previous to the year 321, commanded the suspension of all suits and courts of justice on Sunday. It was a beautiful exception, wholly in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, by which he provided that the emancipation of slaves, after the usual forms, should be permitted to take place on Sunday.[2] As Eusebius, in his life of Constantine, relates, he also forbade all military exercises on this day.[3] By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege, (as a sacrilegus.)[4]

Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart. Church-teachers, such as Chrysostom, (see above,) were, in truth, often forced to complain, that in such competitions the theatre was vastly more frequented than the church. And among those who gave up the church for the theatre, many might be found not wholly unsusceptible of right feelings, who, if they had not been hurried along by the prevailing corruption, would have employed Sunday in a way more serious and more healthful for their inner life. Moreover, by the civil relations of those times, many were obliged, on account of their particular place among the citizens, to take part in the arrangements necessary for the support of the public shows, and so to be interrupted in their devotions even against their will. Hence, the North-African church resolved, at an ecclesiastical convention held at Carthage in 401, to petition the emperor, that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast days to some other days of the week.[5] Owing to the prevailing passion for the shows, this petition could not be granted, perhaps, without considerable difficulty. First, in the year 425,

[1] Εἴγε δυναίντο σχολάζειν.
[2] L. II. Tit. VIII. l. I.
[3] Euseb. vit. Constantin. IV. 18, 19, 20.
[4] Cod. Theodos. lib. VIII. Tit. VIII. l. 3.
[5] It is adduced as a reason: Populi ad circum magis quam ad ecclesiam conveniunt, — and on the score of those obligations devolving on many classes of citizens: Nec oportere quemquam Christianorum cogi ad hæc spectacula, maxime, quia in his exercendis, quæ contra præcepta Dei sunt, nulla persecutionis necessitas a quopiam adhibenda est; sed, uti oportet, homo in libera voluntate subsistat sibi divinitus concessa. Cod. can. eccles. Afr. c. 61.

the exhibition of spectacles on Sunday, and on the principal feast days of the Christians, was forbidden, in order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance.[1] In this way, the church received help from the state for the furtherance of her ends, which could not be obtained in the preceding period. But had it not been for that confusion of spiritual and secular interests, had it not been for the vast number of mere *outward conversions* thus brought about, she would have needed no such help. The spirit of church fellowship could effect more in those ancient times than all which the outward force of political law and a stricter church discipline could now do, towards restraining or expelling such as had never been brought to feel the inward power of that spirit; and the church of those times could well dispense, therefore, with the outward support.

In respect to the yearly festivals, those still continued, at first, to be universally observed, which answered to the weekly feast-days; for, as we observed in the preceding period, the circle of yearly feasts had sprung out of that of the weekly feasts, and both had arisen from the same fundamental idea, around which the whole Christian life revolved.[2] Hence, Augustin, about the year 400, still mentions, as the celebrations recognized in the whole church, only those of Christ's passion and resurrection, of his ascension, and of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.[3]

The difference of views with regard to the feast of the passover, which we had occasion to notice in the preceding period, continued to exist also in this; but men were wise enough not to allow the bond of Christian fellowship to be ruptured by this difference.[4] Yet the spirit of church uniformity which sprung up in the West, sought to insinuate itself also here. The council of Arles, in 314, already decreed that the paschal feast should be celebrated on the same day throughout the world;[5] but this ecclesiastical assembly, to which the people of the East paid little attention, had no such great and general influence as to be able to triumph over the old Asiatic custom. Now to the emperor Constantine it seemed scandalous, that the commemoration of the fact which laid the foundation for the recovery of mankind should not be celebrated by all Christians on the same day; and that, while some were fasting, others should be feasting. To him, such a difference would perhaps appear more grave, and less compatible with the unity of the Catholic church, than an important dogmatical difference, known by him to exist about this time, in respect to the doctrine of Christ's divinity. He attempted, first through the negotiations of Hosius, bishop of Cor-

[1] Totæ Christianorum ac fidelium mentes Dei cultibus occupentur. Cod. Theodos. l. XV. Tit. VII. l. 5.

[2] This was acknowledged even by the Roman bishop Innocentius; and from this very fact he inferred, that as fasting was practised not merely on Good Friday, but on the Friday of each week, the same practice should be observed also in respect to the Sabbath. (L. c. § 7. Quod si putant semel atque uno sabbato jejunandum; ergo et Dominica et sexta feria semel in Pascho erit utique celebranda.)

[3] Quæ toto terrarum orbe servantur,—quod Domini passio et resurrectio et adscensio in cœlum et adventus de cœlo Spiritus Sancti anniversaria solennitate celebrantur, ep. 54 ad Januar. and the passage above referred to from Hieronym. comment. ep. ad Galat. l. II. c. 4.

[4] Sozom. I. 16.

[5] C. I.

dova, to bring the churches together in one usage. In this, however, he did not succeed; he therefore convoked, partly for this object, the general council of Nice, in 325. As the reason which, in earlier times, had led to the Oriental custom, and which especially contributed to preserve it, viz. the adherence to Judaism, no longer existed, — but, on the contrary, a polemical tendency in opposition to the Jewish spirit rather predominated, — this change in the way of thinking would naturally lead to the laying aside of the ancient custom.[1] Accordingly an agreement was entered into, at this council, to abandon the old Jewish custom, and to celebrate the remembrance of Christ's passion always on Friday, the remembrance of Christ's resurrection on Sunday. It was acknowledged that, by the sacrifice of Christ for mankind, the feast of the passover had lost its significance; that the thanksgiving for the sacrifice of Christ in the sacrament of the supper had taken the place of the passover, and that the former was restricted to no particular time.[2] But, as it usually happens, there were still many communities and individuals in the East, who refused to depart from the old traditional custom, on account of its very antiquity, without assigning any further reason for their refusal. Instead of winning them over by love, the church excluded them from her communion.[3] Persecution made the old custom still dearer to them; they accused the Nicene council of having altered it out of flattery to Constantine.

The council of Nice, it is true, had decreed[4] that the feast of the passover should, for the future, be celebrated on one and the same day; but they had suggested no means for securing uniformity in the reckoning of the time; and the purpose of the council, therefore, was still far from being attained. In the Alexandrian churches, where astronomical and mathematical knowledge was very generally diffused, the most accurate calculations were instituted, which the whole Eastern church followed. The bishop of Alexandria made known every year, at the feast of Epiphany, by a circular letter[5] to his whole diocese, the day on which the next Easter festival would fall. But, as the Roman church was not so exact, differences arose as to the time of Easter, between the Eastern churches and those of the West, which amounted sometimes to a week, occasionally even to a month; until at length, particularly by means of the Roman abbot Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century, the Alexandrian mode of reckoning was introduced also into the Roman church.[6]

[1] This reason, that it was so disgraceful a thing for the Christian church to govern itself by the pattern of the unbelieving Jews, who had crucified the Lord, is made particularly prominent therefore by the emperor, *μηδὲν ἔστω ἡμῖν κοινον μετὰ τοῦ ἐχθίστου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὄχλου.* See Euseb. de vita Constantini, l. III. c. 18.

[2] This is now *τὸ πάσχα ἐπιτέλειν*, says Chrysostom against the advocates of the Jewish custom. Orat. c. Judæos. III. § 4, T. I. f. 611.

[3] They were denominated as a separate sect, (after that fourteenth day of the month Nisan,) Quartodecimani, *τεσσαρεςκαιδεκατίται, τετραδίται*, (probably by an abbreviation,) *πρωτοπασχίται.*

[4] It is remarkable that this decree occurs only in the letter in which the emperor Constantine (see above) made known and recommended the decisions of this council, and that among its own canons no one is to be found which has any reference to it. Perhaps it was omitted out of indulgence to the adherents of the ancient custom, who, it was hoped, would be induced to yield by degrees.

[5] Libellus paschalis, *γράμματα πασχαλία.*

[6] The more accurate and detailed development of this point is to be found in a

It became, by degrees, as we have observed already in the preceding period, a more universally prevailing custom to prepare for the jubilee of the feast of the resurrection by a season of penitence and fasting. This fast was compared with the forty days' fast of Christ; (see vol. I. p. 300;) hence it received the name of τεσσαρακοστή, quadrigesima; although the whole time of forty days was by no means observed so generally as the name was applied.[1] It was sought by degrees, however, to make the period of fasting, in its whole extent, actually correspond to the ancient name (quadrigesima.) In determining, then, the number of weeks before Easter, that difference of usage between the Eastern and the Western church by which the Sabbath was excepted from the fast-days in the former and not in the latter church, must have had its influence.

This period of fasting was designed to furnish the Christians an opportunity of preparing themselves, by a more moderate indulgence of the sensual appetites, by abstinence from the pleasures of the world, and by the diligent reading of God's word, to enter more worthily upon the celebration of the days consecrated to higher spiritual enjoyments, — to commemorate the new creation in humanity which came from the resurrection and glorification of Christ, — to engage, by means of self-examination and repentance, in a worthy celebration of the holy supper, in which so many participated at the time of the Easter festival.[2]

A portion of the year so consecrated might also send a healthful influence through the rest of it. An occasion was offered to those who divided their whole time between worldly business and sensual pleasures, for collecting their thoughts from this dissipation and for self-examination. The holy scriptures, which at least they heard read in the church, and sermons pointedly exhorting to repentance, would lead them to this. Their minds, less absorbed in the things of sense, would be more open to spiritual impressions. The solemn, earnest stillness following at once upon tumult and dissipation in the large cities, the sudden change in the aspect of public life, was calculated to arouse the trifling mind out of its sleep of security, and render it susceptible of higher influences. In truth, the commencement of the fasts must have produced a striking

dissertation of F. Walch, in the novis commentariis Soc. Reg. Gottingensis, T. I. Ideler's Chronology, T. II. p. 202, etc.

[1] About this difference Socrates treats, V. 22. At Antioch the number of forty days was accurately observed as early as the fourth century; for Chrysostom says, orat. III. c. Judæos, § 4, T. I. f. 611, in a discourse delivered during the fast: Νηστεύομεν τὰς τεσσαρακόντα ταύτας ἡμέρας, where the only question that arises is, whether the Sundays and Sabbaths, in which no fasts were observed, were also reckoned among these forty days. The difference related not alone to the number of days, but also to the extending of the fast to each day, and to the kind of abstinence which was practised at meals during this period. Not only among the communities of different countries, but also among individuals, a different custom existed in this respect. Some, who would be eminently pious, passed two entire days without food. Others not only refrained, like the rest, from wine, flesh and oil at their meals, but supported themselves wholly on bread and water. H. IV. de statuis, § 6.

[2] This aim is assigned to the institution by Chrysostom, orat. adv. Judæos, III. § 4. T. 1, f. 611. Οἱ πατέρες ἐτύπωσαν ἡμέρας τεσσαρακόντα νηστείας, εὐχων, ἀκροάσεως, συνόδων, ἵν' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταυταῖς καθαρθέντες μετ' ακριβείας ἅπαντες καὶ δι' εὐχων καὶ δι' ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ διὰ νηστείας καὶ διὰ παννυχίδων καὶ διὰ δακρύων καὶ δι' ἐξομολογήσεως καὶ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων, οὕτω κατὰ δυνάμιν τὴν ἡμέτεραν μετὰ καθαροῦ συνείδοτος προσίωμεν.

change in the large towns. "Quiet, to-day, is nowhere disturbed," says Chrysostom in a fast sermon preached at Antioch,[1] "nowhere do we hear cries; nowhere the noise of the shambles, the bustle of cooks. All this is past; and our city presents to-day the appearance of a sedate and modest matron. To-day, there is no difference between the table of the emperor and that of the poor man." And in another sermon:[2] "Then, no songs are heard in the evening, no revels of the drunkard in the day; the voice of clamor and contention is hushed, and profound quiet everywhere reigns." Still, as it usually happens with such sudden revolutions of life, this change was more often transient than enduring, more apparent than real. If there was a horse-race at the circus during the fast, all was over; the city rapidly assumed another look. The same persons who had been momentarily aroused by the earnest, impressive words of a Chrysostom, who had beaten their breasts and sighed over their sins, now filled the circus, and took a passionate interest in the contending sides.[3] True, men soon returned back again to the previous quiet and repose of the fast; but, if this could be so easily disturbed by other impressions from abroad, it is plain how superficial must have been the change produced on these occasions. As is usually the case with such changes, prescribed by law and enforced by constraint, the end often failed of being attained because confounded with the means. Men looked for justification and increase in holiness, in outward fasting, and entirely forgot in this the essential things, true repentance and sanctification, which the period of fasting was only designed to remind them of. Or the end was missed because men submitted to the laws of the church from constraint and in opposition to their inward feelings, partly influenced by the sense of shame, and partly by dread of the divine punishment. Hence many sought to indemnify themselves beforehand for the forced abstinence imposed on them by the fasts, by indulging in the more riotous excess on the days immediately preceding them.[4] Many only complied with the laws of fasting in their literal sense; refraining from meat, but taking care to provide themselves with the daintier fare out of what was permitted by the fast laws literally interpreted.[5]

The more eminent church-teachers of this period, Chrysostom, Augustin, Maximus of Turin, Cæsarius of Arles, Leo the Great, often warned against this hypocritical tendency of the fasts. They showed that fasting was without force or meaning, except as accompanied with the hearty forsaking of sin and sincere penitence. They exhorted Christians to use fasting as a means of learning how to subdue sinful passions and desires, propensities and habits. They gave examples, especially Chrysostom, to show how this must be done. They took this occasion to rebuke the corrupt tendencies particularly prevailing in

[1] H. II. in Genesin, § 1, T. IV. f. 8.

[2] In Annam H. I. § 1, T. IV. f. 700.

[3] See the admonitory discourse of Chrysostom, preached after an incident of this sort at Antioch. H. VI. in Genesin, T. IV. opp.

[4] Chrysost. de Pœnitentia, H. V. § 5, T. II. f. 315. Παραίνω ὥστε μὴ τὴν ἐκ τῆς νηστείας ἐσομένην ὠφελείαν προανέλειν λαμαργίᾳ καὶ μέθῃ.

[5] Augustin. p. 209, § 3, et 108, § 1. Pretiosiores sine carnibus animalium escas. On the other hand: Restringendæ sunt deliciæ, non mutandæ.

their own times and under their own eyes, and warned men against them. They called upon Christians to unite charity and benevolence with fasting; to appropriate to these purposes what they saved by abstinence; to forgive each other's offences; to lay aside contentions; as, in fact, the bishops made it a point, at this particular season of fasting, to close all disputes in the communities, and bring about a reconciliation between the contending parties; using, as a means for this end, the conviction of universal sinfulness and need of redemption awakened by the season, and the approaching celebration of the remembrance of Christ's sufferings for the sins of mankind: they moreover called on masters in particular to treat their servants with kindness.

The season of fasting ended with the week which, on account of the great events connected with the salvation of mankind, and commemorated in it, was called the *great* week (ἑβδομὰς ἡ μεγάλη.)[1] It began with Palm-Sunday, (ἡμέρα τῶν βαίων,) and closed with the great Sabbath, as it was called. The approach of the Easter festival reminded all, high and low, of their individual sins, and of the grace to which they owed their forgiveness. Hence the emperors made laws[2] to release those who had been arrested for minor offences; and on Palm-Sunday special decrees of mercy were frequently issued by them. "As on this day," says Chrysostom in one of his discourses, "our Lord delivered men from the chains of sin, so his servants will do all in their power to imitate his love to mankind, and, as they cannot deliver men from spiritual fetters, will release those who are bodily bound."

In this week of solemnities, some days were particularly distinguished; Thursday, for example, in which was commemorated the last supper of Christ with his disciples, and the institution of the Eucharist.[3] On this occasion great numbers were accustomed to participate in the sacrament of the supper.[4] While, on other occasions, the holy supper was only to be received with fasting, it was dispensed on this day in memory of the original institution, in the afternoon, and could be received after a meal.[5] Next, came the day commemorative of Christ's passion.[6] At Antioch, perhaps also in other churches of the East, it was customary for the church on this day to hold its assemblies in the grave-yard, to commemorate the crucifixion of Christ without the gates of Jerusalem.[7] The week was closed by the great *Sabbath*, (τὸ μέγα σάββατον,) on which many were baptized, and put on their white robes; and in the evening the cities were illuminated, and appeared like streams of fire. The whole population poured along with torches to church, and vigils were kept till the dawn of the morning of universal jubilee, the feast of the resurrection. The small number of Pagans who still dwelt amongst

[1] See the Homily of Chrysostom respecting the meaning of this name.

[2] See in the codex Theodos. the titulus de indulgentiis.

[3] Ἡ ἁγία πέντας, quinta feria Paschæ, dies anniversarius, quo cœna Dominica celebratur.

[4] See Chrysostom's discourse delivered on this day. T. II. f. 386.

[5] Thus it was at least in the North-African church, by the decree of the council of Hippo, A.D. 393, in the cod. canon. eccles. Afr. c. 41. Augustin. ep. 54 ad Januar. § 9.

[6] The ἡμέρα τοῦ σταύρου, also called in a more restricted sense, Pascha.

[7] See the discourse of Chrysostom on this day, V. II.

the Christians must also, in one way or another, have been affected, in spite of themselves, by what so moved the whole multitude on this occasion of general Easter vigils.[1]

The custom having been borrowed from the Jews, of holding a last festival on the eighth day after the commencement of the series, the celebration of the passover was concluded with the following Sunday as the eighth day of the feast. Throughout the whole of this week, from the Easter Sabbath and onward, the persons then baptized had worn their white garments, and, as new Christians, the new-born,[2] had formed a separate division of the community, easily distinguished by their dress. This sacred time of the celebration of their new birth being now over, they laid aside their white robes: the bishop exhorted them to a faithful observance of their baptismal vow, and they joined the rest of the community. This important transaction gave its name to this Sunday. So it was at least in the Western church.[3] Thus, then, the whole period of fourteen days, reckoning from Palm-Sunday, was a festival. As such, it was recognized also by the civil authority, and in it no court of justice could be held.[4] Moreover the fifty days after Easter were specially distinguished, although the feast of Ascension, and the feast of Pentecost, in the more restricted sense — the feast of the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost, were selected from the rest for particular celebration. In the Eastern church, the Acts of the Apostles were read during this time, in the public worship, as recording what the risen and glorified Christ had wrought through the apostles; and in the year 425, it was decreed, that during this whole period the devotion of Christians should not be disturbed by any public sports.[5]

To these were added two principal festivals, which, as we observed in the preceding period, most probably existed in their germ in very early times, but which first began to be more generally observed during the course of the fourth century, and that in an opposite order, — the one coming from the East to the West, and the other from the West to the East; the *festival of Christ's baptism*, and the festival of his nativity.

As to the first, we find it mentioned by Chrysostom, as an ancient

[1] Respecting this Sabbath: Λαμπροφορία καὶ φωταγωγία, ἣν ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ δημοσίᾳ συνεστησάμεθα· πᾶν γένος ανθρώπων μίκρου καὶ ἀξία πάσα δαψίλει τῷ πύρι τὴν νύκτα καταφωτίζοντες. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. II. in Pascha v. orat. 42, at the beginning. Augustin: Clara vigiliæ hujus celebritas toto orbe terrarum. Respecting the Pagans: Ista nocte multi dolore, multi pudore, *non-nulli etiam, qui fidei propinquant*, Dei jam timore non dormiunt. P. 219.

[2] Novi, infantes.

[3] Octava infantium, dies novorum, dominica in albis, κυριάκη ἐν λεύκοις. Augustin. p. 376. Hodie octavæ dicuntur infantium; miscentur hodie fidelibus infantes nostri. P. 260. Hodie completis sacramentum octavarum vestrarum. Comp. ep. 55, § 35. Respecting the newly baptized: Veste dealbatus intra octavas suas. Ep. 34, § 3. It may perhaps have been otherwise in the Eastern church, where, as it seems, the newly baptized wore their white garments until the end of the feast of Pentecost. See the passage presently to be referred to from the Cod. Theodos.

[4] Dies feriarum, sancti quoque Paschæ dies, qui septeno vel præcedunt numero vel sequuntur. Cod. Theodos. l. II. T. VIII. l. 2.

[5] Cod. Theodos. l. XV. Tit. VII. l. 5. Quamdiu cœlestis lumen lavacri imitantia novam sancti baptismatis lucem vestimenta testantur, (which is probably said only in conformity with the use of the Eastern church,) quo tempore et commemoratio apostolicæ passionis, totius Christianitatis magistræ, a cunctis jure celebratur. Which refers to the reading of the Acts.

principal feast of the church in Eastern Asia, under the name of the feast of the appearance or manifestation of Christ, who had till then been hidden from the world; ἡ ἐπιφάνεια or τὰ ἐπιφάνεια according to Tit. 2: 11.[1] But if, in the region where this feast originated, another festival having reference to the first appearance of the Logos in human nature, a feast of Christ's nativity, was already existing, the latter would hardly have become so entirely lost sight of, and a name which belonged to it transferred to the feast of Christ's baptism. More probably, this was the only festival which in that district had reference to the first appearance of Christ. Accordingly Chrysostom actually denominates it, in the discourse already cited, which he pronounced at the feast of Pentecost in Antioch, the festival of Epiphany, the first among the principal feasts, and the only one which had reference to the appearance of Christ among men.[2] He speaks here according to the views of Christian antiquity which prevailed in those countries, where a Christmas festival was as yet wholly unknown. In a certain sense, men doubtless had some reason for placing this festival in special connection with the baptism of Christians, — inasmuch as the divine life, which was to proceed forth from Christ to all the faithful, here first began to reveal itself in a visible way to the greater portion of men. But as the age, confounding the outward sign with the inward grace, ascribed to the water in baptism a supernatural power to sanctify, so it supposed that Christ first imparted to the water its power to sanctify, by his own baptism.[3] The first indication of the celebration of this feast having spread to the Western church we find about the year 360; for the historian Ammianus Marcellinus relates,[4] that the emperor Julian, then residing at Vienna in the month of January, celebrated the feast of Epiphany in the Christian church. By means of the union of the Greek colonial and mercantile towns in the south of France with the East, this feast may have been adopted, perhaps, in these districts, at an earlier period than in the other countries of the West. It was because this festival was originally unknown to the Western church, that the Donatists, who had separated themselves from the dominant church at a time when as yet no knowledge of any such feast existed among the people of the West, rejected it as an innovation; as they did other regulations that arose after their secession.[5] And as this festival was originally unknown to the Western church, so it happened that its meaning also was changed, though in such a way as to be easily connected with the fundamental idea of the festival. The general conception of a manifesta-

[1] Chrysostom in his Homily on this feast, § 2, T. II. f. 369. Ἐπείδη οὐχ' ὁτέ ἐτέχθη, τότε πάσιν ἐγένετο καταδήλος, ἀλλ' ὁτὲ ἐβαπτίσατο.

[2] H. I. in Pentecost. § 1, T. II. f. 458. Παρ' ἡμῖν ἑορτὴ πρώτη τὰ ἐπιφάνια· τίς ἡ ὑποθέσις τῆς ἑορτῆς; ἐπείδη θέος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη.

[3] Τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων ἡγίασε φύσιν. Chrysostomus. Out of this false notion also sprung the custom at Antioch, of very zealously drawing water about midnight of this feast, to which water was attributed the wonderful property of remaining fresh several years. Even Chrysostom partook of this superstition, h. de baptismo Christi, § 2. Being the feast of Christ's baptism, and of baptism generally, it was also called in the Eastern church, ἑορτὴ τῶν φώτων, or τα φώτα. So in Gregory of Nazianzen.

[4] L. 21, c. 2.

[5] Augustin. p. 202, § 2. Merito istum diem nunquam nobiscum Donatistæ celebrare voluerunt, quia nec unitatem amant, nec Orientali ecclesiæ communicant.

tion of Christ in his divine dignity, or in his divine calling as a Redeemer, was applied in a way which must have been more agreeable to the point of view taken by the communities of the West, which were formed of pagan Christians, than the view of it which had first sprung out of the peculiar conceptions of Jewish Christians; (see vol. I., sect. 3, p. 302;) and, at the same time, this festival was brought into closer connection with Christmas, which had been established here for a long time already. While, in the countries where the feast of Christ's baptism had its distinct traditional meaning as the feast of Epiphany, and where it was adhered to, therefore, without any change, everything which had reference to Christ's infancy was connected with the festival of Christmas; in the Eastern church, on the other hand, the idea of the manifestation of Christ was applied in a preëminent sense to his manifestation to the heathen world, as the Redeemer of all mankind. The festival was referred to the coming of the three wise men from the East, who were supposed to be Heathens; and so this feast became the feast of the first announcement of salvation to the heathen world, of the first conversion of some Heathens, as the precursors of the approaching general conversion of the pagan nations.[1] When these two points of view became united in one, the general conception of the Epiphany was referred to the first manifestation of the miraculous power of Jesus after his baptism, in the first miracle at Cana, the dies natalis virtutum Domini.[2]

The case was directly the reverse with the festival of Christ's nativity, which in its origin belonged to the Western church. As it was particularly from the church of the West the dogmatic tendency proceeded, by which the doctrine of original sin cleaving to all men from their birth, and of the necessity of their being renewed and sanctified in order to deliverance from this corrupt nature, was clearly unfolded; as it was in the church of the West that the practice of infant baptism first became generally spread; so too in the Western church originated the festival which refers to the sanctification of man's nature from its first germ by participation in a divine life. This feast first makes its appearance, as one generally celebrated in the Roman church, under the Roman bishop Liberius, after the middle of the fourth century.[3] The general participation in the celebration of this feast leads to the inference, that it was not at that time a festival wholly new. It was not till later, however, that it spread from the Roman church to Eastern Asia. From what we have previously observed respecting the celebration of the feast of Epiphany in this part of the church, it would already seem

[1] Augustin. p. 203. Hodierno die manifestatus redemptor omnium gentium, fecit sollennitatem omnibus gentibus. The mystic interpretation of Psalm 72, v. 10, led to the converting of the three Magi into three kings. See Tertullian. adv. Judæos, c. 9.

[2] Maximus of Turin, in the beginning of the fifth century, says, after having cited all the three modes of explaining the feast: Sed quid potissimum hoc factum die, novit ipse, qui fecit. H. VI. He calls it a certain tradition, that the three facts collectively occurred on the same day, the sixth of January; but in H. VII. he says, that although the tradition respecting what occurred on that day, and respecting that to which the feast alluded, was different, yet there was but one faith and one devotion.

[3] Ambrose relates, that when his sister Marcella was consecrated as a nun on the dies natalis Salvatoris, in St. Peter's church, by the bishop Liberius, the latter said to her: Vides quantus ad natalem sponsi tui populus convenerit. Ambros. de virginib. l. III. c. 1.

clear, that the Christmas feast could not be one which originated there; but Chrysostom says expressly, in a discourse pronounced at Antioch in celebration of this festival, on the 25th of December of the year 386, that it *had first become known there less than ten years before.*[1] In a sermon which Chrysostom pronounced on the 20th of December in the same year, on the feast of a martyr,[2] he digresses from the proper subject of his discourse for the purpose of inviting his hearers to participate in the approaching festival of Christmas.[3] The way in which he speaks of it, shows how desirous he was of making the interest more general, which he himself felt in a festival still new to this portion of the church.[4] In the next following discourse, on the 25th of December, he says, indeed, that this feast, although still new in that part of the world, yet soon acquired equal authority with the more ancient high festivals: of this, the crowded assemblies, which the churches could scarcely contain, bore witness. But still, it is evident from his own remarks, that, as usually happens with new church regulations, all were not satisfied with the celebration of this new festival. A controversy arose about it. While some denounced the festival as an innovation, others affirmed in its defence that it had been known of old from Thrace to Cadiz.[5] This difference of opinion led him into a detailed argument in support of the festival. Its object would of course be acknowledged by every Christian of the orthodox church at that time, as worthy of commemoration. The grounds of opposition, therefore, could relate only to the arbitrary

[1] Hom. in diem natal. Christi, § 1, T. II. f. 355. Οὔπω δεκατόν ἐστιν ἔτος, ἐξ οὗ δῆλη καὶ γνώριμος ἡμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα γεγένηται. True, he is speaking in that place particularly of *the celebration of this feast on the twenty-fifth of December*; yet the course and mode of his argument shows that it was only on the assumption of the twenty-fifth of December as the birth-day of Christ, a distinct feast for the celebration of this birth-day had there been founded. If it had already been the custom there at an earlier period to celebrate some festival of this sort, but on a different day, he would without doubt have separated the celebration of such a feast generally from the assumption of the twenty-fifth of December for its celebration. He would have endeavored to show the want of foundation for reckoning of the time previously fixed upon, before he adduced the reasons for the new calculation. Moreover, it would assuredly have been yet more difficult to introduce the determinate time adopted at Rome into the Antiochian church, if another time had there already been fixed upon. The authority of the Roman church would hardly have been such as to induce the whole community to transfer a feast already existing, to another day. It may be conjectured, that, previous to this time, people were as far from thinking to consecrate a feast to the birth-day of Christ, as they were from the thought of chronologically determining when this birth-day occurred; for we find the bishop of Edessa still declaring in the seventh century, that nobody knew on what day Christ was born. See Assemani bibl. oriental. T. II. f. 1636. It was not until men believed that there was some account which could be relied on respecting this last-mentioned fact, that they were led to connect with it the celebration of a particular feast. At the same time it may be said perhaps with truth, that the interest in behalf of a festival which must have commended itself to the feelings of Christians, contributed to create the belief and admission that the time had been truly determined.

[2] *Philogonius.* T. I. f. 492.

[3] L. c. § 3.

[4] Which he here styles "the mother of all other feasts, μητρόπολις πασῶν τῶν ἑορτῶν," as indeed all the others presuppose the birth of Christ; and he names on this occasion the principal feasts, ἀπὸ γὰρ ταυτῆς τὰ θεοφανία καὶ τὰ πάσχα καὶ ἡ ἀναλήψις καὶ ἡ πεντεκόστη τὴν ἀρχην καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔλαβον.

[5] Ἄνωθεν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπὸ Θρᾴκης μέχρι Γαδείρων οἰκοῦσι καταδῆλος καὶ ἐπισήμος γέγονε. Though this assertion cannot pass for a credible historical testimony, yet it is something in favor of the supposition, that the festival existed from early times in many countries of the West.

determination of the time: hence, Chrysostom labored only to show that the true time was determined.

He appeals, in the first place, to the rapid and general reception of the festival, to its authority increasing every year, as evidence that the time had been rightly assumed; applying here the well-known remark of Gamaliel. But it is plain that in the settling of a date this argument can decide nothing; although there is certainly good reason for supposing that the natural propriety of such a festival, its entire accordance with the feelings which glowed in every Christian breast, promoted its reception on its own account, and created a general belief that the true time for it had been rightly determined. Next, he appeals to the precise time, preserved in the Roman archives, of the census of the Procurator Quirinus. On this point it is possible he may have been deceived by false reports; or perhaps, at Rome itself, certain apocryphal records had been allowed to pass as genuine. In other homilies, also, written towards the close of the fourth century, by Greek fathers, who notice this festival as one which Christians very generally observed, there are nevertheless marks of its comparatively recent introduction.[1]

On account of this more recent introduction of the Christmas festival from the West into the East, the Christians in many countries of the East preferred, instead of adopting a festival altogether new, to unite the commemoration of Christ's nativity with the ancient feast of the Epiphany. Thus it was at Jerusalem, and in the Alexandrian church. And it was attempted to justify this simultaneous celebration on the authority of Luke 3: 23, from which passage it was inferred that the baptism of Christ took place on the very day of his nativity.[2] Hence again it was, that, in many of the Greek churches where, from the ear-

[1] It seems to be the wish of Gregory of Nyssa to defend the authority of this festival against those who were not disposed to place it on the same level with the ancient principal feasts, which commemorated the passion, the resurrection, and the ascension of Christ, when he says, (Hom. in natalem Christi, T. II. ed. Paris, 1638, f. 352:) Μηδείς τῷ κατὰ τὸ πάσχα μυστηρίῳ μόνην τὴν τοιαύτην εὐχαριστίαν πρέπειν ὑπονοείτω, and therefore endeavors to show, like Chrysostom, that that which constituted the object of this festival was presupposed by everything else Christ had wrought for the salvation of mankind. So in a homily, ascribed incorrectly to Basil of Cæsarea, (T. II. opp. ed. Garnier, f. 602, § 6,) it is said: Οὐδείς ἀσυντέλης, (let there be no one but what contributes something to the general joy,) οὐδείς ἀχρίστος, φθεγξώμεθα τίνα καὶ ἡμεῖς φώνην ἀγαλλιάσεως, ὄνομα ὑμνήσωμεν τῇ ἑορτῇ ἡμῶν θεοφανία, — from which passage we may infer, perhaps, that in the country where this was said, not even the old Epiphany festival of the Syrian church was as yet introduced; since, were it otherwise, its name would hardly have been transferred to the new feast of Christ's nativity.

[2] See Cosmas Indicopleust. topographia Christiana in Montfaucon, collectio nova patrum, T. II. l. V. f. 194; Cassian. Collat. 10, c. II. respecting the simultaneous celebration of these festivals by the Egyptians. This custom of the Alexandrian church must have been altered, it is true, at a later period; for in a homily delivered at Alexandria, in the year 432, by Paulus, bishop of Emisa in Phœnicia, we find the feast of Christ's nativity described as an independent feast by itself. According to the title, this festival was held on the 29th of the Egyptian month Choyac, which answers to the 25th of December. See acta concilii Ephesini pars IV. Harduini Concil. T. I. f. 1694. It might be, that the intimate connection of the Alexandrian church with the Roman in the time of Cyril; the posture of opposition in which the former stood at that time to the churches of Eastern Asia; the dogmatical interest in the polemics waged against the Antiochian type of doctrine, — all this contributed to bring about the change.

liest times, neither of the two feasts had been observed, and where the feast of Christ's nativity was now introduced because it appeared the more important of the two, the name *Epiphany* or *Theophany* was transferred to the latter.[1]

But to explain how the Christmas festival came to be observed first in the Roman church, and to pass from this to the other churches; and how the time for its observance came to be transferred to this particular date of the 25th December; certain antagonistic tendencies were referred to, growing out of the peculiar circumstances of the Roman church, of which mention is already made in older writings.[2]

Precisely in this season of the year, a series of heathen festivals occurred, the celebration of which among the Romans was, in many ways, closely interwoven with the whole civil and social life. The Christians, on this very account, were often exposed to be led astray into many of the customs and solemnities peculiar to these festivals. Besides, these festivals had an import which easily admitted of being spiritualized, and with some slight change transformed into a Christian sense. First came the *saturnalia*, which represented the peaceful times of the golden age, and abolished for a while the distinction of ranks, the distance between servants and free men. This admitted of being easily transferred to Christianity, which, through the reconciliation of man with God, through the restoration of the fellowship between God and man, had introduced the true golden age, representing the equality of all men in the sight of God, and brought the like true liberty as well to the freeman as to the slave. Then came the custom, peculiar to this season, of making presents, (the strenæ,)[3] which afterwards passed over to the Christmas festival; next, *the festival of infants*, with which the saturnalia concluded, — the sigillaria, where the children were presented with images;[4] just as Christmas was the true festival of the children. Next came a festival still more analogous to the Christmas, that of the shortest day, the winter solstice; the birth-day of the new sun about to return once more towards the earth (dies natalis invicti solis.)[5] In

[1] So in the passage above cited from the sermon extant under the name of Basil, and in the expositio fidei of Epiphanius: Ἡμέρα τῶν ἐπιφανίων, ὁτὲ ἐγεννήθη ἐν σάρκι ὁ κυρίος. Jerome disputed the propriety of this use of the term *Epiphania*, in his Commentary on Ezekiel, c. 1: Epiphaniorum dies non, ut quidam putant, natalis in carne, tum enim absconditus est et non apparuit.

[2] The account of Johannes, bishop of Nice, in Combefis. auctarium bibliothecæ patrum novissimum, Paris, 1648, T. II., and with supplementary additions in the edition of the patres apostolici, by Coteler. T. I. 313, is from too late a period, and too fabulous, to possess any historical importance whatever.

[3] The participation in the customs of this pagan festival, as well as the mutual sending of presents, were practices for which the Christians were already reprimanded by Tertullian.

[4] Macrob. Saturnal. l. I. c. XI. quæ lusum reptanti adhuc infantiæ oscillis fictilibus præbent.

[5] The Manichean Faustus actually brings it as a charge against the Christians of the Catholic church, that they celebrated the solstitia with the Pagans: Solennes gentium dies cum ipsis celebratis, ut kalendas et solstitia. See Augustin. l. 20, c. Faustum. The Roman bishop, Leo the Great, complains that many Christians had retained the pagan custom of paying obeisance from some lofty eminence to the rising sun; so too, when in the morning they were ascending the steps of St. Peter's church. Leo, p. 26, c. 4. The second council of Trulla, or quinisextum, 691, were still under the necessity of forbidding the Christians to take any part in the celebration of the Brumalia. Now if it was the case that the remains of heathen customs still existed among the Greeks, at a time when Pa-

the case of this last-named feast, a transition to the Christian point of view naturally presented itself, when Christ, the sun of the spiritual world, was compared with that of the material. But the comparison was carried still further; for, as in the material world, it is after the darkness has reached its highest point that the end of its dominion is already near, and the light begins to acquire fresh power; so, too, in the spiritual world, after the darkness had reached its utmost height, Christ, the spiritual sun, must appear, to make an end of the kingdom of darkness. In fact, many allusions of this kind are to be found in the discourses of the church fathers on the festival of Christmas.[1]

That Christian festival which could be so easily connected with the feelings and presentiments lying at the ground of the whole series of pagan festivals belonging to this season, was now, therefore, to be opposed to these latter; and hence the celebration of Christmas was transferred to the 25th of December, for the purpose of drawing away the Christian people from all participation in the heathen festivals, and of gradually drawing over the Pagans themselves from their heathen customs to the Christian celebration. This view of the matter seems to be particularly favored in a New Year's discourse by Maximius, bishop of Turin, near the close of the fourth century, where he recognizes a special divine providence in appointing the *birth of Christ to take place in the midst of the pagan festivals;* so that men might be led to feel ashamed of pagan superstition and pagan excesses.[2]

But these allusions to the series of heathen festivals happening in this season of the year, furnish, however, no decisive evidence that the Christian festival was instituted on this account generally, or that it was transferred to this particular time for the purpose of being opposed to the pagan celebrations. In fact, the resorting to this means for drawing away men from the pagan superstitions, was a very hazardous experiment, which might easily lead men to confound Christianity with Heathenism, and to lose out of sight the true import of the Christian festival. Of this, indeed, Leo the Great found it necessary to give warning.[3] Yet we must allow, that, from the unsuitableness of the

ganism had already almost wholly vanished, much more must this have been the case among the Roman Christians in the earlier centuries.

[1] Thus says Gregory of Nyssa, in his sermon on this festival, T. III. f. 340. — It was not a matter of chance that Christ's nativity took place at this season, *ἐν ᾗ μειοῦσθαι τὸ σκότος ἄρχεται καὶ τὰ τῆς νυκτὸς μέτρα τῷ πλεοναζόντι τῆς ἀκτῖνος συνωθεῖται πρὸς ἐκλείψιν· μυστήριον τι διὰ τῶν φαινομένων τοῖς διορατικωτέροις διηγεῖται ἡ κτίσις.* Augustin. p. 190, § 1. "Since the infidelity which covered the whole world like a night, was to diminish, while faith increased; for this reason, on the nativity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the night begins to grow less, and the day to increase. Let us, then, celebrate this festival, not like the unbelievers, on account of this sun, but on account of the Creator of this sun." So, too, Leo the Great, (p. 25, § 1,) says, that this day, more than any other, presents, by the new light beaming forth even in the elements, an image of this wonderful birth.

[2] Maximus Taurinens. H. V. in Kal. Jan. bibl. patr. Galland. T. IX. f. 353. Bene quodammodo Deo providente dispositum, ut inter medias gentilium festivitates Christus Dominus oriretur et inter ipsas tenebrosas superstitiones errorum veri luminis splendor effulgeret, ut perspicientes homines in vanis superstitionibus suis puræ divinitatis emicuisse justitiam, præterita obliviscerentur sacrilegia, futura non colerent.

[3] P. 21, c. 6. Diabolus illudens simplicioribus animis de quorundam persuasione pestifera, quibus hæc dies sollennitatis nostræ non tam de nativitate Christi, quam de novi, ut dicunt, solis ortu honorabilis videatur.

means, it in nowise follows that such a means was not then resorted to. Easily might it happen, that, with their eyes intently fixed on the single object proposed, men might overlook the evil naturally connected with it. In a later period, such a mode of proceeding would be no matter of surprise. But it may be questioned whether we could rightly presume it of the period to which, according to what has been said, the origin of the Christmas festival must be referred. We can hardly separate the origin of this festival, considered by itself, from the particular designation of its time; for it can hardly be conceived, that, after a tradition had once obtained credit respecting the day of Christ's nativity, and after the festival of Christmas had been fixed on this day, the specific time would be altered out of regard to the festivals of the Pagans. Yet it should be remarked, in general, that the accommodation of Christian to pagan institutions proceeded, in most cases, from the side of the people; the church-teachers resisted, at first, the intermingling of pagan customs with Christian; afterwards they gave way, or were themselves carried along by the spirit of the times. Individual exceptions, it is true, are to be met with; yet in no point which could be compared with the institution of such a principal festival, and which reached back to so early a period as the origin of Christmas. Originally, the prevailing mode of procedure, in the Western church, was by no means to connect the celebration of Christian festivals with pagan; but rather to set over against the pagan festivals, days of fasting and penitence.[1] The passage of Faustus, in which Christians of the Catholic church are accused of taking part in the festivities of Paganism, (see above,) seems, it is true, at first glance, to confirm the conjecture above mentioned; but, on closer examination, it will be found rather opposed to it. Faustus accuses the Christians, first, of merely changing the heathen into a Christian superstition; for example, substituting the worship of the martyrs in place of the worship of idols;[2] and secondly, of imitating, without any change, heathen festivities, as heathen; — and here he names the *kalendæ* and the *solstitia*. Now, with regard to the first of these charges, we know certainly — a fact presently to be mentioned — that the church never had anything to do with those pagan festivities, but constantly expressed the warmest opposition to all participation in them. The same would be true, therefore, of the celebration of the solstitia, since this belonged in the same category with the rest. But if Faustus had had any ground whatever for accusing the Christians of altering the pagan celebration of the solstitia into a seeming Christian celebration of the nativity,[2] it is the less to be supposed that he would have omitted to bring such an accusation against them, as the feast of Christ's nativity must have been particularly disagreeable to him as a Manichæan, who looked upon the birth of Christ in the flesh as a sorry superstition.

[1] Leo the Great cites it, in his VII. Sermo, as an old tradition, ut quoties cœcitas paganorum in superstitionibus esset intentior, tunc præcipue populus Dei orationibus et operibus pictatis (under which he comprised alms and fasts, which were not allowable on the principal festivals) instaret.

[2] Idola eorum vertistis in Martyres, to which passage we shall again revert on a future occasion.

And what necessity is there, in truth, of searching for outward causes to account for a fact which, as we have already remarked, explains itself, as growing out of the inner development of the Christian life? As it respects, however, the specific time of the 25th of December, designated for the festival of Christmas, it should not be forgotten, that, in the earlier ages, there were several different determinations of the day of Christ's nativity; and we might, with the same good reason, repeat the question with regard to each one of these, — How was this ascertained? It is very probable that, in the Roman church, this point was settled by the authority of some historical tradition, founded on apocryphal records. Now it is very possible, we may admit, that, allowing the existence of such an apocryphal tradition, it might have been helped along — not indeed by any design of imitating or rivaling the pagan ceremonies, but quite independently of these — by the mystical interpretation given to that season of the year.[1]

We find that it was originally a principle with teachers and governors of the church to resist the tendency, among the multitude, to confound pagan rites with Christian. We see this particularly illustrated in the case of the New-Year's festival, the Kalendæ Januariæ. The celebration of this grandest of the Roman festivals, which began with the end of December and lasted several days, was, more than that of any other, interwoven with the whole public and private life of the Romans; with all civil, social, and domestic arrangements, manners, and customs. It was, in fact, the commencement of the civil year, according to which all sorts of business had to be adjusted and arranged. It was the time when the magistrates entered upon their several offices. It was therefore the ordinary season of congratulations, when presents were mutually given and received. Tertullian already found reason to complain that Christians participated in all these customs. In defence of this participation it could ever be alleged, as it was still alleged by many in the beginning of the fifth century, that this whole festival was in truth of a purely civil nature, having no necessary connection with religion, and that it might be joined in, therefore, without the least danger to the faith.[2] But *with* this celebration were united customs standing directly at variance with the principles of the Christian faith and the rules of Christian conduct—riotous excesses, abandoned revelry, and various kinds of heathen superstition, which sought, by means of omens and the arts of divination, to unveil the destinies of the whole year. The first day was spent by many of the Pagans in an unrestrained indulgence of sensual enjoyments, under the persuasion that such a beginning would be followed by a corresponding year of pleasure.[3] It is manifest what a corrupting influence this contagious example of pagan immorality and

[1] How easily the determination of chronological questions of this sort might proceed from mystical interpretations of scripture texts, may be seen, e. g. by consulting Hieronym. in Ezechiel. c. I. V. 1, where, on the principle that the first month of the civil year of the Jews must nearly correspond to the month of October, the fourth month therefore to January, the author concludes that the baptism of Jesus, on the fifth of January, is here typified.

[2] Petrus Chrysologus, p. 155. Esse novitatis lætitiam, non vetustatis errorem, anni principium, non gentilitatis offensam.

[3] See Liban. ἐκφράσις Καλένδων. Chrysost. Homil. Kalend.

superstition would exert on the Christian life: indeed, the Christian teachers were often forced to complain of it in their homilies.[1] Yet even in this case, the pagan festival could have been converted into a Christian one, having no connection with the pagan in religion, by simply giving to the commencement of the *civil* year a Christian import, on the principle that every change and new beginning in earthly things should be sanctified by religion. Thus the commencement of the year, as it was to be regarded from the Christian point of view, would be most appropriately opposed to the pagan celebration of the day. Such considerations are to be met with; for instance, in Chrysostom's discourse on the commencement of the new year. But to no one does the obvious thought seem to have occurred, of converting the civil observance wholly into an ecclesiastical one: for this thought lay too remote from the original Christian point of view, conformably to which all festivals were referred exclusively to the momentous facts connected with man's salvation, and had their origin in a purely religious interest; while, at the same time, there was a strong reluctance to fall in with the pagan custom of celebrating the commencement of the year with religious observances. It would have been nearer the Christian point of view, to separate the ecclesiastical year from the civil, and to make the year begin either with Easter or the Christmas festival.[2] It was only *to oppose a counter influence to* the pagan celebration, that Christian assemblies were finally held on the first day of January; and they were designed to protect Christians against the contagious influence of pagan debauchery and superstition. Thus when Augustin had assembled his church, on one of these occasions, he first caused to be sung the words, "Save us, O Lord our God! and gather us from among the heathen!" Ps. 106 : 47; and hence he took occasion to remind his flock of their duty, especially on this day, to show, that as they had, in truth, been gathered from among the Heathen; to exhibit in their life the contrast between the Christian and the heathen temper; to substitute alms for New-Year's gifts, (the Strenæ,) edification from scripture for merry songs, and fasts for riotous feasting. This principle was gradually adopted in the practice of the Western church, and three days of penitence and fasting opposed to the pagan celebration of January,[3] until, the time being designated, the festival of Christ's circumcision was transferred to this season; when a Jewish rite was opposed to the pagan observances, and its reference to the circumcision of the heart by repentance, to heathen revelry.

[1] See the homilies of Asterius of Amasea, of Maximus of Turin, of Chrysostom, Augustin, Leo the Great.

[2] With the Easter festival, since the resurrection of Christ was the beginning of a new creation, and the spiritual spring might be associated with the spring of nature. With the Christmas festival, since the nativity of Christ was the beginning of his life, which laid the foundation for man's salvation, and the festival was the one from which all the others proceeded.

[3] See Isidor. l. I. c. 40, de officiis and Concil. Turonense II. A.D. 567, c. 17. Triduum illud, quo, ad calcandum gentilium consuetudinem, patres nostri statuerunt privatas in Kalendis Januariis fieri litanias, ut in ecclesiis psallatur, et hora octava in ipsis Kalendis circumcisionis missa Deo propitio celebretur. It may be a question, whether the latter refers to the circumcisio cordis, or already to the memoria circumcisionis Christi.

Besides these festivals, should be mentioned also the days consecrated to the memory of holy men, who had endeared themselves to the church as teachers, or as martyrs to the faith. Of these we shall speak more particularly hereafter. We now pass to consider the particular acts of Christian worship.

4. *Particular Acts of Christian Worship.*

The principal acts of Christian worship, respecting the origin of which we spoke in the preceding period, continued to be observed also in the present. To this class belongs first the *reading of the holy scriptures.* We have already spoken of the important influence which the reading of large portions of the sacred scriptures had on the church life of this period. At the beginning, it was left for each bishop to appoint such portions of the Bible as he chose, to be read at each meeting of the church. The historical and practical allusions to the above-mentioned parts in the cycle of Christian festivals, first led to the practice of selecting certain portions of scripture with reference to the principal feasts; and this practice was gradually converted, by tradition, into a standing rule.[1]

As to the relation of the sermon to the whole office of worship, this is a point on which we meet with the most opposite errors of judgment. Some, who looked upon the clergy as only offering priests, and who considered the main part of Christian worship to consist in the magical effects of the priestly services, were hence inclined greatly to overvalue the liturgical, and wholly to overlook the necessity of the didactic element of worship. The gift of teaching they regarded as something foreign from the spiritual office, as they supposed the Holy Ghost, imparted to the priest by ordination, could be transmitted to others only by his *sensible mediation.* Others, however, and on account of the rhetorical style of culture which prevailed among the higher classes in the large cities of the East,— this was especially the case in the Greek church — gave undue importance to the didactic and rhetorical part of worship; and did not attach importance enough to the essentials of Christian fellowship, and of common edification and devotion. Hence the church would be thronged when some famous speaker was to be heard; but only a few remained behind when the sermon was ended and the church-

[1] What Augustin says in the prologue to his homilies on the first epistle of John, may serve as a proof: Solennitas sanctorum dierum, quibus certas ex evangelio lectiones oportet recitari, quæ ita sunt annuæ, ut aliæ esse non possint. Thus, in Easter week, the history of Christ's resurrection was read in turn from all the gospels. See Augustin, p. 231 and 39. Chrysostom, in Hom. IV. in principio actorum, T. III. f. 85, says, the fathers had introduced such apportionments of scripture to particular times, not for the sake of abridging Christian liberty, (οὐκ ἵνα ὑπὸ ἀνάγκης καίρων τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῖν ὑποβάλωσιν,) but out of condescension to the necessities of the weak. But the natural propensity of men to bind themselves to forms once sanctioned by use, was shown also in the present case. In the African church it was customary to read, on Good Friday, the history of the passion from Matthew. When Augustin, to give his church a more varied and full knowledge of the history of the passion, proposed to read the different gospels yearly, in turn, and on a certain Good Friday caused the portion to be read from another gospel, disturbances arose; for many were disappointed not to hear what they had been accustomed to: Volueram aliquando, ut per singulos annos secundum omnes evangelistas *etiam passio* legeretur. Factum est, non audierunt homines quod consueverant, et perturbati sunt. P. 232, § 1.

prayers followed. "The sermons," said they, "we can hear nowhere but at church; but we can pray just as well at home."[1] Against this abuse Chrysostom had frequent occasion to speak, in his discourses preached at Antioch and Constantinople. Hence, too, without regard to the essential character of the church, a style borrowed from the theatre or the lecture-rooms of declaimers was introduced into the church assemblies; as these were frequented for the purpose of hearing some orator, celebrated for his elegant language, or his power of producing a momentary effect on the imagination or the feelings. Hence the custom of interrupting such speakers, at their more striking or impressive passages, with noisy testimonials of approbation (*κρότος*.) Vain ecclesiastics, men whose hearts were not full of the holy cause they professed, made it the chief or only aim of their discourses to secure the applause of such hearers; and hence labored solely to display their brilliant eloquence or wit, to say something with point and effect. But many of the better class too, such men as Gregory of Nazianzen, could not wholly overcome the vanity which this custom tended to foster, and thus fell into the mistake of being too rhetorical in their sermons.[2] Men of holy seriousness, like Chrysostom, strongly rebuked this declamatory and theatrical style,[3] and said that, through such vanity, the whole Christian cause would come to be suspected by the Heathens.

Many short-hand writers eagerly employed themselves in taking down, on the spot, the discourses of famous speakers, in order to give them a wider circulation.[4] The sermons were sometimes—though rarely—read off entirely from notes, or committed to memory; sometimes they were freely delivered, after a plan prepared beforehand; and sometimes they were altogether extemporary. The last we learn incidentally, from being informed that Augustin was occasionally directed to the choice of a subject by the passage which the "prælector" had selected for reading; when, he tells us, he was sometimes urged by some impression of the moment, to give his sermon a different turn from what he had originally proposed.[5] We are also informed by Chrysostom, that his subject was frequently suggested to him by something he met with on his way to church, or which suddenly occurred during divine service.[6]

Church music was cultivated, in this period, more according to rule.

[1] See Chrysostom. H. III. de Incomprehensib. § 6, T. I. 469.

[2] Gregory of Nazianzen says himself, in his farewell discourse at Constantinople: *Κροτήσατε χείρας, ὀξὺ βοήσατε, ἀράτε εἰς ὕψος τὸν ῥήτορα ὑμῶν.*

[3] Thus on one occasion he says: "This is no theatre; you are not sitting here as spectators of comedians." *Οὐδὲ γὰρ θέατρον ἐστι τὰ παρόντα, οὐ τραγῳδοὺς καθήσθε θεώμενοι νῦν.* In Matth. H. 17, § 7.

[4] Hence Gregory of Nazianzen, in his farewell discourse, preached at Constantinople, says: *Χαίρετε γράφιδες φανέραι καὶ λανθανούσαι.* Hence the complaint of Gaudentius of Brescia, that his sermons had been inaccurately transcribed by note-takers, who sat out of sight. See the Præfat. to his Sermones. Hence the different recensions we have of so many of the ancient homilies.

[5] Augustin. in Psalm. 138, § 1. Maluimus nos in errore lectoris sequi voluntatem Dei, quam nostram in nostro proposito.

[6] See the sermon of Chrysostom, of which the theme was chosen on his way to church, when he saw, in the winter time, lying in the vicinity of the church, many sick persons and beggars, and, touched with pity, felt constrained to exhort his hearers to works of brotherly kindness and charity. T. III. opp. ed. Montf. f. 248. Compare also the turn which he gave to his discourse in a certain sermon, when the lighting of the lamps drew away the attention of his hearers. See T. IV. f. 662.

In connection with the "prælectors,"[1] were appointed church-choristers, who sung sometimes alone, sometimes interchangeably with the choirs of the congregation. It was considered very important that the whole church should take part in the psalmody.[2]

Besides the Psalms, which had been used from the earliest times, and the short doxologies and hymns consisting of verses from the holy scriptures, spiritual songs composed by distinguished church-teachers, such as Ambrose of Milan and Hilary of Poictiers, were also introduced among the pieces used for public worship in the Western church. To the last-named practice, much opposition, it is true, was expressed. It was demanded that, in conformity with the ancient usage, nothing should be used in the music of public worship, but what was taken from the sacred scriptures. And as sectaries and heretical parties often had recourse to church psalmody, as a means for giving spread to their own peculiar religious opinions, all those songs which had not been for a long time in use in the church, were particularly liable to suspicion.[3]

It must already have become a matter of complaint, however, as well in the Western as in the Greek church, that the ecclesiastical music had taken too artificial and theatrical a direction, and departed from its ancient simplicity; for we find the Egyptian abbot Pambo, in the fourth century, inveighing against the introduction of heathen melodies into church psalmody,[4] and the abbot Isidore of Pelusium complaining of the theatrical style of singing, particularly among the women, which, instead of exciting emotions of penitence, served rather to awaken sinful passions;[5] and Jerome, in remarking on the words of the apostle Paul, in Ephes. 5 : 19,[6] says, "Let our youth hear this; let those hear

[1] Ψάλται, cantores, who, like the Lectores, were taken from the younger clergy.

[2] In the fifteenth canon of the council of Laodicea, it was ordered, that no others besides the regularly appointed church cantors should sing in divine service, (*περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πλέον τῶν κανονίκων ψάλτων τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀμβώνα ἀναβαινόντων καὶ ἀπὸ διφθέρας*, (the church song-books,) *ψαλλόντων ἑτέρους τίνας ψάλλειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.*) But this is hardly to be understood as meaning that the participation of the congregation in the church music was to be wholly excluded. At least, if this were the case, it must be regarded as a temporary and provincial regulation; and it would be in direct contradiction to the usage of the Eastern church, in which the distinguished church-teachers, such as Basil of Cæsarea and Chrysostom, expended much labor in improving the style of church music. Most probably this canon is to be understood in the sense, that none but persons of the clerical order should hold the post of professed church-singers, so that the singing of the congregation was to be regarded as a wholly independent thing.

[3] See Concil. Laodicen. c. 59. *Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτίκους ψάλμους λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* The first council of Braga, in the year 561, c. 12, against the Priscillianists, directed, ut extra psalmos vel scripturas canonicas nihil poëtice compositum in ecclesia psallatur. On the other hand, the fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633, c. 13, defended the use of such sacred hymns as were composed by Hilary and Ambrose. Even the ancient hymns and doxologies, taken from scripture, were not, they said, wholly free from human additions. As prayers and liturgical forms of human composition were used in divine service, the same use might be made also of sacred hymns indited by men.

[4] See the conference of the abbot Pambo with his disciples, on the too artificial church music of Alexandria, in imitation of the heathen melodies, (*κανόνες καὶ τροπάρια.*) "The monks," says he, "have not retired into the desert, to sing beautiful melodies, and move hands and feet:" *Μελῳδοῦσιν ᾄσματα καὶ ῥυθμίζουσιν ἤχους καὶ σείουσι χείρας καὶ μεταβαίνουσι (βάλλουσι?) πόδας.* See the Scriptores ecclesiastici de Musica, published by the abbot Gerbert, T. I. 1784, p. 3.

[5] Isidor. Pelus. l. I. ep. 90. *Κατάνυξιν μὲν ἐκ τῶν θείων ὕμνων οὐχ' ὑπομένουσι, τῇ δὲ τοῦ μελοῦς ἡδυτῆτι εἰς ἐρεθίσμον παθημάτων χρώμενοι, οὐδεν αὐτην ἔχειν πλέον τῶν ἐπὶ σκήνης ᾀσμάτων λογίζονται.*

[6] See his Commentar. in ep. Ephes. l. III. c. V. T. IV. f. 387, ed. Martianay.

it whose office it is to sing in the church. Not with the voice, but with the heart, must we make melody to the Lord. We are not like comedians, to smoothe the throat with sweet drinks, in order that we may hear theatrical songs and melodies in the church: but the fear of God, piety, and the knowledge of the scriptures, should inspire our songs; so that not the voice of the singer, but the divine matter expressed, may be the point of attraction; so that the evil spirit, which entered into the heart of a Saul, may be expelled from those who are in like manner possessed by him, rather than invited by those who would turn the house of God into a heathen theatre."

We now proceed to consider the administration of *the sacraments.*

And first, as it respects *baptism:* it may be remarked that infant baptism — as we have observed that the fact was already towards the close of the preceding period — was now generally recognized as an apostolical institution; but from the theory on this point, we can draw no inference with regard to the practice. It was still very far from being the case, especially in the Greek church, that infant baptism, although acknowledged to be necessary, was generally introduced into practice. Partly, the same mistaken notions which arose from confounding the thing represented by baptism with the outward rite, and which afterwards led to the over-valuation of infant baptism, and partly, the frivolous tone of thinking, the indifference to all higher concerns, which characterized so many who had only exchanged the pagan for a Christian outside, — all this together contributed to bring it about, that among the Christians of the East, infant baptism, though in theory acknowledged to be necessary, yet entered so rarely and with so much difficulty into the church life during the first half of this period.

Accustomed to confound regeneration and baptism, believing that they were bound to connect the grace of baptism with the outward ordinance, with the performance of the external act; failing to perceive that it should be something going along with, and operating through, the entire life; many pious but mistaken parents dreaded entrusting the baptismal grace to the weak, unstable age of their children, which grace, once lost by sin, could never be regained. They wished rather to reserve it against the more decided and mature age of manhood, as a refuge from the temptations and storms of an uncertain life.

To a mother who acted on this principle, says Gregory of Nazianzen: "Let sin gain no advantage in thy child; let it be sanctified from the swaddling clothes, consecrated to the Holy Ghost. You fear for the divine seal, because of the weakness of nature. What a feeble and faint-hearted mother must you be! Anna consecrated her Samuel to God, even before he was born; immediately after his birth, she made him a priest, and she trained him up in the priestly vesture. Instead of fearing the frailty of the man, she trusted in God!"[1] Others, unlike this mother, were induced, not by an error of the understanding, but by a delusion springing from an altogether ungodlike temper, to defer their baptism to a future time. They had formed their conception of God,

[1] Orat. 40, f. 648.

of whom they would gladly have been relieved from the necessity of thinking, only as an almighty judge, whose avenging arm appeared to their unappeased conscience ready to strike them; and they sought in baptism a means of evading the stroke, without being willing, however, to renounce their sinful pleasures. They were disposed to enter into a sort of compact or bargain with God and Christ,[1] to be permitted to enjoy, as long as possible, their sinful pleasures, and yet in the end, by the ordinance of baptism, which like a charm was to wipe away their sins, to be purified from all their stains, and attain to blessedness in a moment.[2] Hence many put off baptism, until they were reminded by mortal sickness, or some other sudden danger, of approaching death.[3] Hence it was, that in times of public calamity, in earthquakes, in the dangers of war, multitudes hurried to baptism, and the number of the existing clergy scarcely sufficed for the wants of all.[4]

In the case of many, who first received baptism in the later period of life, this proceeding was no doubt attended with one advantage,— that the true import of the baptismal rite might then be more truly expressed. It was not until after they had been led, by some dispensation affecting the outward or the inner life, to resolve on becoming Christians with the whole soul, that they applied for baptism; and the ordinance, in this case, was not a mere opus operatum; but really constituted to them the commencement of a new era of life, truly consecrated, in the temper of the heart, to God. Thus it was, that many made it a point, from the time of their baptism, to enter upon the literal observance of Christ's precepts; they would no longer take an oath; and not a few outwardly renounced the world and became monks, which, at all events, shows what importance they attached to this ordinance. But, on the other hand, the cause of delaying baptism, with numbers, was their want of any true interest in religion, their being bred and living along in a medley of pagan and Christian superstitions; nor can it be denied, that the neglect of infant baptism contributed to prolong this sad state of things. By means of baptism, children would have been immediately introduced into a certain connection with the church, and at least brought more directly under its influence; instead of being exposed, as they now were, from their birth, to pagan superstition, and often kept at a distance, in their first training, from all contact with Christianity. To commend their children to God and to the Saviour in prayer, was not the custom of parents; but rather to call in

[1] They are very justly styled by Gregory of Nazianzen, l. c. f. 643: Χριστοκαπήλους καὶ χριστέμπορους.

[2] Gregory of Nyssa, de baptismo, T. II. f. 221, aptly calls it: Καίνη καὶ παράδοξος ἐμπόρια, οὐ χρύσου καὶ ἐσθῆτος, ἄλλα πληθοῦς ἀνομίων, καπήλεια περίεργος τῆς κατὰ ψύχην καθάρσεως.

[3] Πρὸς τὰς ἐσχάτας ἀναπνοὰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀναβαλλόμενοι σωτηρίαν. Chrysostom. h. 18, in Joh. § 1.

[4] Gregory of Nyssa, in the sermon above cited, mentions a case, which is said to have proved to many a warning example. A young man of a respectable family in the town of Comana in Pontus, was fatally wounded by the Goths, — who had already taken the suburb, — as he was going out to reconnoitre. As he fell dying, he begged with a cry of despair, for baptism, which at the moment no one was at hand to bestow on him. To be sure, if he had been more correctly taught respecting the nature of baptism, and of the forgiveness of sin, he would not have been reduced to such a strait.

old women, who were supposed to possess the power of protecting the life of infants by amulets and other devices of heathen superstition.[1]

We observed, in the preceding period, that the catechumens were distributed into two classes. To these, at the beginning of the fourth century, was added a third. At first a distinction was made, generally, between those who professed Christianity, though they had not, as yet, attained to a complete knowledge of the Christian doctrines, nor received baptism — the catechumens, who were, in the common meaning of the word, called also Christians,[2] though in a vaguer sense, — and the fully instructed baptized Christians.[3] The lowest class among these constituted the ἀκροώμενοι, ἀκροαταί, or auditores, audientes, who took this name from the circumstance that they were admitted to hear only the reading of the scriptures and the sermon, and then were immediately dismissed.[4]

The second class consisted of those who had already received more full and accurate instruction in Christianity. In behalf of these a special prayer of the church was offered, and they received, kneeling, the blessing of the bishop: whence their name ὑποπιπτόντες, γονυκλινόντες, Genuflectentes, Prostrati; also Catechumens in the stricter sense of the term. This prayer of the church was so composed and arranged, as to bring directly before the consciousness of these individuals their need of being enlightened by the Holy Spirit, without which the divine doctrines could not be vitally apprehended, and the necessary connection between faith and practice; as well as to assure them of the sympathy of the whole community in all their concerns.[5]

[1] Chrysostom contrasts the Christian consecration which the child ought to receive from the first, with the pagan superstition to which it was immediately exposed: Τὰ περίαπτα καὶ τοὺς κωδώνας τοὺς τῆς χειρὸς ἐξῃρτημένους καὶ τὸν κόκκινον στήμονα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ πολλῆς ἀνοίας γέμοντα, δέον μήδεν ἕτερον τῷ παίδι περιτιθέναι ἀλλ' ἢ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ φυλακήν. Hom. 12, in ep. I. ad Corinth. § 7.

[2] Hence the act of the bishop or presbyter, who received those who were not Christians, as candidates for the Christian church, into the first class of catechumens, by making over them the sign of the cross: Ποιεῖν χριστιανούς. Concil. œcum. Constantinop. I. c. 7. Ποιεῖν χριστιανόν.

[3] The distinction Christiani ac fideles, and Christiani et catechumeni. Cod. Theodos. de apostat. l. 2.

[4] Some have supposed, that there was a still lower class, those who were not as yet permitted to attend the meetings of the church, the ἐξωθούμενοι. But as this attendance was allowed even to Pagans and Jews, it is scarcely possible to suppose that a class of catechumens were particularly designated by a name which signified their present exclusion. Neither would the term ἐξωθούμενοι, denoting, as it does, not the fact that persons have not yet been received, but that those once received have been excluded, be suited to the case in question. The V. canon of the council of Neocæsarea (in which it was simply ordered that those ἀκροαταί who had fallen into any sin rendering them unworthy of the Christian name, inasmuch as they could not be transferred to a lower class of catechumens, should be wholly excluded from the list,) furnishes no warrant for the hypothesis of a particular class of excluded persons among the catechumens: on the contrary, the canon here speaks of such as were no longer to be considered as belonging to the catechumens in any sense.

[5] As an example of the manner in which the Christian feeling expressed itself in these prayers, we will insert here the form of this prayer according to the liturgy of the ancient church of Antioch: "That the all-merciful God would hear their prayer, that he would open the ears of their hearts, so that they might perceive what eye hath not seen nor ear heard; that he would instruct them in the word of truth; that he would plant the fear of the Lord in their hearts, and confirm the faith in his truth in their souls; that he would reveal to them the gospel of righteousness; that he would bestow on them a godly temper of mind, a prudent understanding, and an upright and virtuous walk, so that they might at all times meditate and practise what is of God, might dwell in the law of the Lord day and night; that he would deliver them from all

On leaving *this class*, they next took their place among those who proposed themselves for baptism, the baptismal candidates,[1] the Competentes,[2] φωτιζόμενοι. They learned by heart the confession of faith, since this was to be orally transmitted, as written on the living tablets of the heart, and not in a dead, outward letter (see vol. I. sect. 3, p. 308;) and this confession, as containing the sum and essence of Christian doctrine, was explained to them by the lectures of the bishop or the presbyter. To the symbolical usages connected with the preparation for baptism, of which we have spoken in the preceding period, new ones were added, yet not the same in all the churches. It seems to have been a custom which very generally prevailed, for the candidates, until the time they were incorporated, on the octave of the festival of Easter, by the complete rite of baptism, (in the Western church, see above,) with the rest of the church, to wear a veil on the head and over the face, which perhaps was meant, in the first place, as it is explained by Cyrill of Jerusalem, to serve as a symbol, expressing that the attention should not be diverted by foreign objects; afterwards, on the ground of St. Paul's declaration in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the additional meaning was given to it, that, as the act of veiling was a sign of dependence and of tutelage, so the removing of the veil was a sign of freedom and of maturity conceded to them as regenerated persons.[3] To exorcism was now added insufflation, or breathing on the candidate, (ἐμφυσᾶν, insufflare,) to denote the communication of the Holy Ghost, as the former had denoted deliverance from unclean spirits. The bishop next touched the ear of the candidate, saying, in the words of Mark 7: 34, "Ephphatha, Be opened, and may God send thee an open understanding, that thou mayst be apt to learn and to answer."[4] In the North-African church, the bishop gave to those whom he re-

evil, from all devilish sins, and from all temptations of the evil one; that he would vouchsafe to them, in his own time, the new birth, the forgiveness of sins, the investiture of the new, imperishable, divine life, (ἔνδυμα τῆς ἀφθαρσίας. See sect. 3, and below, the doctrine concerning baptism;) that he would bless their coming in and their going out, their families, their domestics; that he would multiply their children, bless them, preserve them to the ripeness of age, and make them wise; that he would cause all things that awaited them to work together for their good." The deacon then bade the catechumens, who had remained kneeling during this prayer, to arise, and invited them to pray themselves, "for the angel of peace, for peace upon all that awaited them, peace on the present days, and on all the days of their life; and for a Christian end." He concluded by saying: "Commend yourselves to the living God and to his Christ." They then received the blessing from the bishop, in which the whole community joined by saying, Amen. See Chrysostom, in epist. II. ad Corinth. Hom. II. § 5.

[1] Their names were inscribed for this purpose in the church books, the *diptycha*, the matricula ecclesiæ; which was: nomen dare baptismo. The ὀνοματογραφία is mentioned in Cyrill's prologue to his Catecheses, § 1; and to this the mystical exposition of Gregory of Nyssa alludes, de baptismo, T. II. f. 216, where he says, "that, as he inscribed the names with ink in the earthly roll, so might the finger of God write them down in his imperishable book:" Δοτέ μοι τὰ ὀνόματα, ἵνα ἔγω μὲν αὐτα ταῖς αἰσθήταις ἐγχαράξω βίβλοις. In the fifth act of the council under Mennas, A.D. 536, a deacon occurs, Ὁ τὰς προσηγορίας τῶν εἰς τὸ βαπτίσμα προσιόντων ἐγγράφειν τεταγμένος.

[2] Simul petentes regnum cœlorum. Augustin. p. 216.

[3] Cyrill. Prolog. c. V. Ἐσκεπάσται σοῦ τὸ προσώπον, ἵνα σχολαση λοίπον ἡ διανοία, Augustin. p. 376, § 2. Hodie octavæ dicuntur infantium, revelanda sunt capita eorum, quod est indicium libertatis.

[4] The sacramentum apertionis. Ambros. de iis qui mysteriis initiantur, c. 1. See the work ascribed to him, de sacramentis, l. I. c. 1.

ceived as competentes, while signing the cross over them as a symbol of consecration, a portion of salt, over which a blessing had been pronounced. This was to signify the divine word imparted to the candidates as the true salt for human nature.[1] When the baptism was to be performed, the candidate was led to the entrance of the baptistery, where he first stood with his face towards the West, as a symbol of the darkness which he was now to renounce, and pronounced, addressing Satan as present, the formula of renunciation, the origin and meaning of which were explained under the preceding period: "I renounce thee, Satan; all thy works, all thy pomp, and all thy service."[2] Next he turned to the East, as a symbol of the light into which he would now enter from the darkness, and said: "To thee, O Christ! I devote myself."[3]

We noticed as existing already in the preceding period the custom of anointing at baptism.[4] In this period, when there was an inclination to multiply symbols, the custom arose of a double unction; one as a preliminary rite, denoting the consecration to be imparted to the believer by his fellowship with Christ, whereby he was to be delivered from the sins of the old man, the putting away of whom had just been symbolized by the laying aside of the garments.[5] The second unction, with the consecrated oil, (the *χρίσμα*,) the same symbolical act which we found existing already in the preceding period, denoted the completion of baptism by a perfect communion of divine life with the Redeemer, — the communication of the Holy Spirit consecrating the individual to the spiritual Christian priesthood.[6] At the first anointing, the head only was marked; — at the second, the forehead, ears, nose, and breast, — to show how this consecration by the divine life should pervade and ennoble the entire human nature.

We noticed in the preceding period, how, in the Western church, a distinct sacrament had arisen out of *confirmation*, or the laying on the hands of the bishop as a symbol of the communication of the Holy Spirit, (see above,) which originally made a part of the rite of baptism. The ideas which men associated with the administration of that chrism, and with the imposition of hands by the bishop, were originally so kindred that they might easily be led to comprehend them both under one and the same conception, and to unite them in one transaction. Yet on this point the usage was still unsettled.[7]

[1] Augustin. de catechizandis rudib. c. 26. Confession. l. I. c. 11.

[2] Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, σατανα, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πόμπῃ σοῦ, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ λατρείᾳ σοῦ.

[3] Συντάσσομαί σοι, Χρίστε.

[4] See vol. I. sect. 3, p. 315.

[5] Cyrill. Mystagog. II. c. 3. Κοινῶναι ἐγίνεσθε τῆς καλλιελαίου Ἰήσου Χρίστου. Constitut. apostol. VII. 22.

[6] Τούτου τοῦ ἁγίου χρίσματος καταξιωθέντες, καλεῖσθε χριστιανοί, says Cyrill of Jerusalem, Cateches. Mystagog. III. c. 4, conf. Concil. Laodic. c. 48.

[7] Jerome reckons among the things reserved to the bishop the manus impositio and invocatio Spiritus Sancti, as constituting together only one act. *Adversus Luciferianos*, § 8. Moreover, Augustin, in his work de baptismo contra Donatistas, l. V. § 33, considers the manus impositio to be the only thing necessary in the case of those who had already received baptism in a heretical church, (and so, too, Siricius ep. ad Himerium, § 2;) so that, according to this, confirmation would consist simply in the laying-on of the hands of the bishop. But the seventh canon of the council of Laodicea ordains, that the Fideles from several sects whose baptism was recognized as valid, should not be admitted to the com-

The baptized now arrayed themselves in white robes, as a sign of regeneration to a new divine life, of infantile purity, as in fact the laying aside of the old garments had been a symbol of the putting away of the old man. Next followed a custom, in the Western churches, also handed down from the foregoing period, of giving them a mixture of milk and honey, as a symbol of childlike innocence (a foretype of the communion which was to be received by them.)[1]

To the times of administering this rite more particularly observed in the preceding period, among which, however, the Easter Sabbath ever continued to be the principal one, was now added, in the Greek church, the *feast of Epiphany*, — a favorite season for the administration of this ordinance, on account of its reference to the baptism of Christ; while, by the same church, the feast of Pentecost was not reckoned among the other customary seasons for administering baptism.[2] The free evangelical spirit of Chrysostom declared strongly against those who would confine baptism to particular seasons, and who imagined that a genuine baptism could not be administered at any other: he brings against this opinion the examples in the Acts of the Apostles.[3] The narrow spirit of the Roman church, on the other hand, was here again the first to lay a restraint on Christian liberty. The Roman bishop Siricius, in his decretal addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarraco in Spain, A.D. 385, styled it arrogant presumption in the Spanish priests that they should baptize multitudes of people at Christmas, at the feast of Epiphany, and at the festivals of the apostles and martyrs, as well as at the other regular times; and decreed, on the other hand, that, except in the case of new-born infants, and other cases of necessity, baptisms should only be administered at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost.[4]

With reference to these two constituent portions of the church assemblies, the *catechumens* [5] and baptized believers, the whole service

munion till they had received the chrism. The Roman bishop, Innocent, finally decided, in his Decretals to the bishop Decentius, A.D. 416, § 6, that the anointing of the forehead belonged to the act of consignation, (in the middle age called confirmation,) which was specially appropriated to the bishop. Hoc autem pontificium solis deberi episcopis, ut vel consignent vel paracletum Spiritum tradant. Presbyteris chrismate baptizatos unguere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum, non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis, cum tradunt Spiritum paracletum.

[1] Hieronym. adv. Lucif. § 8, Cod. canon. eccles. Afr. canon. 37. Mel et lac et quod uno die solennissimo,—probably Easter Sabbath or Easter Sunday—(more probably the former, because on Easter Sunday they already united together in the communion) —in infantum mysterio solet offerri.

[2] Chrysost. H. I. in act. ap. § 6. He here intimates as the reason, that fasts belonged, with other things, to the preparation for baptism, and that no fasts were held during the season of Pentecost.

[3] H. I. in act. ap. § 8.

[4] See the Decretals, § 3.

[5] In respect to what took place between the two portions of time, the arrangements seem not to have been everywhere alike; and this is true especially so far as it concerns the number of the single prayers of the church, appointed for the different classes of Christians. In the nineteenth canon of the council of Laodicea, the prayer for the catechumens is mentioned first after the sermon; then, after their dismission, the prayer for the penitents, (Pœnitentes.) In the Apostolic Constitutions, there occurs also a special prayer for the baptismal candidates, (Competentes;) but the author of these Constitutions seeks in every way to multiply the liturgical services, and it may be questioned whether such a church-prayer was ever in actual use. We find no indication of it in Chrysostom. There certainly occurs, however, in the latter writer, (H. III. de incomprehensib. § 6, T. I. f. 469,) the notice of a special church-prayer for the Energumens, while the same is not mentioned in the above-cited canon of the Laodicean council. But it may be

was divided into two portions: one in which the catechumens were allowed to join, embracing the reading of the scriptures and the sermon, the prevailingly *didactic* portion; and the other, in which the baptized alone could take part, embracing whatever was designed to represent the fellowship of believers, — the communion, and all the prayers of the church which preceded it. These were called the missa catechumenorum and the missa fidelium; (λειτουργία τῶν κατηχουμένων and τῶν πίστων;)[1] which division must of course have fallen into disuse after the general introduction of infant baptism.

We now leave the Missa Catechumenorum to speak of the Missa Fidelium; and first of the preparations for the celebration of the communion.

The separation of the sacrament of the supper from the agapæ had, as we have observed, (see vol. I. sect. 3, p. 325,) been made long before, in the preceding period. The original celebration of the latter was a thing so remote from the views and feelings of this present period, that the homeletic writers find it difficult even to form a just conception of it.[2] The Agapæ had lost their original meaning. They were at present banquets with which the wealthier members of the community sometimes entertained the poorer Christians, and at which the latter enjoyed a somewhat better fare than ordinarily fell to their lot.[3] The more gloomy and morose spirit, whose opposition to the Agapæ we have already noticed in the preceding period, continued to show the same dislike to them in this. The above-mentioned council of Gangra, which manifested some resistance to this one-sided ascetic tendency, took the Agapæ under its protection; pronouncing sentence of condemnation, in its eleventh canon, on those who treated these festivals with contempt when they were made from Christian motives, and discourteously refused to attend them when the brethren were invited in honor of the Lord. Other councils did not object to the Agapæ, *in themselves considered*, but only forbade them to be held *in the churches*.[4]

well supposed, that persons of this description would be found only in the larger towns, and under particular circumstances of climate, in sufficient numbers to constitute a class by themselves in the public worship, for whom a particular prayer would be offered. All these church-prayers, however, are known to us only from Eastern sources. The question comes up, whether these special church-prayers were in use also in the Western church, in addition to the universal prayer of the church for the different classes of Christians. Augustin, Sermo 49, § 8, represents the dismission of the catechumens, and next the Paternoster, which was designed only for baptized believers, the εὐχὴ τῶν πίστων, as following immediately after the sermon.

[1] The term *missa*, in the Latinity of this period, is a substantive, and synonymous with *missio*. The dismission of any assembly was called missa. Avitus of Vienna, ep. I. In ecclesia palatioque missa fieri pronuntiatur, cum populus ab observantia dimittitur. In this sense Augustin used the word, p. 49, § 8. Post sermonem fit missa catechumenorum. As the term then properly denoted the dismission of the catechumens, so it was next applied metonymically to the different portions of divine service which preceded or followed this dismission; and finally, in an altogether peculiar sense, to the communion which came afterwards, and by synecdoche to the whole of a complete service. Thus the word missa, *mass*, in its ordinary acceptation, came gradually into use.

[2] As, for example, Chrysostom, in the twenty-seventh homily on the first epistle to the Corinthians.

[3] Augustin. c. Faustum. l. 20, c. 20. Agapes nostræ pauperes pascunt, sive frugibus sive carnibus. Plerumque in agapibus etiam carnes pauperibus erogantur.

[4] Concil. Laodicen. c. 28. Concil. Hippon. 393, or Cod. canon. eccles. Afr. 42. Later. Concil. Trullan. II. c. 74.

In respect to the liturgical service connected with the sacrament of the supper in this period,[1] it is to be observed that it was based on the genuinely Christian view of the holy supper as representing the fellowship of divine life subsisting between believers, their Redeemer and one another. The whole design, therefore, was to bring up to lively exercise in the minds of Christians the thought that they were now entering into communion with the ascended Christ, and should, in spirit, ascend up to where he is in heaven; that though the whole was a free gift of divine grace, yet they should be prepared to receive it by the direction of their affections to the Redeemer and by faith in him; that, without mutual love towards each other, they could not enter into communion with the Saviour. The deacon invited all present to bestow the mutual kiss of charity, as a sign of the fraternal communion of hearts, without which no true celebration of the sacred supper could be observed.[2] Next the deacon called upon the assembled church to examine themselves and one another, to see that no unworthy person was among them;[3] meaning by this, that they should see, not merely that no catechumens, unbelievers, or heretics were present, but also that there was no one who harbored wrong feelings against his brother, no one playing the part of a hypocrite.[4] "Let us all stand up; our eyes directed to the Lord, with fear and trembling (in the sense of our own unworthiness and weakness, and the exalted character of him who is willing to commune with us.")[5] Then, for the purpose of making it still more distinctly felt, that none but the heart whose affections were bent on heavenly things could take any part in communion with the Saviour, the deacon once more said: "Lift up your hearts;"[6]—to which the church responded, "Yes, to the Lord we have lifted them up."[7] Next, in conformity with the original meaning and celebration of the ordinance, followed the invitation of the bishop, calling on the church to unite in giving thanks for all the blessings of creation and redemption;[8] and the church replied to the bishop's invitation in the words, "Yes, it is meet and right to give thanks unto the Lord."[9] Before the elements were distributed, the bishop, to signify that only a holy temper was prepared to participate in a holy ordinance, exclaimed, "The holy, to the holy."[10] But the church expressed the consciousness,

[1] As we learn from the Apostolic Constitutions, from the V. among the *λόγοις μυσταγωγίκοις* of Cyrill, and from the scattered fragments in the homilies of Chrysostom; also from single hints in the sermons of Augustin and of others.

[2] *Ἀσπασέσθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ*, or in Cyrill, *ἀλλήλους ἀπολάβετε καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀσπαζώμεθα*: which last formula doubtless was to show, that the clergy should consider this as addressed not only to the flock, but also to themselves.

[3] *Ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους*, according to Chrysostom.

[4] *Μή τις κατὰ τινος, μὴ τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει.*

[5] *Ὀρθοὶ πρὸς κύριον μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἑστῶτες ὦμεν προσφέρειν.* In the word *προσφέρειν* lies, it is true, the notion of sacrifice; yet in this connection the term may still have reference to the notion of sacrifice, taken in the spiritual, symbolical sense. See vol. I. sect. 3, p. 330; and it is singular to observe, that here the sacrificial act is set forth *according to the original view*, which held the clergy to be only the representatives of the church in the exercise of the universal Christian priesthood, as a common transaction of the priest and the flock, not as a special act of the priest alone.

[6] *Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας*, or *ἄνω τὸν νοῦν*, or both together, *ἄνω τὰς καρδίας καὶ τὸν νοῦν*, sursum corda.

[7] *Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον.*

[8] See vol. I. sect. 3, p. 329.

[9] *Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον.*

[10] *Τὰ ἁγία τοῖς ἁγιοις.*

that no man is holy out of his own nature, that only one is holy, and the sinful could be made holy only through faith in him, by exclaiming, "One is holy, one Lord, Jesus Christ, blessed for ever to the glory of God the Father."[1] During the celebration of the supper, the 34th Psalm, particularly the 9th verse, was sung, as an invitation to the communicants.

In the consecration of the elements, it was considered to be essentially important, that the words of the institution, according to the gospel, and according to the apostle Paul, should be pronounced without alteration; for it was the general persuasion, that when the priest uttered the words of Christ: "This is my body, my blood," by virtue of the magical power of these words, the bread and wine were, in some miraculous way, united with the body and blood of Christ.[2] Concerning the particular notions on this point, see section IV. These words of institution were, however, introduced into a prayer,[3] in which God was invoked graciously to accept this offering.[4] When the bishop or presbyter was about to finish the consecration, the curtain which hung before the altar was drawn up,[5] and the consecrating minister now showed to the church the outward elements of the supper, which till now had been concealed from their eyes, lifting them up, as the body and blood of Christ.[6] That the church then fell on their knees, or that they prostrated themselves on the ground, cannot indeed be proved by the authority of any ecclesiastical writer of this period. We know it was not until a much later period, that this usage was introduced into the Western church; but the custom, to say the least, fell in with the prevailing views and language of the Greek church;[7] and this outward sign of reverence was, in fact, more frequently used by the latter, and in a less rigid sense, than among the people of the West.

The confounding of the inward thing with the outward sign, in the sacrament of the supper, gave rise to many expressions of a superstitious reverence for the external symbols of the ordinance;[8] while

[1] Εἷς ἅγιος, εἷς κύριος, εἷς Ἰησοῦς Χρίστος, εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πάτρος εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

[2] See Chrysostom. Hom. I. de proditione Judæ, § 6, T. II. f. 384. Τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταῤῥύθμιζει τὰ προκείμενα· ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη ἅπαξ λεχθεῖσα καθ' ἑκαστην τράπεζαν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐξ ἐκείνου μέχρι σήμερον καὶ μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας τὴν θυσίαν ἀπερτισμένην ἐργάζεται. De sacramentis, lib. IV. c. IV. Ubi venitur, ut conficiatur sacramentum, jam non suis sermonibus sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi; ergo sermo Christi hoc confecit sacramentum.

[3] Basilius, de Sp. S. c. 27, says, that besides the words taken from the gospels and from Paul, many others were here used from tradition. Προλέγομεν καὶ ἐπιλέγομεν ἑτέρα.

[4] Such a form of prayer has been preserved to us in the work de sacramentis, l. c.; and it is remarkable, that here, too, the primitive way of thinking and feeling still manifests its presence, since it was not Christ, but the bread and wine, the symbols of his body, which were represented as the object of the sacrificial act. Hanc oblationem — it runs — quod est figura corporis et sanguinis domini nostri, offerimus tibi hunc panem sanctum.

[5] Chrysostom. Hom. III. in epist. ad Ephes. § 5. Ἀνελκόμενα τὰ ἀμφίθυρα.

[6] Basil. de Sp. S. c. 27: Ἀναδείξις τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Dionys. Areopagit. hierarch. 3. Of the consecrating officer it is said: Ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγει ἀνακαλύψας.

[7] See Theodoret. Dial. II. in confus. respecting the outward elements in the supper: Προσκυνεῖται ὡς ἐκείνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται.

[8] Thus Cyrill of Jerusalem, Mystagog. V. 17, recommends that, as long as any moisture remained in the mouth, Christians should apply it to the hand, and with the hand so moistened, touch the forehead, the eyes, and the other organs of sense, and thus sanctify them.

this superstitious reverence had no tendency whatever to promote the worthy use of it as a means of grace. On the contrary, the more men were accustomed to look upon the holy supper as possessing a power to sanctify by some magical operation from without, the less they thought of what was requisite on the part of the inner man, in order to a right use of this means of grace in its religious and moral purport; a fact made sufficiently evident by the censures and admonitions which the Greek fathers found it necessary so frequently to introduce in their homilies.

We already noticed, in the preceding period, the origin of the diversity of custom which prevailed in respect to the less frequent or the daily participation in the communion. This difference of practice continued to prevail also in the present period. In the *Roman*, the *Spanish*, and the *Alexandrian* churches,[1] daily communion was still practised, at least in the fourth century. In other churches, the custom was to observe the communion less frequently; each individual, in fact, joining in it according as his own inward necessities required. This diversity of practice, also, grew out of the different views which prevailed respecting the use of this means of grace. Some, who were in favor of the less frequent participation of the sacrament, said, certain seasons ought to be chosen in which Christians might prepare themselves, by a life of severity and abstinence, by collecting the thoughts, and by self-examination, for a worthy participation, so as not to join in the holy ordinance to their own condemnation. Others maintained that Christians ought never to keep away from the ordinance, except when, on account of some great transgression, they were, by the sentence of the bishop, suspended from the communion and condemned to church penance; on all other occasions they ought to look upon the Lord's body as a daily means of salvation.[2] Augustin and Jerome reckoned these differences also among the ones where each individual, without prejudice to Christian fellowship, was bound to proceed according to the usage of his own church and according to his own subjective point of view. "Each of them," says Augustin, "honors the Lord's body, in *his own way;* just as there was no difference between Zaccheus and that centurion, when one of them received the Lord joyfully into his house, Luke 19 : 6, and the other said, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof,' (Matt. 8 : 8,)— both honoring the Saviour in different, and, so to speak, opposite ways, both felt themselves wretched in their sins, both obtained grace." Chrysostom inclines to the opinion that, as the celebration of the communion of believers with the Lord and with one another, in the sacred supper, belonged to the essential being of every church assembly, therefore, whenever the communion was celebrated in the church, all should participate in it: but here assuredly everything depends on its being done in the right temper of heart; else it must only redound to the condemnation of him who unworthily participates in the ordinance. "Many," says he, in a discourse preached at Antioch,[3] "partake of the sacrament *once* in the

[1] Respecting the two first, see Hieronymus, ep. 71 ad Lucinium, § 6; — respecting the latter, Basilius of Cæsarea, ep. 93.

[2] See Augustin. ep. 54 ad Januar. § 4.

[3] H. 17, in ep. ad Hebr. § 4.

year, others *twice*. The anachorets in the deserts oftentimes can partake of it only once in two years. Neither of these cases can be approved, in itself considered. We can give our unqualified approbation only to those who come to the communion with a pure heart, a conscience void of offence, and a blameless life. Such may continually repair to the sacrament of the supper; but those who are not so disposed eat and drink condemnation to themselves, even though they partake of it but once." He was obliged to complain that many, who, on ordinary occasions, felt themselves unworthy to participate in the communion, still had no scruples to communicate once a year, after the fasts, at the festival of Easter, or of the Epiphany; just as if they did not incur the same condemnation, whether they received the holy supper at these or at any other times, in an unholy temper of mind.[1] He complains[2] that of those who, on other days when the church assembled, attended the entire missa fidelium, very few participated in the communion, to which the whole liturgy had reference; so that the whole act in this case was a mere formality. "They either belong to the class of the unworthy, who are notified (see above) to depart from the assembly, or they remain behind as belonging with the worthy, in which case they ought to partake of the communion. What a contradiction, that, while they join in all those confessions and songs, they yet cannot participate of the Lord's body!"

In those cases, however, where the custom of daily communion still prevailed, but divine service was held and the sacramental supper consecrated only once or twice on Sunday and Friday, or at most but four times a week, on Sunday, Saturday, Wednesday, and Friday, no other course remained for those who were desirous of having the body of the Lord for their daily nourishment, except to take home with them a portion of the consecrated bread, — for a superstitious dread prevented them from taking with them the wine, which might be so easily spilled, — and to reserve it for future use, so that now they might every day, before engaging in any worldly employment, participate of the sacrament, and consecrate and strengthen themselves by communion with the Lord.[3] In voyages by sea, also, Christians were in the habit of taking with them a portion of the consecrated bread, so as to have it in their power to partake of the sacrament by the way.[4]

This abuse, so contradictory to the original design of the holy supper,

[1] H. V. in ep. I. ad Timoth. § 3. In ep. ad Ephes. Homil. III. § 4.

[2] The last-cited place, § 5.

[3] This is said by Jerome, in ep. 48 ad Pammachium, § 16, concerning Rome: Romæ hanc esse consuetudinem, ut fideles semper Christi corpus accipiant; and subsequently, in reference to those who, although they were afraid to come to church, yet had no fear of participating in the Lord's body at home, he says: An alius in publico, alius in domo, Christus est? In like manner, Basil of Cæsarea says of Alexandria, ep. 93, that in that place, each one communicated, whenever he pleased, at home.

[4] See Ambros. oratio funebris de obitu fratris Satyri. This notion of a magical virtue residing in the bread, is illustrated by an example which Ambrose here relates in the case of his own brother. The latter, at some period before he had received baptism, being on board a ship which ran ashore and was wrecked, obtained from some of his fellow voyagers who had been baptized, a portion of the consecrated bread, which they carried with them. This he bound round his neck, and then confidently threw himself into the sea. He was the first to get to the land, and of course ascribed his deliverance to the power of this charm.

whereby it was converted into a sort of amulet,[1] was the occasion, too, of bringing about the first deviation from the original form of institution; for Christians were now satisfied when they partook of the consecrated bread without the cup. In other respects, the full participation of the sacrament in both kinds was uniformly held to be necessary. The contrary practice was condemned as savoring of Manichæism; since the Manicheans, conformably to their ascetic principles, avoided partaking of the wine in the sacrament of the supper.[2]

The preceding period shows us how, by a change of the idea of the Christian priesthood, another shape and direction was given also to the original idea of a sacrificial act in the sacrament of the supper. In the present period we may still trace, by various marks, the separate existence of these very different elements, out of which the notion of a sacrifice in the Lord's supper gradually arose. On the one hand, was the *older form of intuition* and the *older phraseology*, according to which the name sacrifice was referred to the *outward elements*, so far as these represented the gifts of nature, all to be consecrated to God in the temper of grateful, childlike love: on the other, was the later form of intuition, which referred the sacrifice to the body of Christ himself. Again, considerable prominence was given, it is true, on one side, to the assertion that, if the sacrament of the supper must, in the last reference, be called a sacrifice, yet by this was to be understood simply the celebration of the memory of Christ's sacrifice once for all; but still the notion here crept in, of effects and influences similar to those of a priestly sacrifice.

At this point came in many traditional usages from the preceding period, which, though they sprung originally out of a purely Christian feeling, yet, on account of their connection with the false notion of a sacrifice, received an unevangelical meaning. With the prayer of thanks at the celebration of the Lord's supper, were united intercessions for all the different classes of Christendom, and also intercessions for the repose of the souls of the dead. In the uniting together of these objects, the idea lying at bottom was, that all the prayers of Christians, both thanksgivings and intercessions, derived their Christian significancy from their reference to the Redeemer and to the redemption; that the spirit of love which actuated the community of believers longed to have the blessed effects of the redemption experienced by all the individual members of Christ's body, and also by those who did not as yet belong to it, who must first be incorporated into it by divine grace; that nothing could be alien from this love, which concerned the individual members of the body of Christ; that the fellowship between those who had died in the faith of the Lord, and the living members of the same community of the Lord, still endured, and could not be interrupted by death; that the celebration of the remembrance of Christ's sufferings for the redemp-

[1] Meanwhile we find, in the third canon of the council of Cæsaraugusta, (Saragossa,) A.D. 380, and in the fourteenth canon of the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400, a stringent decree against those who did not partake of the sacrament of the supper at church; but this decree may perhaps have been directed, not so much against the abuse of treasuring up the consecrated element, by itself considered, as against the hypocritical catholicism of the Priscillians.

[2] See Leo the Great, Sermo 41.

tion of mankind was especially suited to call forth all these feelings. It is this combination of ideas, too, though not so distinctly apprehended, which lies at the basis of those rhetorico-poetical representations in the Greek homilists, concerning the connection of these church-prayers with the celebration of the Lord's supper.[1] Petitions were offered for those who had fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who celebrated their memory.[2] On this occasion, too, the individuals were particularly mentioned by name, who had made donations to the church; a practice certainly calculated to inspire the more wealthy with a false confidence, by leading them to imagine that by such gifts they could purchase the remission of their sins, or to flatter their vanity, since they considered it a special honor to have their names thus publicly proclaimed.[3] Parents, children, husbands, and wives, celebrated the memory of their departed friends, by laying a gift on the altar at their death and on each returning anniversary of it, thus causing them to be particularly remembered in the prayers of the church.[4]

But now, when the idea of a commemorative celebration of the sacrifice of Christ for mankind passed insensibly into the idea of an efficacious sacrificial act of the priest standing as a mediator between God and men, it was just from the connection of these intercessions and offerings with this sacrificial act, that a special efficacy was attributed to them.[5] The expressions, more rhetorical than dogmatically precise, which were employed by the Greek homilists, for the purpose of representing to the imagination the efficacy of these intercessions,[6] likewise contributed to promote the tendency, already existing in the popular

[1] E. g. Chrysostom. H. 21, in act. apostol. § 4. *Καταγγέλλεται τότε τὸ μυστήριον τὸ φρικτόν, ὅτι ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐδώκεν ἑαυτὸν ὁ θεός, μετὰ τοῦ θαύματος ἐκείνου εὐκαιρῶς ὑπομιμνήσκει αὐτον τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων.*

[2] *Ὁ διάκονος βοᾷ: ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Χρίστῳ κεκοιμημένων καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων.*

[3] See Hieronymus, lib. II. in Jeremiam opp. ed. Martianay, T. III. f. 584. Nunc publice recitantur offerentium nomina, et redemptio peccatorum mutatur in laudem, —also the 29th canon of the council of Elvira, nomen alicujus ab altare cum oblatione recitare. The Roman bishop Innocent directed, that all the gifts presented should first be commended to God, as consecrated to his service by the love of the Christians; and that then all the individuals should be mentioned by name in the prayers of the church at the celebration of the communion. Prius oblationes sunt commendandæ ac tunc eorum nomina, quorum sunt, ediconda, ut *inter sacra mysteria* nominentur, ep. 25 ad Decentium, § 5. The patrons of the church were also specially mentioned on this occasion; for Chrysostom represents it as a special privilege of the proprietor who allows a church to be built on his land, *τὸ ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις ἀναφόραις ἄει τὸ ὄνομα σοῦ ἐγκεῖσθαι.* H. 28, in act. ap. § 5.

[4] Chrysost. h. 29, in act. ap. § 3. *Ἔθος ὁ δείνα ἔχει ποίειν τὴν ἀναμνήσιν τῆς μήτρος ἢ τῆς γυναίκος ἢ τοῦ παιδίου.* Epiphanius cites among other ancient usages of the church, expos. fid. cathol. *Ἐπὶ τῶν τελευτησάντων ἐξ ονόματος τὰς μνήμας ποιοῦνται, προσεύχας τελοῦντες καὶ λατρείας καὶ οἰκονομίας.* Chrysostom distinguishes expressly the presentation of the Lord's supper, in reference to the departed, from the prayer and the alms connected therewith. *Οὐκ εἰκῆ πρόσφοραι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπελθόντων γίνονται, οὐκ εἰκῆ ἱκετηρίαι, οὐκ εἰκῆ ἐλεημόσυναι.* In act. ap. H. 21, § 4.

[5] Thus the words of Innocent, in the above-cited passage from his Decretals, refer to this connection: Ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris precibus aperiamus.

[6] See Chrysostom. H. 21, in act. ap. § 4. "As, on the celebration of an imperial victory, the imprisoned obtain their liberty, but he who lets this opportunity slip obtains no further grace, so it is here." And Cyrill of Jerusalem, Cateches. Mystagog. V. § 7. "Just as when the emperor condemns one to banishment, but, if his kinsmen present a chaplet in his behalf, the emperor is induced to show him favor; so we present to God, in behalf of those who are asleep, though they were sinners, the Christ who was offered for our sins."

belief, to regard this ordinance in the light of a charm, just as in other cases we may often observe a similar action and reaction between the dogmatical and the liturgical departments.

Still, however, the opposite purely evangelical way of regarding the relation of the sacramental supper to Christ's sacrifice is expressly adopted by Chrysostom, when he says: "Do we not offer every day? We do offer, it is true; but only in this sense, that we celebrate *the memory of Christ's death*.[1] We ever present the same offering; or rather we *celebrate the remembrance of that one offering*."[2] This purely Christian way of regarding the ordinance is presented also by Augustin, when he says that Christians, by the presentation and participation of the body and blood of Christ, celebrate the memory of the offering made once for all;[3] when he styles the Lord's supper an offering in *this* sense, that it is the sacrament which celebrates the remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ.[4] His mode of apprehending the idea of sacrifice seems to proceed from a genuinely Christian spirit. The true sacrifice consists, according to him, in this: that the soul, consumed by the fire of divine love, consecrates itself wholly to God. All actions which flow from such a temper are, in this sense, sacrifices. The whole redeemed city of God, the community of saints, is the universal offering presented to God by the High Priest, who has offered himself for us, that we, following his example, might become the body of so great a head. This, the celebration of Christ's sacrifice in the sacrament of the holy supper represents; in the sacrifice of Christ, the church at the same time presents itself as a sacrifice to God. That is, the living celebration of the memory of Christ's sacrifice, in Christian communion, necessarily includes in it, that they who are united together, by faith in the Redeemer, in one community of God, should in spirit follow the Saviour, and, as they have been redeemed, in order wholly to belong to him and to serve him, give themselves unreservedly to God.[5] But had Augustin conceived and expressed this in a way so entirely clear, and introduced into the sacramentum memoriæ nothing besides, no room would have been left for the notion of a sacrificial act working on for the salvation of others. He did connect with it, however, the idea already implied in the practice of the church, of an offering for the repose of departed souls.[6] It was thus, then, that the germ of the false idea of sacrifice still continued to be propagated; and so it passed over, by means of Gregory the Great, (with whom we shall commence the next period,) in its fully developed form, to the succeeding centuries.

To that which, in itself considered, had sprung out of a purely Christian root, but had received a different turn by becoming diverted and estranged from the original Christian spirit, belonged also the *cele-*

[1] H. 17, in ep. ad Hebr. § 3. Ἀλλ' ἀναμνήσιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.

[2] Μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναμνήσιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

[3] Peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant. c. Faust. l. 20, c. 18.

[4] L. c. c. 21. Sacrificium Christi per sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.

[5] De civitate Dei, l. X. c. 6. Quod etiam sacramento altaris fidelibus non frequentat ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re, quam offert, ipsa offeratur.

[6] Ep. 32 ad Aurelium, § 6. Oblationes pro spiritibus dormientium, quas vere aliquid adjuvare credendum est.

bration of the memory of the great teachers of the universal church, divinely enlightened by the Holy Spirit, or of distinguished individual confessors of the faith. By itself considered, a purely Christian feeling and interest manifested themselves in this fact, that men not only looked for, and acknowledged, the working of the Holy Spirit in the great whole of the church, but had their attention particularly directed also to the special forms of this activity in the sanctified and enlightened human minds which had specially served as the organs of that Spirit; that in these, and the labors of these, men specially honored the power and grace of God, the Redeemer and Sanctifier, and gave this particular direction to the views of their contemporaries and of the following generations, which should go on to develope themselves under the influence of Christian remembrances. The commemorative days of holy men passed over from the preceding period into this; many such days were celebrated in those particular portions of the church where these men were born, or where they had labored; and some of them throughout the whole church, with more than usual pomp and circumstance. The latter was the case with festivals in commemoration of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, which were among the principal festivals at Rome, and with the feast in honor of St. Stephen.[1]

The Christian mode of judgment was shown also in this, that men no longer shrunk from the contact of a dead body, as if it were unclean and defiling; but looked upon the body as the organ of a purified soul, destined to be transfigured to a higher form of existence. Hence it was, that the repose of such bodies was watched with the faithful memory of reverence and love; that they were gladly received and deposited in newly erected churches, so as to connect these places, as it were, by an outward historical bond, with the Christian deeds of the church achieved in more ancient times. But we observed already, in the preceding period, how the multitude began to incline towards a deification of human instruments. The church-teachers, who in one respect resisted this popular bent,[2] yet in another were hurried along themselves by the same spirit; and they certainly fostered in the germ that tendency, the extravagancies and manifestly pagan-like offshoots of which they were contending against. The churches now erected over the tombs of the martyrs tended to promote the veneration for them.

[1] The fact that this last-mentioned festival was transferred by the Western church to the day after Christmas is not to be ascribed to any exaggerated reverence for Stephen, that ventured to compare him, in some sense, with Christ; but the reason of it is to be found rather in the right apprehension of Stephen's relation to his Saviour and Master, to whom he bore witness by his confession and death. In this way it was intended to represent Stephen as the first witness of Christ, who was born on the day before; it was intended by this to make it manifest, that without the Saviour's birth, Stephen could not have suffered this martyrdom; that his martyrdom was a standing memorial of what human nature had attained by Christ's nativity. The Western homilists, especially Augustin, understood very well how to unfold and turn to good account this connection of ideas.

[2] At the death of a venerated monk, contentions might arise between the people of the city and the country about the possession of his body. See Theodoret. hist. religios. c. 21, T. III. p. 1239. But pious monks, as has been already seen in the case of Anthony, took care beforehand, to have the place of their burial concealed, and to prevent their bodies from becoming objects of worship. See hist. religios. p. 1148 and 1221, in the vol. just cited.

The feelings and remembrances here awakened by the place itself, might, in many cases, lead to extraordinary effects on the mind. Thus it may be explained how the conscience of many a guilty individual might here be aroused, and impel him to the confession of his crime;[1] how many kinds of diseases, where a particular bent of the imagination or state of the nervous system had special sway, might here be relieved, — especially mental diseases, as indeed many of the churches of the martyrs were celebrated for the cure of demoniacs. The same effects were attributed to the reliques of saints and martyrs, the sight and touch of which often produced great effects, by virtue of what they were for the mind of the beholder. The fact was triumphantly appealed to, that the divine grace revealed itself in so manifold ways, through these consecrated organs, that the body of each martyr was not preserved in a single burial place, but cities and villages shared it between them; and that although the martyr's body was thus distributed in fragments, yet the gracious virtue of the remains continued to be undivided.[2] But in this way it came about, that the people, on whom what was immediately present and made a direct impression on their own senses exerted the greatest influence, instead of adhering steadfastly to the one Saviour and mediator for sinful humanity, forgot him in their admiration of men standing in equal need of redemption with themselves, and made the latter their mediators; and that much which was essentially heathen became incorporated, under a Christian form, with Christian modes of feeling and thinking. There were to be found in the churches of the martyrs, as formerly in the temples of pagan gods, representations in gold or silver, of limbs supposed to have been healed by help of the martyrs, and which were suspended there as consecrated gifts.[3] Transferring to these churches the old practice of incubation in the temples of Æsculapius, sick persons laid themselves down in them, and sought for the cure of their complaints by such remedies as it was supposed the martyrs would reveal, in dreams, during the night; and many were the legends told of their appearances on these occasions. If a man was about to start on a journey, he besought some martyr to accompany and protect him; and, on his safe return, he repaired again to the church to return thanks. As, under Paganism, every province and city had its tutelary deity, so now the martyrs were converted into these tutelary beings.[4] Sometimes pagan myths were mixed up with Christian legends, martyrs converted into mythical personages, and others invented, who never lived. Thus the fable of Castor and Pollux was transferred to Phocas,

[1] Augustin tells the story of a thief, who was about to perjure himself in the church of a martyr, but was so wrought upon as to confess his theft, and restore the stolen property. Novimus Mediolani apud memoriam sanctorum, ubi mirabiliter et terribiliter dæmones confitentur, furem quendam, qui ad eum locum venerat, ut falsum jurando deciperet, compulsum fuisse confiteri furtum et quod abstulerat reddere. Augustin, ep. 78, § 3.

[2] Theodoret. Ἑλληνικ. θεραπεύτικη παθήματ. disputat. 8, p. 902. Πόλεις καὶ κώμαι ταύτα διανειμάμεναι μερισθέντος τοῦ σώματος ἀμερίστος ἡ χάρις μεμένηκε.

[3] Theodoret. l. c. T. IV. f. 922.

[4] As Theodoretus says himself, l. c. 902: Σωτῆρας καὶ ψύχων καὶ σωμάτων καὶ ἰατροὺς ὀνομαζοῦσι καὶ ὡς πολιούχους τιμῶσι καὶ φύλακας· and Synesius says of the Thracian martyrs:

Θέους
Δρηστῆρας ὅσοι
Γόνιμον θράκης
Ἔχουσι πεδόν.
Hymn III. v. 458.

a martyr, said to have been a gardener at Sinope, in Pontus,—whether any such a person ever lived, or the whole was but a mythical invention,—and he was converted into a patron saint of sailors, whose opportune appearance and friendly interposition formed the subject of many a legend.[1] The pagan celebrations in memory of the dead, (the parentalia,) offerings and sacrificial banquets in honor of the manes, were transferred to martyrs and other deceased persons, at whose graves the people prepared feasts, which they were invited to attend as guests. Well-meaning bishops had overlooked these things in the untutored multitude, hoping that, by the triumph of Christianity over sensual rudeness, these abuses would disappear of themselves.[2] But it was by means of this unwise connivance, springing from an anxiety to promote conversion by masses, that encouragement was given to the habit of confounding pagan and Christian customs, and the pervading influence of the Christian spirit greatly retarded. The abuse, which might have been more easily suppressed at the beginning, was now upheld by the authority of the older bishops, and, by length of time, became so inveterate, that a North-African council could only decree that these banquets should be discontinued as far as possible,[3] and that it required all the firmness and pastoral prudence of an Augustin, which few possessed in the same eminent degree, to get the better here over the rudeness and superstition of the multitude.[4]

Pagans and Manichæans already frequently reproached the catholic church with deifying the saints. As it regards the Pagans, it was indeed oftentimes the very circumstance which most completely accorded with the *Christian feelings*, that was most repugnant to their own. The church fathers defended themselves against this reproach, by affirming that it was far from being the design of the church to deify the martyrs; that they were only honored and loved as instruments of the divine working. Thus, Augustin says:[5] "The Christian people celebrate the memory of the martyrs, as well that we may be excited to emulate their virtues, as that we may share in their merits and be supported by their prayers. Yet it is not to the martyrs, but only to the God of the martyrs, even in churches consecrated to their memory, that we erect altars. What bishop has ever stood at the altar near the

[1] Connected with this was the following beautiful, though not purely Christian custom. During a voyage at sea, in preparing the common table for the whole crew, a dish was set for Phocas, who was supposed to be an invisible guest. The different individuals of the crew purchased this dish in turn. The amount of all the days of the voyage was reckoned up; and, the vessel having prosperously terminated her voyage, the crew distributed all the money thus collected among the poor, as a testimony of gratitude for the successful journey. Asterius in Phocam.

[2] See vol. I. sect. 3, p. 1231.

[3] Concil. Hippon. A.D. 393, quantum fieri potest.

[4] See the report on this matter in Augustin. ep. 29 ad Alypium. This pagan celebration was transferred particularly to the festival which was held originally in remembrance of the power to bind and to loose, conferred on Peter, the natalitia ecclesiæ et episcopatus. As this festival fell on the 22d of February, the usages connected with various kinds of sin-offerings, the *parentalia*, *februationes*, which happened in the month of February, came to be mixed in with it. Perhaps, too, the idea of the keys to the kingdom of heaven being given to Peter, gave occasion for the introduction of various pagan ideas and customs of this sort. See concil. Turon. II. A.D. 567, c. 22, against those qui in festivitate cathedræ Petri cibos mortuis offerunt.

[5] C. Faust. l. 21, c. 21.

grave of a martyr, and said, 'We offer to thee, Peter, Paul, or Cyprian!' Whatever is offered, we offer to the God who crowned the martyrs, and we present it on the holy spots consecrated to the memory of those whom he has crowned; so that, by the very recollections of the place, our feelings may rise upward, and our love be enkindled as well towards those whose example we would imitate, as towards Him by whose help we may be enabled to do so. We honor the martyrs, then, with that reverence of love and communion, which even in this life we pay to the holy men of God, who, in the temper of their hearts, appear to us to be prepared to suffer such things for the gospel truth. But the former we reverence with the greater devotion, as the confidence is greater with which it can be done, after the conflict is over,—as the assurance with which we praise the conquerors is more complete than we can have with regard to those who are still engaged in the conflict." So Theodoret: "We honor them as witnesses and well-disposed servants of the most High."[1] The church-teachers, as well as the rest, shared in that wide-spread faith in the operations of divine grace through the remains which had once served as the sanctified bodily organs of these men. They looked upon these as an evidence of the importance which a *sanctified* man, in whatever state or condition, had in the sight of God; they spoke on this subject with enthusiasm: but at the same time they constantly referred back from these sanctified men to God the author of all, and represented them as only living monuments of the Redeemer's grace. Teachers like Chrysostom and Augustin exhorted their hearers not to place their dependence on the intercession of the martyrs, without any holiness of their own; not to use them as a crutch for their own inactivity; representing the martyrs and saints as being, after all, but *men*, in their *sinful nature* the same with all others; and calling upon their hearers to reverence them truly by imitating their virtues. In a word, we find here various conflicting elements of a Christian estimation of true worth, and an unevangelical over-valuation of human instruments.

So also the liturgy of the Eastern church, where it makes mention of the martyrs, contains something at variance with the exaggerated reverence bestowed on them. For as the original custom of *oblationes pro martyribus* arose from the fact that they were placed on the same level with other redeemed sinful men, so this view of the case passed over into the liturgical forms, and the martyrs were mentioned, in like manner with others, in the intercessions.[2] We must endeavor to reconcile this element, originating in the primitive Christian way of thinking, with the prevailing notions concerning the martyrs, by some such explanation as the following: that although the martyrs were mentioned in the same rank and series, yet this was done with a different reference and in another sense; the martyrs being considered as a standing witness of the redeeming power of Christ's sufferings, the remembrance of which was celebrated in the sacrament of the supper, and also of his victory

[1] L. c. 908. Ὡς θεοῦ γε μάρτυρας καὶ εὐνοῦς θεραπόντας.

[2] In the general πρόσφορα for the community of believers, it was said also: Κφ μάρτυρες ὅσι, κ᾽ὰν ὑπερ μαρτύρων. Chrysost. H. 21, in act. ap. § 4.

over death;[1] just as, in the celebration of a triumph of the emperor, all those partook of the honor who had borne any share in obtaining the victory.

Much, however, as the more distinguished teachers of the church labored to reconcile with the essence of the pure Christian worship of God, and so to spiritualize, the worship of the saints, still the extravagant encomiums which they bestowed on them, in their rhetorico-poetical style of writing and speaking, could not fail to result in promoting the popular superstition. And by the same principle on which they here proceeded to spiritualize the worship of the saints, the New-Platonic philosophers could sublimate and spiritualize polytheism itself.

But here, too, as in the case of the overstrained ascetic tendency, respecting which we have already spoken, an opposition manifested itself, which grew out of the original Christian spirit still remaining in the church. The extravagant veneration paid to the martyrs, which among the people bordered on idolatry, moved the presbyter Vigilantius of Barcelona, a native of Gaul — whom we have mentioned in another connection as an opponent of the one-sided ascetic tendency and of Monachism — to call the whole thing in question. He seems to have been a man possessed, indeed, of too headstrong a temper, yet actuated by an honest and pious zeal for preserving the purity of the Christian faith.[2] Had he used greater moderation in attacking aberrations of the religious spirit which still had some foundation in the feelings, although misinterpreted, of the Christian heart, he might have accomplished more. In a tract written against the abuses of the church in his time, he calls the venerators of martyrs and reliques, "ashes-worshippers and idolaters."[3] He represents it as supremely ridiculous to manifest such veneration, nay, adoration of a miserable heap of ashes and wretched bones; to cover them under costly drapery, and kiss them.[4]

In answer to this reproach of worshipping the martyrs, Jerome replies, that Christians were far from intending to pay creatures the honor which is due to the Creator alone; they so honored the reliques of the martyrs as to worship Him only of whom the martyrs had borne testimony. The honor they showed to the servants had reference to the Master himself, who says, Matth. 10: 40, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me." *But was the thought which Jerome here makes so prominent actually present to the consciousness of the people in their veneration of reliques and martyrs?*

When Vigilantius spoke of *wretched bones*, Jerome could very justly reply, that the devotion of believers saw and felt somewhat more than this in them; that, to the eye of faith, there was nothing here which

[1] Chrysostom: Καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ τε θανατοῦσθαι τὸν θάνατον σημεῖον.

[2] Hence may have proceeded the somewhat ignorant zeal which he manifested in the Origenistic controversies. See below.

[3] Cinerarios et idololatras. Hieronym. ep. 109 ad Riparium.

[4] Quid necesse est, te tanto honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid, quod in modico vasculo transferendo colis? ubicunque pulvisculum nescio quod in modico vasculo pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorant. Hieronym. c. Vigilant. § 4. The nescio quod intimates, perhaps, that the bones of some unknown person were often given out for reliques.

was dead; but that, through these, believers looked up to the saints living with God; that God is, in truth, not the God of the dead, but of the living.

Vigilantius complained that the heathen practice of placing lighted lamps before the images of their gods had been transferred to the martyrs; that wax tapers were burned during the day-light in the churches of the martyrs;[1] — how could they think of honoring those martyrs by the light of miserable wax candles, on whom the Lamb in the midst of God's throne reflected all the brightness of his majesty? To this Jerome replies: "Even though some of the laity or pious women might, in their simplicity, suppose the martyrs were so honored; yet we are bound to recognize and to respect the pious feelings evinced, though they may err in the mode of their expression. Thus Christ approved the pious feelings of the woman who anointed him, and reproved the disciples who found fault with her." Such considerations ought, indeed, to teach indulgence towards errors of religious feeling; yet not the less on this account ought those errors to be censured which might prove so dangerous to pure Christianity. True, the charity which seeks out and indulgently embraces whatever of truth may be lying at the ground of the error, ought not to fail; and it is only in connection with this charity that zeal for truth can work rightly; but neither should the corrective zeal for truth be wanting, if the error must not be suffered at length wholly to supplant the fundamental truth, and Christianity to be completely subverted by the unchristian element. Zeal for truth, actuated by the spirit of love, must operate constantly as a corrective and refining energy in the life of the church, if its divine foundation is to be preserved pure and entire.

Vigilantius inveighed, also, against the nocturnal assemblies (the vigils) held in the churches of the martyrs; asserting, what his antagonist Jerome could not deny, that these assemblies, in which both the sexes participated, frequently served as a pretext and as an occasion for gross immoralities. He seems also to have thought it unbefitting that the vigils — which, according to ancient usage, were a distinctive feature of the Easter festival — should be transferred to the festival of the martyrs. He inveighed next against the *reliance placed on the intercessions of the martyrs*. "According to the holy scriptures," says he, "the living only should mutually pray for each other." To this Jerome replies, that, if the apostles and martyrs in this earthly life, before they had yet come safely out of the conflict, were able to pray for others, how much more could they do so after they had obtained the victory. But what word of scripture bids the faithful call upon such departed saints to be their intercessors, as it invites the living to mutual intercession for each other, in the fellowship of love?

As an argument against such invocations, Vigilantius affirms that the martyrs could not be present wherever they were invoked, to hear men's petitions, and to be ready to succor them. Here he may have conceived of the habitation of the blessed spirits after a manner somewhat

[1] Prope vitium gentilium videmus sub prætextu religionis introductum in ecclesiis, sole adhuc fulgente moles cereorum accendi.

confined and local, and possibly may have taken various figurative expressions of the New Testament in too material and literal a sense.[1] On the other hand, Jerome asserts of the glorified saints, that they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes, Rev. 14: 4. If, then, the Lamb is everywhere present, so must we believe that they also who are with the Lamb are everywhere present; thus the faithful are, in spirit, everywhere present with Christ. Both Vigilantius and Jerome, although in opposite ways, were for knowing too much respecting those things of a higher world which are hidden from the eye of man, and of which he cannot judge by the forms of his earthly perception.

When the miracles said to have been wrought at the graves of martyrs, and by their reliques, were alleged in defence of the propriety and great importance of honoring them, we do not find that Vigilantius took much pains to examine into the credibility of these reports, but he simply opposed to this prevailing passion for the miraculous, the Christian principle of judgment respecting miracles. "The Christian who is certain of his faith," says he, "neither seeks nor asks for miracles; nor does he need them. Miracles were wrought, not for the believing, but for the unbelieving." Perhaps Vigilantius intended, by so saying, to have it understood, on the one hand, that those who were seeking miracles from the martyrs showed, by this very circumstance, how far removed they were from the genuine Christian spirit, and on the other, that, in the main, these pretended miracles were nothing but a delusion; for, as the end for which all miracles were performed no longer existed in the minds of believers, miracles ought, among Christians, no longer to be admitted.

This extravagant, superstitious tendency manifested itself also particularly in the *worship of the virgin Mary*. The ascetic spirit venerated in Mary the ideal of the unmarried life; the name, "mother of God," (θεοτόκος,) which it had become the custom to apply to her ever since the last times of the fourth century, and which afterwards became the occasion of so many controversies, — this name itself might, by a natural misconstruction of the people, contribute some share towards the deification of Mary. Among a small sect of women, who came from Thrace and settled down in Arabia, the superstition had already advanced to an idolatrous worship of the virgin Mary; a practice universally condemned, it is true, by the church. They looked upon themselves as the priestesses of Mary. On a set day, consecrated to her as a festival, they conveyed about in chariots, (δίφροι,) similar to those used by the Pagans in religious processions, cakes or wafers consecrated to Mary, (κολλύριδες, κολλύρια, hence their name κολλυριδιάνισες, Collyridianians,) which they presented as offerings to her, and then ate themselves. It would seem that this was a transfer of the oblations at the Lord's supper to the worship of Mary, the whole taking the shape of a pagan ceremony. The truth, perhaps, was,[2] that a corruption was here introduced

[1] We perceive here the advocate of the grossly literal interpretation of the Bible, the opponent of Origen, when he says: Vel in sinu Abrahæ vel in loco refrigerii vel subter aram Dei animas apostolorum et martyrum consedisse.

[2] A conjecture of bishop Münter of Seeland.

from the pagan worship of Ceres, that the customary bread-offerings at the heathen feast of the harvest, (Thesmophoria,) in honor of Ceres, had been changed for such offerings in honor of Mary. The excessive veneration of Mary had, as a further consequence, however, to call forth still more violent opponents; and these seem to have been antagonists, at the same time, of the one-sided ascetic tendency which chose Mary as its ideal. This controversy grew more particularly out of a disputed question of history and exegesis. Many teachers of the church had, in the preceding period, maintained that by the brethren of Jesus, mentioned in the New Testament, were to be understood the later born sons of Mary. But the ascetic spirit, and the excessive veneration of Mary, were now shocked at the renewal of this opinion. Thus it came about that, at the close of the fourth century, a layman of Rome, by the name of *Helvidius*, destitute, as it would seem, of a regular theological education, supposed that in the New Testament he found reasons for this opinion, while at the same time he appealed to the authority of Tertullian and Victorinus of Petavio. He affirmed, also, that by this opinion he in nowise infringed on the honor of Mary; and he was thus led to attack also the exaggerated opinion of the unmarried life. He quoted the examples of the patriarchs, who had maintained a pious life in wedlock; while, on the other hand, he referred to the examples of such virgins as had by no means lived up to their calling. These opinions of Helvidius might lead us to conclude, that the combating of a one-sided ascetic spirit was a matter of still more weight with him than the defence of his views with regard to Mary. Perhaps, also, he may have been led into these views simply by exegetical inquiries and observations, and so had been drawn into this opposition to the *over-valuation* of celibacy, merely for the purpose of defending his opinion against an objection on the score of propriety.

But when we consider, that at the very time when Helvidius appeared at Rome, the presbyter Jerome, by his extravagant encomiums on the unmarried and his depreciation of the married life, was creating there a great sensation, and, by his extreme statements, giving every provocation which, according to the common course of things, would be likely to call forth opposition from the other side; it seems more probable, that both Helvidius and Jovinian were excited by this very counter-action of their own polemical efforts, although, in the case of the latter, the opposition doubtless was based on a deeper inward ground, in the whole, connected system of his Christian faith. Jerome wrote against Helvidius, to whom, in scientific culture and erudition, he was confessedly superior, with all the violence and heat which characterized him.

Among these opponents of the reigning opinion belongs also another contemporary, Bonosus, a bishop, probably of Sardica, in Illyria, against whose views several synods, as well as the bishops, Ambrose of Milan, and Siricius of Rome, protested.[1]

[1] See the letter to Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, probably written by the Roman bishop, Siricius. Both Siricius and Ambrose held this opinion to be an essentially false doctrine. The latter says: Hoc tantum sacrilegium — and we see it was nothing but the ascetic spirit which attributed so much importance to this dispute —

The idolatrous veneration of the virgin Mary, in Arabia, of which we have just spoken, was probably the occasion also of the same views being advanced by many, whom the blind zealot Epiphanius denominates enemies of Mary, (*ἀντιδικομαριανίται.*)

In the preceding period, we already noticed the devotion with which places in Palestine consecrated by religious remembrances were regarded and sought out by the Christians. The tendency towards the outward, in the religious spirit of these times, must have contributed to increase the veneration for these monuments of sacred history. Especially since the empress Helena and other members of the Constantine family had been so eager to visit these spots, and had decorated them with magnificent churches, the number of pilgrims began greatly to multiply. Chrysostom says, that from all quarters of the earth men flock to see the places where Christ was born, where he suffered and was buried.[1] Emperors made pilgrimages to the tomb of the apostle Peter in Rome, and before they visited it, laid aside all their imperial insignia, in memory of this hero of the faith. Even the memory of Job drew many pilgrims to Arabia, to see the dung-heap and to kiss the earth on which the man of God had suffered with such resignation.[2] Very justly did it appear a great thing to Chrysostom, that, while the monuments of earthly glory were overlooked, the places, in themselves inconsiderable, consecrated by nothing but the remembrances of religion, should be searched out, after hundreds and thousands of years, by the common devotion; and very properly might he say, that great profit could be derived from visiting those spots, from the recollections and thoughts which they suggested, while the sight of imperial magnificence left but a transient impression. It was in consonance with a deep-seated feeling of human nature, that these places should possess a peculiar worth for the Christian heart. The only mischief was when too great stress was laid on these sensible and outward means of exciting devotion, since they usually made a momentarily all-absorbing and transitory, rather than a deep and lasting impression; although certainly some allowance should be made here for the different temperaments of southern and northern races of men. The effect was especially disastrous, when men began to attribute to these visits to holy places, in themselves considered, a sanctifying and justifying power. And it must be allowed that this would very soon happen, since men so easily inclined to overlook the inward grace in the outward form, the end in the means. Yet even here, a remarkable opposition of the pure evangelical spirit manifested itself against the sensual tendency. Thus Jerome declared[3] that "the places of the crucifixion and of the resurrection of Christ profited those only who bore their own cross, and rose each day

cum omnes ad cultum virginitatis s. Mariæ advocentur exemplo. De institutione virginis, c. V. § 35.

[1] Exposit. in Psalm. 109, § 6, T. V. 259. Ἡ οἰκουμένη συντρέχει. In Matth. H. VII. § 2. Ἀπο τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἔρχονται, ὀφθῆναι τὴν φάτνην καὶ τῆς καλύβης τὸν τόπον.

[2] Chrysostom. Homil. V. de stutuis, § 1, T. II. p. 59. Πολλοὶ νῦν μακράν τινα καὶ διαπόντιον ἀποδημίαν στέλλονται ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν Ἀραβίαν τρέχοντες, ἵνα τὴν κόπριαν ἐκείνην ἰδῶσι καὶ θεασάμενοι καταφιλήσωσι τὴν γῆν.

[3] Ep. 49 ad Paulin.

with Christ; but those who said 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord,' should hearken to the apostle, '*Ye* are the temple of the Lord, the Holy Spirit dwells within you.' Heaven stands open to us in Britain, as well as in Jerusalem; the kingdom of God should be within ourselves." He relates, that the venerable monk Hilarion, in Palestine, had visited the holy places but once in his life, although he lived in their vicinity, so that he might not give countenance to the exaggerated veneration of them. And Gregory of Nyssa said (ep. ad Ambrosium et Basilissam:) "Change of place brings God no nearer. Wherever thou art, God will visit thee, if the mansion of thy soul is found to be such that he can dwell and rule in thee. But if thou hast thy inner man full of wicked thoughts, then, whether thou art on Golgotha, on the Mount of Olives, or at the monument of the crucifixion, thou art still as far from having received Christ into thy heart, as if thou hadst never confessed him." The moral corruption which prevailed in these very regions, beyond what was the case in any other country, he very justly cites as a proof of the little influence which those impressions on the senses could of themselves have on the sanctification of the heart.

Thus, throughout this entire section, we perceive still going on, the conflict between the original, free and purely Christian spirit, directed to the worship of God in spirit and in truth, and the encroaching, sensuous, half-Jewish and half-pagan spirit, which would rob the inner man of the liberty achieved for him by Christ, and make him a slave to outward, earthly things, and to the maxims of this world.

In concluding this section, we may bring forward another witness of this struggle, who appeared as an opponent of various novel tendencies of the church life, even of such as had their origin in the preceding period. This was Ærius, a youthful friend of that Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, in Arminia, whom we have already mentioned. When Eustathius was made bishop, he placed his friend, as presbyter, over a house of paupers. But subsequently to this, Ærius fell into a quarrel with the bishop. He accused him of not remaining true to the ascetic life, which had originally brought them together, and of being too much interested in the acquisition of earthly property:—Whether the fact was that Eustathius deserved this reproach, or that Ærius, owing to the strength of his prejudices, did him injustice, and would make no allowance for the change of conduct to which he was impelled by his office and the wants of the church placed under his care. Probably also he had been drawn into disputes with his bishop respecting the proper administration of ecclesiastical affairs; against whom he advocated the equality of bishops and presbyters, according to the original system of church polity. As evidence of this he brought the fact, that presbyters as well as bishops baptized and consecrated the elements of the holy supper. Finally, he became the author of a schism, and attacked various usages of the dominant church. He inveighed against the practice of attaching value to intercessions and to the celebration of the eucharist as an offering for the dead. If such an ordinance could help the departed to bliss, there would be no need of moral efforts in the present

life; it would only be necessary for each to make or purchase for himself friends, who could be induced to pray and offer the oblation of the supper in his behalf. (See above.) It is worthy of notice, that, although an ascetic, he was opposed to the laws regulating fasts, and to the confining of fasts to set times, as Wednesday, Friday, the Quadrigesima, and Good-Friday. All this, he maintained, ought to be done according to the spirit of the gospel, with freedom, according to the inclinations and necessities of each individual. He found fault with the ordinances of the church on this point, because they had substituted the yoke of a Jewish bondage to the law, in place of the gospel liberty. He disputed, moreover, the custom of celebrating the passover, which, handed down from more ancient times, was still observed in these parts of Asia.[1] By the sufferings of Christ, that which this type foreshadowed was fulfilled once for all. Such a celebration was, in his opinion, a confounding of Jewish rites with Christian. It is easy to see, that the spiritual bent of Ærius required a total separation of Christian ordinances and doctrines from Jewish.

The hierarchical sentiment occasioned violent persecutions against Ærius and his party. Driven from all quarters, they were often obliged to hold their assemblies in the open fields, in groves and on the mountains.[2]

[1] See vol. I. sect. 2, p. 522.

[2] The principal authority, hæres. 75.

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY APPREHENDED AND DEVELOPED AS A SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES.

I. General Introductory Remarks.

This period introduced important changes as well in the evolution of the conceptions of Christian doctrine as in other branches of Christian development. The change proceeding from outward relations, which formed the groundwork of this new period, was not, it is true, so *immediately* connected with that which, by its very nature, must take its outward shape from a power residing within. But, in tracing the course of development of human nature, no single branch can be contemplated without some reference to the others; much rather do all stand in a relation of mutual action and counteraction. Changes having their beginning from without extend their influence also to the inner world; and seldom does an important revolution take place in outward relations, until the way for its transforming influence has been prepared in the more inward development. This was particularly true with reference to the influence on the inward development of doctrines, produced by the great change which had taken place in the outward relations of the church since the time of Constantine. For the effects which actually resulted from this influence, the way had long since been prepared by the course of development within the church itself. It was not all at once and through the influence of an external force, that the Christian doctrine was first delivered from the struggle with Judaism and Paganism; but the development of the Christian doctrine in intelligent consciousness had, of itself, so far pushed on its way triumphantly, through the oppositions of Judaism and Paganism, that these were forced to retire, when now the peculiar essence of Christianity, as a whole, and as it appeared in its several great doctrines, had come to be more clearly and distinctly apprehended by means of the conflict with these antagonists.

The agreement in the essentials of Christianity, expressed in the struggle against those heresies which sprung up out of impure commixtures of Judaism or Gentilism, continued from the preceding period into the present. In the mean time, however, notwithstanding the agreement in essentials, various germs of opposition in respect to the mode of apprehending particular Christian doctrines had sprung up; as indeed we observed to be the case in the preceding period. These might, at first, subsist peacefully side by side, while fellowship as to the essentials of Christianity still overbalanced the individual peculiarities arising out of different modes of apprehension, and the common opposition to those tendencies of spirit which appeared in the struggle against the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, diverted men's attention from these subordinate differences. But it lay in the very essence

of human nature, that the germs of these oppositions should ever proceed to unfold and shape themselves into a more distinct form of subsistence. But the common opposition to the Jewish and Judaizing, to the pagan and paganizing spirit, having begun to relax; the church, delivered from the hostile tendencies which assailed her from without, being left more entirely to herself; it now happened, that those differences in the mode of conceiving individual doctrines, unfolded to downright opposition, came into conflict with each other. According to the regular course of the development of human nature, it could not well happen otherwise. The process of development, once begun, could not stand still: as human nature is constituted, the harmonious apprehension of Christianity in all its parts, could only proceed out of these opposite views of doctrine. If the entire substance of humanity, in thought as well as in life, was to be thoroughly pervaded by Christianity, it must necessarily enter also into these oppositions. But the melancholy fact was, indeed, the same here as often recurs in the history of the church; — that, amid these oppositions, the unity of Christian consciousness, which embraced and included them all, could be wholly forgotten; that each party apprehended and judged the opposite views of the other, only from its own particular position; and, contemplating them from without, instead of entering into their principles and examining them according to their internal coherence and connection, charged them with consequences which lay utterly remote from them. Thus to each of the contending doctrinal parties, the struggle for their *own peculiar* modes of apprehension seemed identical with the struggle for Christianity itself. Had men but clearly seized, and fixed in their own consciousness, the exact relation of the *speculative* system of faith to the *life of faith*, and the relation of the single Christian doctrines to that which constitutes the peculiar and *essential foundation* of the gospel, to the doctrine concerning Christ as the Redeemer of mankind, the whole would have turned out otherwise. The oppositions, which often existed only in the speculative mode of apprehending doctrines, would not have been able to disturb and break up the fellowship and unity of the Christian consciousness; and a peaceful mutual understanding would have soon taken the place of oppositions rigidly set over against, and mutually excluding each other.

But — as men were not prepared to acknowledge that different speculative modes of apprehending doctrines might subsist side by side, provided only that the unity in the fundamental essence of Christianity was also held fast in the speculative conception — it was attempted to bind the unity of Christian consciousness to a unity of speculative apprehension, excluding all differences; and hence the effort after a narrow and narrowing uniformity, which would force all the different bents and tendencies of mind under one yoke, and which must necessarily check the free and natural evolution of the Christian system of faith, and thereby, in the end, of the Christian life of faith itself.

Still more hurtful was the course taken by these doctrinal controversies when disturbed by the interference, especially in the East Roman empire, of a foreign power, — namely, that of the state, — which hindered

the free development and the free expression of the different opposite opinions. Owing to this, the purely dogmatic interest of the controversies was oftentimes extremely vitiated by the intermixture of a foreign secular interest and foreign secular passions. Not unfrequently did it happen, that the opposite views of doctrine, which, after being developed outwardly from within, had already proceeded to such extent, indeed, as to be prepared for collision with each other, were first called forth into actual collision by outward, foreign occasions, arising out of the confusion of ecclesiastical with political matters. And the consequence of this was, that, from the very first, a foreign interest was superinduced, which increased the difficulty of arriving at a mutual understanding, and disturbed the pure course of development. In remarking this, however, many too superficial observers have been led falsely to suppose, that these disputes were due *solely* to their outward occasions, and to the conflict of passions; when the truth is, that the outward occasions could only call forth what had long since been prepared in the course of development within the church itself; as in fact we saw, when we traced the incipient germs of these oppositions in the preceding period, and as will be still more clearly shown in detail, when we come to consider their progressive movement in the period before us. The interference of that foreign power might, moreover, for certain transient periods of time, bring about some other result of the controversies, than that which corresponded to the natural relation of the conflicting elements to each other; but such results, forced on from without, could not, as the history of their doctrinal controversies shows, be anything permanent. The theological spirit of that portion of the church on which such results were forced, was moved to resist them, and the foreign element was spurned away again, though not without a violent struggle.

The different dogmatic tendencies of spirit, which in the preceding period could unfold and express themselves with some degree of universality and completeness, now presented themselves, for the most part, in a more precise and definite shape, in controversies about single doctrines, — and, as a general thing, did not proceed to unfold themselves in wider compass and with more logical consistency. For this reason, the controversies about single doctrines also furnish us with the most important help towards understanding the different general tendencies of the dogmatic spirit. While, in the preceding period, the conflict of universal spiritual tendencies fully carried out, in the oppositions of Judaism, of Gnosticism, of the Roman church tendency, of Montanism, and of the Alexandrian tendency, predominated; in the present period, on the other hand, the oppositions manifested themselves rather in the history of single doctrines, than in the tendencies of the dogmatic spirit generally. Had the universal ground-tendencies which lay at the foundation of the controversies respecting single doctrines, been allowed to express themselves in their entire compass, this circumstance would have been attended with very important consequences, affecting the entire development of Christianity.

Amidst the doctrinal controversies of this period, the characteristic difference between the tendency of the dogmatic spirit in the Eastern

and in the Western church became apparent, while, at the same time, it went on to shape itself into a more precise and determinate form. In the Eastern church, the Greek mobility of intellect and speculative direction of thought predominated. In the Western church, the more rigid and calm, the less mobile but more practical tendency of the Roman spirit prevailed.[1] Hence it happened, that while, in the Eastern church, the development of doctrines had to pass through the most various forms of opposition before they could come to any quiet adjustment, the result to which the Eastern church first arrived, after manifold storms and conflicts, was, in a certain sense, anticipated by the church of the West; and she subsequently appropriated to herself the accurate definitions of doctrine which had been devised in the Eastern church from the conflict of opposite parties.

In the next place, the doctrinal controversies of the Eastern church sprung out of the speculative theology, although at the same time there was also an interest for practical Christianity at bottom. But the only doctrinal controversy belonging properly to the *Western* church took its beginning from that which constitutes the central point of all practical Christianity, anthropology in its connection with the doctrine of redemption.

All the doctrinal controversies of the Eastern church stand closely connected, as the following exhibition of them will show, with the controversy about the speculative mode of apprehending and defining the doctrine of the Trinity. This was fraught with very important consequences on the peculiar direction of the system of faith in both churches. As it had already happened, in the preceding period, that, in the doctrine of the Trinity, the form of speculative apprehension and the essential, practically Christian, object-matter, had been too much confounded; as the custom had been to apprehend this doctrine in too isolated a way,—not enough in its vital connection with the doctrine of redemption, in the right connection with which it can alone have its true significancy; so the course taken by the doctrinal controversies in the Greek church contributed still more to establish and confirm this method of treating the doctrine of the Trinity. And hence it came about, that, in the Greek church, the whole system of faith was built on a founda-

[1] This difference between the two churches was rightly perceived by Greek theologians, as early as the twelfth century, and made use of as an argument in defending the Greek church against the reproach, that all the heresies had sprung out of her bosom. See the remarks of Nicetas, archbishop of Nicomedia, in Anselm. Havelbergem. Dialogg. l. III. c. XI. D'Achery spicileg. T. I. f. 197. Quoniam nova et pluribus inaudita fides subito publice prædicabatur, et in hac civitate studia liberalium artium vigebant, et multi sapientes in logica et in arte dialectica subtiles in ratione disserendi prævalebant, cœperunt fidem Christianam disserendo examinare et examinando et ratiocinando deficere. Next, to the vana sapientia, by which the Greek false teachers had suffered themselves to be misled, is opposed the simplicitas minus docta of the Romans, which is derived vel ex nimia negligentia investigandæ fidei, vel ex grassa tarditate hebetis ingenii, vel ex occupatione ac mole secularis impedimenti. So far as the intellectual phenomena of different times admit of being compared, we might find some analogy in the relation existing between the *theological development among the Germans and the English;* but with this difference, so important in its bearing on the result, that in Germany, the more active intellectual life has not been checked and hampered in the development of its oppositions by anything which resembles Byzantine despotism.

tion too entirely speculative; that matters of philosophy and matters pertaining to the system of faith were too frequently jumbled together; that speculative definitions with regard to the divine essence were held to be just the most important; and that so much the less interest was taken, therefore, in that which is the most important thing for practical Christianity in the true sense, namely, with Christian anthropology, in its connection with the doctrine of redemption; and the doctrines bearing on this subject were held to be of inferior importance.[1]

Since, then, the systematic theology of the Greeks placed at the centre of its system a certain speculative form of apprehending Christian truth, a certain speculative definition of the Christian idea of God, rather than that which constitutes the natural centre of the whole Christian life; the consequence was, that doctrines of faith and doctrines of practice could not be evolved from a common centre, and hence the vital organic connection between the two could not be fairly presented to the conscious apprehension, and so a system of legal morality grew up by the side of an excessively metaphysical, cold, and lifeless system of faith. Thus the adoption of a wrong method in treating the doctrines of faith must exert an influential reaction also on Christian life itself.

It was otherwise in the church of the West. The only doctrinal controversy which properly had its origin in this church, related to Christian anthropology in its connection with the doctrine of redemption. Owing to this circumstance, systematic theology here received at once its peculiar practical direction, and the inner connection between doctrines of faith and of practice was clearly presented to consciousness; — and the honor of bringing about this result belongs preeminently to Augustin, the man who bore the most distinguished part in the controversy above mentioned.

The most significant phenomenon in the general history of the system of faith, and one whose influence reached from the preceding period

[1] Thus Gregory of Nazianzen names, among the subjects discussed in the public teaching of those times, the question whether there was but one world or whether there were many worlds; the questions, what is matter, what is soul and spirit; questions about the different kinds of higher spirits, (*ὅσα περὶ κόσμων ἢ κόσμου πεφιλοσοφήται, περὶ ὕλης, περὶ ψύχης, περὶ νοῦ καὶ νοέρων φύσεων,*) and having spoken next of the appearance and sufferings of Christ, he names as the principal thing, (*τὸ κεφαλαίον,*) the doctrine of the Trinity. (see his orat. I. f. 16,) although this doctrine surely derives its *Christian* importance only from its connection with that doctrine which Gregory represents as a subordinate one; although entire Christianity starts not from a speculative doctrine concerning the Divine Being, but from the actual revelation of God, as a fact in history. In another place, he speaks, it is true, as he frequently does elsewhere, against those who made the investigation of Christian truth to consist merely in speculating on the doctrine of the Trinity; and warns against the tendency which seeks to determine too much concerning the essence of the Godhead, — a subject, the full knowledge of which is reserved for the future life; but then he names in connection, as subjects on which men might employ their thoughts more profitably, and in which also there was no danger of going astray, (*τὸ διαμαρτάνειν ἀκίνδυνον,*) the *φιλοσοφεῖν περὶ κόσμου ἢ κόσμων, περὶ ὕλης, περὶ ψύχης, περὶ λογίκων φυσέων βελτιόνων τε καὶ χειρόνων, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, κρίσεως, ἀνταποδόσεως, χρίστου παθημάτων.* Orat. 33, f. 536. An error in respect to the relation of Christ's sufferings to the work of redemption, seemed to him, then, less dangerous, than an error in respect to the relation to one another of the hypostases in the Trinity. It is worthy of notice, also, that nothing occurs here which has any bearing whatever on the distinguishing character of Christian anthropology.

over into the present, was the struggle betwixt the speculative spirit of Origen's school, and the opposite tendency of practical realism. True, at Alexandria itself, the spirit of this school did not maintain itself as one vigorously working onward in its wide embracing compass, and with its whole vital energy. The catechetical school at Alexandria was no longer such as it had been under Clement and Origen. Didymus, the last and the only distinguished teacher of this period, wanted the *original* and profound intellect of Origen, wonderful as was the erudition which this person, blind from his earthly youth, had found means to store up in his mind. Only one thing peculiar to the spiritual tendency of Origen passed over to the *Alexandrian church* as a whole. The contemplative, mystical, and, in part, speculative element continued to be cherished there; and out of this the peculiar dogmatic character of that church gradually formed itself; but Origen's free and enlarged spirit of inquiry vanished away from it. Origen's greatest influence, on the other hand, proceeded from his writings, which had no small share in forming the minds of some of the most eminent church-teachers of the East, who were distinguished in the doctrinal controversies for their free spirit and their theological moderation. Such were Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the great church-teachers of Cappadocia, Gregory of Nazianzen, Basil of Cæsarea, and his brother Gregory of Nyssa, on whose strong mind the speculative spirit of Origen had a very great influence.

In general, though the *realism* of the church spirit offered a counterpoise to the speculative spirit of Origen's school, and though many of Origen's peculiar ideas were universally rejected; partly such as the development of the theological spirit in these times was not ripe enough to receive, and partly such as had grown out of a combination of Platonism with Christianity, and which were really foreign from the essence of the gospel; yet the school of Origen had served, in this struggle, to introduce, throughout the entire church, a more spiritual mode of apprehending the system of faith, and to purge it everywhere of a crude anthropomorphism and anthropopathism, and of the sensuous notions of Chiliasm. And in the treatment of the most weighty single doctrines we may discern the after-working of the influence of that great church-teacher on the development of antagonisms which made their appearance in the fourth century, as will be more particularly shown in the history of those controversies.

As Platonism had been chiefly employed by the Alexandrian school in giving shape to Christian theology, and as the *philosophical character* of this school had been formed under the influence of Platonism, so this peculiar form of the scientific spirit continued to be the prevailing one with all those in the Greek church who made it their special object to obtain a scientific understanding of the system of faith. It was only the narrow dogmatism of the understanding which sprung from Eunomius, that sought wholly to suppress the element of Platonism. Had this latter succeeded in its struggle, a complete revolution would have been brought about in the system of faith. But the three great church-teachers of Cappadocia, who had been formed in the school of Origen,

took strong and decided ground against this whole new tendency. We shall treat more particularly of this struggle hereafter, in relating the history of doctrinal controversies.

A new mixture of Platonism with Christianity, independent of Origen, in which, moreover, the Platonic predominated in a far greater measure over the Christian element, is seen in the case of Synesius of Cyrene, afterwards bishop of Ptolemais, the metropolitan town of Pentapolis, in the early times of the fifth century. We have here a remarkable exemplification of the manner in which a transition might be gradually made from fundamental ideas of the religious consciousness, conceived under the form of Platonism, to Christianity. But we see, also, how a transformation of Christian doctrines into mere symbols of Platonic ideas might be brought about in the same way. Precisely as, in earlier times, (see vol. I. sect. 1, p. 34,) this Platonism had attached itself to the pagan cultus, and to the hierarchical system of Paganism, out of which combination arose a mystico-theurgical system of religion; so a similar phenomenon, under the Christian form, might arise out of a combination of Platonism with the dominant religion of the church. The false notion of the priesthood, by which it was represented as a mediatory organ between heaven and earth, between God and man, as a vehicle for the conveyance of heavenly powers to the earth, as man's representative before God; the false notion, connected with this other, of the sacraments, as the bearers of those heavenly powers — all this might easily be laid hold of as a basis for theurgical mysteries. A theurgical system, or mystical symbolism of this sort, formed out a mixture of Christianity and Platonism, we find completely elaborated in the writings forged under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, which might have been composed some time in the course of the fifth century.

The influence of Origen had been very great, also, in giving form and direction to a thorough exegetical study of the scriptures with all the helps of learning. This method, in truth, was first called into existence by him, in opposition to a crass, literal interpretation of the Bible. The exegetical bent of a Eusebius of Cæsarea and of a Jerome, the latter of whom was the first to create an interest in the more thorough method of studying the scriptures in the Western church, had been first awakened by Origen. But by the introduction of his speculative principles, and by his allegorizing tendency, which was in part owing to this fondness for speculation, the free development of that exegetical method, and the unbiassed application of it to the exposition of the system of faith, had, in Origen's own case, been greatly hindered. Up to this time there had existed only the opposite extremes of that crass literal method of biblical interpretation, and this arbitrary allegorizing tendency. But already, at the close of the preceding period, we observed how a grammatical and logical method of interpreting the Bible, holding the medium between these two extremes, had begun to be formed under the direction of the Antiochian church-teachers. The beginnings of this tendency were still further developed by distinguished men in the fourth century and in the commencement of the fifth; — by Eustathius, bishop of Antioch; Eusebius, bishop of Emisa, in Phœnicia; Dio-

dorus, bishop of Tarsus, in Cilicia; and above all by the sagacious and original Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, in the same country. Now as the Alexandrian church had continued to preserve the allegorizing tendency, it could scarcely fail to happen, as a matter of course, owing to the great influence which different hermeneutical and exegetical tendencies naturally have on the treatment of the system of faith, that opposite tendencies of doctrine would also spring up between the theological schools of the two churches. The allegorizing tendency could, without much difficulty, accommodate itself wholly to the form of the tradition in the dominant church, and explain the Bible in conformity therewith. The more unprejudiced, grammatical, and logical interpretation of the Bible would tend, on the other hand, to purge the existing system of church doctrine of the various foreign elements which had found entrance through the church tradition, guided as that tradition had been by no clear consciousness of the truth. The allegorizing interpretation of the Bible was closely connected with that extreme theory of inspiration which made no distinction whatever between essence and form in the communication of divine things, but regarded everything alike as having come from divine suggestion. The followers of this mode of interpretation looked upon every word as equally divine; they sought mysteries on all sides; they would not admit that there was any human element to be taken account of; they would not construe this element according to its human individuality of character, and human origin — would explain nothing by reference to human modes of apprehension and development. Under the idea of showing particular respect to the Bible, they undesignedly detracted from its authority; because, instead of understanding its human form from the history of its human-becoming, and of perceiving the divine Spirit revealing itself therein, they explained the whole as a single production after a system, foreign indeed from the sacred word, but pre-conceived and pre-established as a divine one by themselves, thus foisting or implying in the Bible what really was not there. Moreover, according to the above mode of interpretation, no insurmountable difficulties, forcing men to perceive that such notions of inspiration were untenable, could occur; for by resort to the mystical sense, (the ἀναγωγή εἰς τὸ νοητόν,) all difficulties could be easily set aside, all striking discrepancies in the representation of scriptural facts explained away. On the other hand, the grammatico-logical interpretation of the Bible must take notice of the human as well as of the divine element in the sacred scriptures; in this case, difficulties would necessarily present themselves, not to be reconciled with the adoption of those extreme notions of inspiration; men must be led to perceive the diversity of human individualities of character in the style of the inspired writers, — the discrepancies between historical accounts in particular matters; and the clear perception of these facts must lead to a different way of apprehending the idea of inspiration. True, men generally proceeded in this period, as in the preceding, upon the idea of a divine inspiration of the holy scriptures, without accurately investigating or defining the idea itself; but still these differences would, of themselves, ever and anon, distinctly come

up to view, although few or none proceeded at once to unfold them in their whole extent; and although sometimes, even unconsciously, conflicting elements of different modes of apprehending the idea of inspiration might practically be united by the same person. The fact is, accordingly, that we meet with no instances of the more free mode of apprehending the idea of inspiration in this period, except in those persons who had been led to it by an unprejudiced, grammatico-logical interpretation of the Bible, as was the case, for instance, with Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Chrysostom.[1] The applying of such a different notion of inspiration to the investigation of the scriptures, with a view to educe from them the system of faith, would also, of itself, lead to many differences in matters of doctrine. In connection with this different mode of conceiving the idea of inspiration, there would come to be fixed also a different point of view, from which to consider the divine and the human elements in the life of the apostles, and in the life of Christ himself; since the Antiochian school was led, by the exegetical tendency above described, to take up the human along with the divine, while the Alexandrian school, taking a more partial view of the matter, gave prominence to the divine element alone. To this we must add the general difference of intellectual bent in the two schools; which difference, again, lay at the root of the other difference between their respective tendencies in exegesis and interpretation. In the Alexandrian school, an intuitive mode of apprehension, inclining to the mystical; in the Antiochian, a logical reflective bent of the understanding, predominated; although that hearty and sincere Christianity which may consist with every variety of intellectual bent, was not wanting to either. The first of these tendencies inclined to give prominence to the transcendent, the ineffable, the incomprehensible side of the divine matter revealed in Christianity;[2] to place by itself the incomprehensible as not to be comprehended, as an object of faith, and of religious intuition; to oppose all attempts at explanation; and, in order to express this in the strongest possible manner, it sought after expressions whereby to push the matter to the utmost extreme, and which were certainly liable to misconstruction. On the other hand, the Antiochian intelligential bent, while it was for allowing faith its just due, and would not attempt to explain the incomprehensible, strove to unfold the matter of revelation by the understanding, to present it in the clearest form in which it could be apprehended, and to provide against all possible misapprehensions, (particularly such as might arise from confounding together and interchanging the divine and the human elements,) by means of precise

[1] As, for example, when Chrysostom says, Hom. I. in Matth. that differences in the gospels on matters not essential constituted no objection to their credibility, but rather served to place their agreement in essentials in the light of a stronger evidence for their truth; since thus it would not be alleged that their agreement and harmony was the effect of design. So when Jerome, commenting on the passage in Gal. 5: 12, finds no difficulty in supposing, that St. Paul, in the choice of an expression, is governed by the vehemence of an emotion, arising, however, out of a pure temper of heart. Nec mirum esse, si apostolus, ut homo, et adhuc vasculo clausus infirmo, vidensque aliam legem in corpore suo captivantem se et ducentem in lege peccati, semel fuerit hoc loquutus, in quod frequenter sanctos viros cadere perspicimus.

[2] Το ἀῤῥητον, το ἄφραστον, τὸ ἀπερινόητον τοῦ μυστηρίου.

conceptions. Thus arose out of the relation of these two schools to each other, the most important theological antagonism in the Eastern church, the effects of which were most decidedly manifested in the doctrinal controversies. This antagonism would have been attended with still more important consequences on the theological development, had it been permitted to go on and express itself in its fullest extent. The tendency of the Antiochian school is seen in its more moderate form, and deeply pervaded by the Christianity of the heart, in the case of two individuals, both of whom present models of biblical interpretation for the period in which they lived, while one of them furnishes the best pattern of a fruitful homiletic application of the sacred scriptures: these were Theodoret and Chrysostom. The example of the latter shows particularly the great advantage of this exegetical tendency, when accompanied by a deep and hearty Christian feeling, and a life enriched by inward Christian experience, to any one who would cultivate a talent for homiletic exposition, and indeed for the whole office of the preacher.

The same important part which Origen had borne in directing the theological development of the Eastern church, was sustained by Augustin with reference to that of the Western church. His influence was, in many respects, still more general and long-continued than the influence of that great father of the church. To remarkable acuteness and depth of intellect he united a heart filled and thoroughly penetrated with Christianity, and a life of the most manifold Christian experience. In system and method, he was doubtless superior to Origen; but he wanted the erudite historical culture, for which the latter was distinguished. If to his great qualities of mind and heart, he had united this advantage, he would thereby have been preserved from many a partially conceived dogma, from many a stiff abstraction pushed to the utmost extreme, into which he was hurried by his speculative turn of mind, his rigid systematic consistency, combined with the peculiar direction of his religious feelings.

We noticed, in the case of the Alexandrian Gnosis, a two fold element; the Platonic view of the reciprocal relation between the esoteric, philosophic knowledge of religion and of the symbolical faith of the people, (of ἐπιστήμη and of δόξα;) and on the other side, the view derived from the Christian consciousness of the relation of doctrinal knowledge to faith. Augustin was the first who clearly separated, in his own consciousness, these two forms of knowing, and placed the latter above the former. Augustin's scientific discipline, as well as Origen's, came from Platonism; but with this difference, however, that in the case of Origen, the Platonic element was sometimes confounded with the Christian, and Christianity subordinated to Platonism. In the case of Augustin, on the other hand, his theology disentangled itself from Platonism, and the forms of Christian intuition and thought were expressed in an independent manner, and even in opposition to the Platonism from which the scientific discipline of Augustin's mind had taken its first direction. And in connection with this, while in Origen's case the philosophical and the dogmatic interest were often confounded, in that of Augustin, on the other hand, with whom the central point of his inner Christian

life constituted also the central point of his system of faith, the dogmatic element unfolded itself, in the main, with more purity and independence. But even in his case, the philosophical interest and element of his speculative intellect unconsciously mixed in with the Christian and theological; and it was from him that this mixture of elements was transmitted to the scholastic theology of the middle age, which stood in immediate connection with his own. We see, in Augustin, the *faith* for which the anti-gnostic party had contended, reconciled with the Gnosis which came from the Alexandrian school. The peculiar training of his life enables us to understand how he came to occupy this important place in the development of the system of faith. The transition, in Augustin's case, from the Platonic philosophy of religion to the peculiar gnosis of Christianity, was not a mere speculative change, but a process in his own life. The development of doctrinal ideas proceeded, in his case, conformably to the natural order of things, out of his own internal experience.

Let us recur here, in the first place, to a fact stated in an earlier part of this history, that a truly pious mother had seasonably scattered the seeds of Christianity in Augustin's heart while yet a child. The incipient germs of his spiritual life were unfolded in the unconscious piety of childhood. Whatever treasures of virtue and worth, the life of faith, even of a soul not trained by scientific culture can bestow, was set before him in the example of his pious mother. The period of childlike, unconscious piety was followed, in his case, by the period of self-disunion, inward strife and conflict. For at the age of nineteen, while living at Carthage, he was turned from the course which a pious education had given him, by the dissipations and corruptions of that great city. The fire of his impetuous nature needed to be purified and ennobled by the power of religion; his great but wild and ungoverned energies, after having involved him in many a stormy conflict, must first be tamed and regulated by a higher, heavenly might, must be sanctified by a higher spirit, before he could find peace. As it often happens that a human word, of the present or the past, becomes invested with important meaning for the life of an individual, by its coincidence with slumbering feelings or ideas, which are thus called forth at once into clear consciousness, so it was with Augustin. A passage which he suddenly came across in the Hortensius of Cicero, treating of the worth and dignity of philosophy, made a strong impression on his mind. The higher wants of his spiritual and moral nature were in this way at once brought clearly before him. The true and the good at once filled his heart with an indescribable longing; he had presented to the inmost centre of his soul a supreme good, which appeared to him the only worthy object of human pursuit; while, on the other hand, whatever had, until now, occupied and pleased him, appeared but as vanity. But the ungodly impulses were still too strong in his fiery nature, to allow him to surrender himself wholly to the longing which from this moment took possession of his heart, and to withstand the charm of the vain objects which he would fain despise and shun. The conflict now began in his soul, which lasted through eleven years of his life.

As the simplicity of the sacred scriptures possessed no attractions for his taste — a taste formed by rhetorical studies and the artificial discipline of the declamatory schools; — especially since his mind was now in the same tone and direction with that of the emperor Julian, when the latter was conducted to the Platonic theosophy; as, moreover, he found so many things in the doctrines of the church which, from want of inward experience, could not be otherwise than unintelligible to him, while he attempted to grasp by the understanding from without, what can be understood only from the inner life, from the feeling of inward wants, and one's own inward experiences; — so, under these circumstances, the delusive pretensions of the Manichean sect, which, instead of a blind belief on authority, held out the promise of clear knowledge and a satisfactory solution of all questions relating to things human and divine, presented the stronger attractions to his inexperienced youth. He became a member of that sect, and entered first into the class of *auditors*. It was the sum of his wishes, to be received into the class of the *elect*, so as to become acquainted with the mysteries of the sect,— which were the more alluring to his eager thirst for knowledge, by reason of their enigmatical character,— and thus finally attain to the clear light he was so earnestly in pursuit of. But his interviews with Faustus, one of the most eminent teachers of this sect, so entirely baulked his expectations, that, after having spent ten years as a member of the sect, he was thrown into complete bewilderment. At length he was fully convinced, that Manicheism was a delusion; but from this he was in danger of falling into absolute scepticism, from which nothing saved him but that faith in God and truth which remained planted in the deepest recesses of his soul. During this inward struggle, the acquaintance which he had gained, by means of Latin translations, with works relating to the Platonic and New-Platonic philosophy, proved of great service to him. He says himself, that they enkindled in his mind an incredible ardor.[1] They addressed themselves to his religious consciousness. Nothing but a philosophy which addressed the heart,— a philosophy which coincided with the inward witness of a nature in man akin to the divine, — a philosophy which, at the same time, in its later form, contained so much that really or seemingly harmonized with the Christian truths implanted in his soul at an early age; — nothing but such a philosophy could have possessed such attractions for him in the then tone of his mind. Of great importance to him did the study of this philosophy prove, as a transition-point from scepticism to the clearly developed consciousness of an undeniable objective truth; — as a transition-point to the spiritualization of his thoughts, which had, by means of Manicheism, become habituated to sensible images; — as a transition-point from an *imaginative*, to an intellectual direction; — as a transition-point from *Dualism* to a consistent *Monarchism*. He arrived, in this way, first to a religious idealism, that seized and appropriated to itself Christian elements; and was thus prepared

[1] L. II. c. academicos, § 5. Etiam mihi ipsi de me ipso incredibile incendium in me concitarunt.

to be led over to the simple faith of the gospel. At first, this Platonic philosophy was his all; and he sought nothing further. It was nothing but the power of that religion implanted during the season of childhood in the deepest recesses of his soul, which, as he himself avowed, drew him to the study of those writings which witnessed of it. He argued that, as truth is but one, this religion could not be at variance with that highest wisdom; that a Paul could not have led such a glorious life as he was said to have led, had he been wholly wanting in that highest wisdom. Accordingly, in the outset, he sought in Christianity only for those truths which he had already made himself acquainted with from the Platonic philosophy, but presented in a different form. He conceived of Christ as a prophet, in illumination of mind and holiness of character exalted, beyond all comparison, above all others; one who had been sent by God into the world for the purpose of transplanting what, by philosophical investigation, could be known only to a few, into the general consciousness of mankind, by means of an authoritative faith. From this point of view, he contrived to explain all the Christian doctrines on the principles of his Platonic idealism. He imagined that he understood them, and spoke of them as a master who was certain of his matter. As he afterwards said himself, he wanted that which can alone give the right understanding of Christianity; and without which, any man will have only the shell of Christianity without its kernel — the *love which is rooted in humility*.[1]

But this theory, as it frequently happens with theories, and especially theories on religious matters erected on some other basis than living experience, was demolished, in his case, by the energy of life; for the Platonic philosophy presented before him, it is true, ideals which ravished the intellectual vision, but could give him no power of obtaining victory over the flesh. The ideals retreated from him, whenever he attempted to grasp them: he was continually borne down again by the ungodly impulses which he thought he had already subdued. As he was conducted, therefore, by his living experience to an acquaintance with the want which Christianity alone can satisfy, and without the feeling of which it cannot be vitally understood, to a knowledge of the want of redemption from the sense of inward schism; so he found in Christianity more than he was seeking for in it, having in fact been led to it chiefly in the way of speculation. The study of St. Paul's epistles in particular, which he began in this epoch of his life, made the more powerful impression on his soul, because so much in the fundamental idea of these epistles respecting that which is law, spirit, and that which is flesh, and respecting the conflict between both, connected itself with his own inner experiences and conflicts, and became clearly evident to him from them. Much that had been unintelligible to him before he had made these experiences, he could now understand; and, in general, he became better acquainted with Christianity, the more he found himself at home in it by means of his own inner life, and the

[1] As he says himself, in his confessions, speaking of this period of his life: Garriebam plane quasi peritus, jam enim cœperam velle videri sapiens; ubi erat illa caritas, ædificans a fundamento humilitatis, quod est Christus Jesus.

more he experienced the sanctifying power of the divine doctrines on his own soul. Thus, then, by degrees, the relation was completely reversed: it was no longer the Platonic philosophy which was most certain to him; and it was no longer barely the prejudice in favor of the religion of his childhood, which made what had been imparted to him by that philosophy appear to him under a more familiar and popular form. But as he had found in Christ his Saviour, so all that Christ taught him was infallible truth, which required no other confirmation. It was the highest criterion of all truth. He himself had experienced the power of this doctrine in his inmost soul; and this was to him a subjective testimony of its divinity and truth. His religious and moral consciousness was now satisfied; his desire of knowledge alone still sought satisfaction. He longed to see that what was certain to him by faith in divine authority and by inward experience, was also true and necessary on internal grounds; and the means to this were to be furnished him by the Platonic philosophy.[1]

Now the fact was, that, at this stage of his development, the same thing happened to him which is so liable to occur in similar cases. He deprived biblical ideas of their *full, peculiar* significance, by translating them into the language of the Platonic philosophy. Thus, for example, he called the wisdom of this world simply a wisdom which is still entangled in the forms of sense, which does not elevate itself to *ideas;* and the kingdom of Christ, as not being a kingdom of this world, he styled one which has its foundation in the world of ideas.[2] Nor was this merely a change of expression, in which nothing was lost to the matter; but the form of expression was intimately connected with the ethical point of view peculiar to this school. Augustin was, at this time, particularly inclined to dwell in his thoughts exclusively upon the opposition between the spiritual world and the world of sense; — to contemplate the divine rather as simply opposed to the things of sense and to sensuous appearance, than as opposed to the self-seeking tendency of the spirit; — to derive moral evil expressly from man's propensity to the things of sense and sensual appearances. Yet by degrees, in proportion as Christianity penetrated from the inner life through his whole mode of thinking, he

[1] Thus he said on entering upon his thirty-third year, in this very epoch of his life: Mihi autem certum est, nusquam prorsus a Christi auctoritate discedere, non enim reperio valentiorem. Quod autem subtilissima ratione persequendum est — ita enim jam sum affectus, ut quid sit verum, non credendo solum, sed etiam intelligendo apprehendere, impatienter desiderem, — apud Platonicos me interim, quod sacris nostris non repugnet — reperturum esse confido. C. academicos. l. III. § 43.

[2] In his critical examination of his own writings, his retractationes, l. I. c. III. Augustin himself passes censure on this translation of the notions of faith into the philosophical language of the Platonic school, in which he had indulged himself in those writings which belonged to the epoch of his life just mentioned, as also in his work de ordine, l. I. c. XI. When Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world," he does not mean by this the ideal world, (the *κόσμος νοητός*,) as opposed to the world of sense, (the *κόσμος αἰσθητός*;) but rather the world in which there should be a new heaven and a new earth, when that came to pass which we pray for in the words, "Thy kingdom come." At the same time we may notice the freedom from prejudice with which he acknowledges that the idea of a *mundus intelligibilis*, in the Platonic sense, by no means contained in it, absolutely considered, any unchristian view, but, rightly understood, was a truth altogether undeniable; the mundus intelligibilis being nothing other than the eternal, invariable order of the world as it lies grounded in the divine reason.

came to perceive the difference between Platonic and Christian ideas, and unshackled his system of faith from the fetters of Platonism.

Augustin had learned from his own experience, that, in reference to the knowledge of divine things, the *life* must precede the *conception;* that the latter could only come out of the former; for, in truth, the reason why the simple doctrines of the gospel had, at the beginning, appeared so foolish to him, and the delusive pretensions of that boastful mock-wisdom of the Manicheans had so easily drawn him into its current, was, that those truths had as yet found no point of union whatever in his inner life. It was from the life within that he had learned to believe in these truths, and to understand them. By love for the godlike, by the power of the religious, moral temper of heart, he had conquered the scepticism with which he had for a while been threatened. Thus — as his system of faith was throughout the copy and expression of the development of his internal life, and hence possessed so much vitality — it became with him a fundamental idea, that *divine things must be incorporated with the life and the affections, before we can be capable of an intellectual knowledge of them.* While a Manichean, he had entertained the opinion, that perfection was to be attained by speculative illumination, by the wisdom of the perfect man. At present, this way to the knowledge of divine things appeared to him as one which, since it reversed the natural order of things, must necessarily fail of its end;[1] for it was clear to him, that the perfect knowledge of divine things presupposed the perfection of the inner man. At present he was convinced, that man must first humbly receive, from a divine authority, the truth which is to sanctify him, ere he could be sanctified and so fitted with an enlightened reason for the knowledge of divine things. Although *that* could only be revealed to men by divine authority which in its intrinsic nature was truth, hence also cognizable as true on grounds of reason,— yet, in the order of time, implicit faith, the faith of authority, must have the precedence,[2] as a means of preparation and culture, in order to a capacity for this knowledge, the process of which is outward from within. Yet he was still, in some sense, bound up in that view of Platonism respecting the relation of δόξα to ἐπιστήμη in religion; and as he perceived, that, without the scientific culture to which but comparatively few Christians could attain, that rational knowledge was not possible, but as without it there seemed to him to be something still wanting to Christianity; so he was of the opinion, therefore, that those few only attained to the real blessedness of this life by Christianity, who combined with it scientific culture. But in proportion as his views became more clearly unfolded with the progress of his Christian *life;* as the life of faith appeared to him possessed of a loftier nature, from the experience of his own heart;[3] and as he became acquainted with this life among all

[1] So he says, in the work de moribus ecclesiæ Catholicæ, l. I. § 47, in opposition to the Manicheans: Quamobrem videte, quam sint perversi atque præposteri, qui sese arbitrantur Dei cognitionem tradere, ut perfecti simus, cum perfectorum ipsa sit præmium. Quid ergo agendum est, quid quæso, nisi ut eum ipsum, quem cognoscere volumus, prius plena caritate diligamus?

[2] Augustin. de ordine, l. II. c. 9. Tempore auctoritas, re autem ratio prior est.

[3] This is an important point, also, in its bearing on the development of Augustin's views respecting grace and predestination,

conditions and forms of culture, in the same proportion he became convinced, that reason (ratio) did but unfold the essential contents of what was given by faith, into the form of rational knowledge, but could impart to it no higher character. He distinctly set forth this relation of reason proceeding out of faith, and the life of faith, to faith itself; especially in his disputes with the Manicheans, who reversed this relation.[1]

Thus it was first by him, that the great principle out of which the subsequent doctrinal system developed itself in its independent self-subsistence — "fides præcedit intellectum" — was established in a logically consistent manner. We find, therefore, in Augustin two tendencies, by which he exerted a special influence on the development of Christian knowledge in this century, and in the following ones: a tendency to assert the dignity and independence of faith, as opposed to a proud, speculative spirit which rent itself from all connection with the Christian life; and to point out, in opposition to the advocates of a blind faith, the agreement of faith with reason, the development of faith from within itself by means of reason.[2] But it is necessary to add here, what we have before remarked, that Augustin assumed as that on which faith must fix, and from which it must take its departure, *everything given in the tradition of the church:* hence he was led to admit into his *ratio* many foreign elements, as though they were given by *fides;* and his well-exercised speculative and dialectic intellect made it easy for him to find reasons for everything, — to construe, as necessary, everything which had once become fused, although originally composed of heterogeneous elements, with his life of faith. His system of faith wanted that historical and critical direction, whereby alone, returning back, at all periods of time, to the pure and original fountain of Christianity, it could *make* and *preserve* itself free from the foreign elements which continually threaten to mix in with the current of impure temporal tradition.

which we shall hereafter examine more closely when we approach the history of these doctrines. In the outset, when his faith was still more purely the faith of authority, the latter appeared to him as the human element, to which alone the divine could attach itself. When he had penetrated more deeply into the essence of that which is the life of faith, faith itself seemed to him already to presuppose the communication of the divine element to the man: it seemed to him, that in faith the divine and human elements were already conjoined.

[1] As in the tract de utilitate credendi.

[2] On this point, the letter of Augustin to Consentius, ep. 120, is particularly worthy of notice. He here proposes the problem, ut ea, quæ fidei firmitate jam tenes, etiam rationis luce conspicias. "Even faith," says he, "has its eyes, with which, in a certain sense, it sees that to be true which still it does not see, and with which it sees with the utmost confidence that it does not yet see what it believes." In faith lies also the yearning after more perfect knowledge; for faith cannot exist without the longing after, and without the hope of, that which one believes. Against an absolute antagonism of fides and ratio, he says: "Far be it from us to suppose, that God should hate in us that by means of which he has made us superior to all other creatures. Far be it from us to suppose, that we are to believe in order that we may be under no necessity of receiving or of seeking rational knowledge; since we could not even believe, unless we were possessed of rational souls. Even this, too, is beyond all question in conformity with reason, that in some things pertaining to the doctrines of salvation, which we are as yet not able to penetrate by our reason, faith precedes rational knowledge, that so the disposition may be purified by faith, in order to be in a condition, at some future period, to receive the light of so great truth."

We now pass to consider the history of the principal doctrines of Christianity singly considered, and of the prominent antagonisms in the modes of apprehending and treating these doctrines; and, in so doing, we shall see still more clearly presented, in their peculiar features, the different and opposite main tendencies of the theological spirit.

2. Opposite ways of Apprehending and Treating the Single Great Doctrines of Christianity.

a. Theology in the more limited sense of the term, or the Christian Doctrine concerning God.

We shall notice first the controversy which, in its result, had the greatest influence on the whole development of the doctrine concerning God; viz. the controversy on the doctrine of the *Trinity*, from which all the others may be most conveniently derived.

This controversy was a natural consequence of the opposite conceptions of the doctrine of the Trinity, which had been formed in the course of the preceding period; and its origin can be rightly understood and judged, only by a previous consideration of the latter. Considering it in this connection, we can be under no temptation of ascribing too much importance here to external circumstances and occasions, or to the influence of any individual man, as, for instance, Arius. Neglecting this, we might easily be misled to pass an unjust judgment on Arius, after having unjustifiably removed him out of his connection with the dogmatic development of his times, so as to consider his system merely as *his own* work, and not as, in a certain sense, a product of the epoch of dogmatic development in which his life was destined to fall.

We observed, near the close of the preceding period, two main systems on the doctrine of the Trinity, and more particularly on the doctrine concerning the relation of the Son of God to the Father: the system, for the most part peculiar to the Western church, in which the Christian *theistic* interest was most distinctly expressed; and the Oriental system of emanation and subordination, which obtained a settled form through the labors of Origen. By the former, the unity of essence (the ὁμοούσιον) in the Triad was made specially prominent, with a view to distinguish precisely the Son of God from all created beings, and to retain firmly the principle of *Monarchy;* while, on the other hand, the latter system had grown from the establishing, under more precise conceptions, of the older emanation theory, — its aim being simply to remove from the latter all temporal and sensuous representations. This system, it is true, in one respect coincided with the other; namely, that it affirmed the difference not merely in degree, but in essence, betwixt the Son of God and all created beings: but the doctrine of the unity of essence was combated by this system as an annihilation of the distinction of persons; and this constitutes that opposition between the two systems which we remarked already at the close of the preceding period. But when now the opposition to the former system was carried to a still further extreme, a third system was formed, which, along with the unity of essence, rejected also the eternal generation; and, in gen-

eral, would not admit any essential difference between the conception, *Son of God*, and the conception of a created being, — between the notion of a generation from God, and the notion of a creation. *This* system stood connected with the older subordination theory, and was, in so far, nothing new,[1] but only an attempt to fix and hold fast, in this doctrine, an earlier step of development, in opposition to any further progressive movement. The novelty consisted in the form in which the doctrine, so fixed and held fast, was understood, and in which it must assume a more rigidly distinctive and exclusive character. In the letter of Dionysius, bishop of Rome, to Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, we find already the indications of such a mode of apprehension (see vol. I., sect. 3, p. 1037.) Now it was this which, being fully expressed, in the beginning of the fourth century, by the presbyter Arius, evoked the disputes, of the rise and progress of which we are about to give an account.

As to Arius, it should be remarked, with regard to his peculiar theological education, that he was a scholar of the presbyter Lucian of Antioch.[2] From this school he took that direction which led him to place the free, grammatical interpretation of the Bible at the basis of his doctrinal system. But in cases where this direction was not accompanied with a general intuition of biblical ideas vitalized by Christian experience, and this general intuition had not made plain the true relation of the particular to the general in the expressions of holy writ, it might tend, by laying too great stress on particulars, and giving them an undue prominence, to promote narrow views of the truths of faith. This was the case with Arius, in whom a tendency to narrow conceptions of the understanding, exclusive of the intuitive faculty, predominated. In the Antiochian school, too, he probably took a direction in opposition to the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, which led him to give particular prominence to the distinction of hypostases, and, what was connected therewith, to assume at the same time a polemical attitude against the Homoousion.[3] But even in the system of Origen's school at Alexandria, he might afterwards find many points of concurrence with his own views, as well in the polemics against the doctrine of the unity of essence and in the subordination theory, as also in the way in which the doctrine of the freedom and self-determination of all rational beings was here apprehended. Arius certainly did not believe that he was preaching a new doctrine, but only bringing out and establishing the old church subordination system; — without which it seemed to him neither the monarchical principle of the Triad, nor the self-subsistent personality of the Logos, could be maintained. "We must either suppose," says Arius, "two divine original essences without beginning, and independent of each other; we must substitute a *Dyarchy* in place of the Monarchy; or we must not shrink from asserting that the Logos had

[1] As, in fact, although the Logos was doubtless distinguished from other created beings, yet no scruples were felt at the same time to apply to him the phrase ἔκτισέ με, in Proverbs 8: 22; consequently, in so far, of applying to him the name of a κτίσμα.

[2] Which may be gathered from the circumstance, that he addresses the bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, in his letter preserved to us by Theodoret and Epiphanius, as συλλουκιανίστης.

[3] See vol. I. sect. III. p. 1036.

a beginning of his existence, that there was a moment when he did not as yet exist" (*ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν.*)[1] The idea of a becoming without a beginning, a derivation in essence and not in time, was, to the feebly speculative and feebly intuitive mind of Arius, something too subtle and refined, — something incomprehensible, self contradictory. We perceive here how little suited Origen's method of intuition was to the mind of Arius. So, too, he supposed that, by a generation from God, — inasmuch as particular stress was laid on this notion of a generation from God, as distinguished from creation, — nothing at all could be distinctly conceived, unless men were disposed to fall in with the sensuous Gnostic representations of a partition of the divine essence.[2] But if men chose to lay particular stress on the notion Son of God, and to employ this designation for the purpose of distinguishing the Logos from all created beings, they would in this way also fall into sensuous, anthropopathic notions. Between God the Creator, and the creature, nothing else could be conceived as intervening. Either Christ was a divine, original essence, like the Father, and then it would be necessary to suppose two Gods, or else there should be no fear or hesitation in distinctly avowing that he was, like all other creatures of God, created, formed, begotten, — or however else it might be expressed; for, however it was expressed, the matter itself remained the same, — by his own will, as it pleased him, from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων.*) Those passages of the New Testament in which he believed he found the expression *ποιεῖν* employed with reference to Christ,[3] in which he found him styled the *First-born*,[4] consequently a beginning of existence, as he thought, ascribed to him, he could cite in favor of his theory. By all this, he intended by no means to lower the dignity of Christ; but would ascribe to him the greatest dignity which a being could have after God, without entirely annulling the distinction between that being and God. God created him, or begat him, with the intent through him to produce all things else; the distance betwixt God and all other beings is too great to allow of the supposition that God could have produced them immediately. In the first place, therefore, when he determined to produce the entire creation, he begat a being who is as like to him in perfections as any creature can be, for the purpose of producing, by the instrumentality of this Being, the whole creation.[5] The names Son of God, and Logos, were given to him in order to distinguish him from other created beings, inasmuch as, although, like all created beings, he owed everything to

[1] He intentionally avoided saying, *ἦν χρόνος, αἰων ὅτε*, for he unquestionably supposed that the Logos was produced by the Father before all time; the conceptions of time and of creation being, according to his opinion, inseparably connected.

[2] Here he might take sides with the school of Origen against a *γεννήσις ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ*, little as he could agree, according to the above remarks, with the spiritual way of apprehending the doctrine of emanation in the same school.

[3] Act. ap. 2, 36. Heb. 3 : 2.

[4] Col. 1 : 15.

[5] *Ὡς ἄρα θέλων ὁ θεὸς τὴν γενητὴν κτίσαι φύσιν, ἐπείδη ἐώρα μὴ δυναμένην αὐτὴν μετάσχειν τῆς τοῦ πάτρος ἀκράτου χείρος καὶ τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργίας, ποιεῖ καὶ κτίζει πρώτως μόνον ἕνα καὶ καλεῖ τοῦτον υἱον καὶ λόγον, ἵνα τουτοῦ μέσου γενομένου, οὑτῶς λοίπον καὶ τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γένεσθαι δυνηθῇ.* Athanas. orat. II. c. Arian. § 24. Although Athanasius is here stating that in which Eusebius of Nicomedia, Asterius and Arius agreed, and these very words consequently ought not to be ascribed to Arius, yet they are certainly altogether in accordance with his way of thinking.

the will and favor of the Creator, he yet enjoyed the nearest relationship to Him, inasmuch as the divine reason, wisdom, power, all which titles could only be transferred to Christ in an improper, metonymical sense, were yet manifested by him in the most perfect degree. As an example of the rude style of conception and expression in which Arius indulged, we may take the following remark of his: "Having determined to create us, God created a certain being whom he named Logos, Wisdom, and Son, in order to create us by him."[1] Arius quoted many examples of scripture phraseology, to show that the expressions Logos, power of God, are by no means always used in the holy scriptures in the same sense; so that it was in nowise necessary to understand by these terms a power and a reason of God inseparable from the Divine Essence; but they were ofttimes transferred and applied in an improper sense to other objects; as, for example, when even the locusts, Joel 2: 25, (according to the Alexandrian version,) were called the great power of God.[2] Such explanations as these might, indeed, easily furnish occasion for representing Arius as a man whose main bent was to contend against the divine dignity of the Saviour, and to misrepresent him. But in reality this was meant by Arius only as a grammatical vindication of his own way of apprehending a biblical idea, where certainly it did not occur to him to suppose that from these examples, adduced to establish the scriptural use of language, anything should or could be inferred tending to the disparagement of our Saviour. But this grammatical interpretation must doubtless have appeared offensive to the prevailing *doctrinal* interest, which flowed out of a hearty Christian feeling. Arius perceived, beyond all question, that, from the very conception of a creature, an infinite distance must be inferred betwixt him and the Creator; nor did he shrink from expressing this. This, in fact, Origen had already expressed in affirming that as God is, in essence, infinitely exalted above all created beings, so, too, in essence he was infinitely exalted above the highest of created beings, the Son; and the latter, in essence, could not at all be compared with him.[3]

He reckoned as belonging to the essence of the rational creature — in this particular, falling in as well with the school of Origen, as with that of Antioch — *the self-determining, mutable, free will;* the foundation of all the superiority enjoyed by rational beings. This principle he applied also, without concealment or evasion, to Christ. By his nature, as a created being, Christ possessed a will subject to change; but he had constantly directed it to that only which is good, and by this means he had become *morally* unchangeable. Thus the Son of God, too, had obtained the glory which he possessed above all other creatures, not without the desert of his own will; for as God by his foreknowledge saw, from the beginning, what a holy life Christ would lead, as a man, in passing triumphantly through all his conflicts, he bestowed on him that glory, foreseeing that he would deserve it as the reward of his

[1] Athanas. c. Arian. I. § 5. Agreeing precisely with the passage above cited: Θελήσας ἡμᾶς δημιουργῆσαι, πεποιήκεν ἕνα τινὰ καὶ ὠνόμασεν αὐτὸν λόγον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ υἱον, ἵνα ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ δημιουργήσῃ.

[2] See in Athanasius.

[3] Ἀλλότριος καὶ ἀνόμοιος κατὰ πάντα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας καὶ ἰδιοτήτος — ἀνόμοιος ἐπ' ἄπειρον τῇ τε οὐσίᾳ καὶ δόξῃ. Athanas. Arian. I. § 6.

virtue.[1] Nor did he believe it possible to conceive of the Christ whom he found revealed in the New Testament in any other way than this. How conceive of his struggles and conflicts in the view of death, and of his prayer in these conflicts, without a changeableness of will? Had he been the almighty power of God himself, he would have had no fears for himself, but rather would have imparted strength to others. And, in the 2d of Philippians, Paul does in fact represent his exaltation, as being the reward of the obedience manifested in his life.[2] By simply distinguishing here between the human and the divine natures in Christ, Arius might, indeed, have been easily refuted; but this refutation could not have touched him according to the coherence of his own system; for here, too, he held fast to the as yet rude, undeveloped doctrine of the first centuries, and trenched himself in what he supposed he found literally taught in the New Testament. Hence, following the older mode of apprehension, he considered the incarnation of the Logos to consist simply in his union with a human body;[3] and hence, too, all the actions and expressions of Christ denoting dependence on God, or limitation of any kind, as, for example, prayer and every manifestation of ignorance, could only appear to him as a proof of the correctness of his theory concerning the essence of the Son of God as a created being. If Christ was in essence the true and indwelling wisdom of the Father, how then could it be written, that he grew in wisdom? Luke 2 : 52. How could he ask where Lazarus had been laid, etc.?[4]

Now although such a conception of Christ did, indeed, contradict what is truly contained in the faith of Christ's divinity, still he did not hesitate to ascribe to him the name of God, which he believed he found clearly ascribed to him in the New Testament,[5] and in the older confessions of faith. He was not conscious to himself of deviating from the older doctrines of the Eastern church; since in truth so much in the older church-teachers seemed to speak in favor of his opinion. Probably he appealed to those passages of scripture, where the name of God seems to be applied in an improper sense to created beings, and thence argued that it was applied after an analogous manner, but in the highest sense, to the Logos. Arius could not, consistently with his system, express himself otherwise than to say, that as Christ was all that which he was only by the grace of God, so by the communication

[1] Τῇ μὲν φύσει ὥσπερ πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἔστι τρεπτὸς, τῷ δὲ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ἕως βούλεται, μένει καλὸς, ὁτὲ μέντοι θέλει, δύναται τρέπεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, τρεπτῆς ὢν φύσεως. (Arius was led to push the matter thus far, on account of the notions he entertained of the creature and of free will; for he set the changeableness of the free will over against a blind necessity of nature. The Arians proposed the dilemma: "Either the Son of God has a changeable free will, by virtue of which he may incline to moral evil or to moral good, or he is without will, like a block of wood or a stone." Athanas. orat. c. Arian. I. § 35.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ προγινώσκων ὁ θεὸς, ἐσεσθαι καλὸν αὐτὸν, προλαβὼν αὐτῷ ταύτην τὴν δόξαν δέδωκεν, ἣν ἀνθρωπος καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρέτης ἔσχε μετὰ ταῦτα· ὥστε ἐξ ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὧν προέγνω ὁ θεὸς, τοίουτον αὐτὸν νῦν γεγονέναι, πεποιήκε.

[2] Athanas. orat. III. 26, I. 43.

[3] We perceive here also the agreement and opposition between Arius and Origen. He coincided with the latter in considering the glorification of Christ the reward of his merit; but Origen referred this to Christ's human soul, — see vol. I. sect. 3, p. 1066, — Arius to the Logos himself.

[4] Athanas. orat. III. 26.

[5] Since, at all events, he referred to him at least the passage concerning the Logos in the beginning of John's gospel.

of that grace he had obtained the divine titles and divine dignity, although in his essence he was not the true God.[1] He affirmed, with the other church-teachers, the incomprehensibleness of the divine essence to all created beings; and, from his own point of view, he consistently applied this likewise to the Son of God, since, in placing him with created beings, he could not do otherwise. To Jesus, too, the essence of God was incomprehensible; and Christ knew him in a manner differing from the knowledge of other created beings only in degree, and according to the proportion of the higher powers bestowed on him by the Father.[2]

All that we know about Arius would by no means persuade us to acknowledge in him a man fitted, by his superiority of intellect, to produce a new epoch in the evolution of doctrine. He himself was assuredly far from entertaining any such design. He was intending simply to defend the old doctrine of the church concerning the Trinity against Sabellian and Gnostic opinions, and to exhibit it in a consistent manner. He was in nowise conscious to himself of the result to which his tendency and his principles really led. It may justly be inferred, however, from the character of this system, and from the onward step of human nature, that, if Arianism had been able to gain the victory, men would not have rested content with the results which satisfied Arius, with such a half-way form of doctrinal opinions as could satisfy neither the demands of the understanding, which aims to comprehend everything, nor those of Christian consciousness and feeling. This contracted, sober tendency of the understanding would have gone on to express itself still further, and would have drawn down the transcendent doctrines of the gospel to another and an alien province.[3]

From what has been said, it may well be conceived that to him who had seized the doctrine of Christ's divinity in its true import and in its coherence with the entire system of Christian faith, the Arian doctrine must have appeared repugnant to the essence of Christianity, when he contemplated it from his own point of view; and hence there can be no mistaking the fact, that this controversy related to a matter of the greatest moment, both in a doctrinal and in a more general Christian point of view.

The Arius with whom these disputes began, was a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and, according to the Alexandrian arrangements, (see vol. II. sect. 1, p. 343,) presided over an independent parish church of this city, which went by the name of Baucalis. He had been placed here shortly before the presbyter Alexander had been made bishop of this city. Being a rigid ascetic,[4] he had probably great influ-

[1] Εἰ δὲ καὶ λέγεται θεὸς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθινὸς ἐστιν, ἄλλα μετόχη χάριτος, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς λέγεται ὀνόματι μόνον θέος. L. c. I. § 6.

[2] Ὁ γινώσκει καὶ ὁ βλέπει ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἰδίοις μέτροις, οἶδε καὶ βλέπει, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς γινώσκομεν κατὰ τὴν ἰδιαν δύναμιν. L. c. Arian. § 6. The same is stated as a doctrine of Arius, by the Arian historian, Philostorgius, II. 3. According to the passage in Athanasius, Arius says, moreover: Αὐτὸς ὁ υἱος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν οὐκ οἶδε. Perhaps he taught that no created being could comprehend its own essence; and, remaining true to his principle, applied this also to the Son of God.

[3] In the Arian doctrine concerning freedom may be found, in fact, already the germ of Pelagianism.

[4] In the old account of the Meletian

ence with his community, as this was a mode of life which there easily procured the highest respect.

Respecting the first outbreak of the controversy, there are different reports, which admit perhaps of being reconciled, if we consider that the first beginnings of such schisms, cherished as they may be in secret long before any public outbreak, are capable of being stated and described in different ways according to different points of view. It is possible that Arius may have displayed his zeal, as a teacher of the faith, before he became a presbyter, and, in seeking to diffuse his own peculiar principles, have made himself friends and enemies.[1] When he proceeded to spread his opinions, under the new bishop Alexander of Alexandria, in his own parish church, he became involved in a controversy with other members of the clergy. Alexander, in the outset, took no part in it: he showed himself at the beginning undecided in his judgment, until finally, on the occasion of a theological conference, which the bishop of Alexandria was accustomed to hold at certain times with his clergy, he declared distinctly against Arius.[2]

The bishop Alexander, at an assembly of the clergy in Alexandria, and then at a more numerous synod of Egyptian and Lybian bishops, composed of a hundred members, in the year 321, deposed Arius from his office, and excluded him from the communion of the church.

After Arius had been excommunicated, he wrote, in defence and for the propagation of his doctrines, a book called Thalia, probably a miscellany composed of pieces in poetry and prose, from which we have already cited a few important fragments as illustrating the character of his system. He wrote also a collection of songs for *sailors*, *millers*, *and pilgrims* — an old expedient for spreading religious opinions among the people. For the rest, it is quite probable, if we may judge from the fragments preserved, from the comparatively prosaic spirit of Arius, and the prosaic character of his doctrines, that in the apologetical work, and in the songs above mentioned, there was nothing poetical besides the mere form.

Alexander, moreover, sent circular letters to the more eminent bishops,

schism, it is said of Arius: Habitum portans pietatis. See Osservazioni letterarie Verona, III. 1738, p. 16, i. e. he wore the pallium of the ascetics. With this agrees also the description of Epiphanius, when he says of him: Ἦν κατήφος τὸ εἶδος, ἡμιφορίον ἐνδιδυσκόμενος.

[1] In the record above referred to, published by Maffei, it is said of Arius: Et ipse doctoris desiderium habens. His rupture with Peter, bishop of Alexandria, and his union with the Meletian party, had some connection perhaps already with doctrinal differences.

[2] Sozomen and Epiphanius relate, that the controversy arose in the first place independently of the bishop Alexander. According to the latter's account, several different parties had already been formed among the clergy and the laity, according as the latter attached themselves to one or the other of the parish presbyters; but many of these parties were lost again, while the more important antagonism betwixt Arius and the defenders of the Homoousion became continually more distinctly prominent, and extended more widely. According to both the reports, the bishop Alexander had his attention first directed to the danger which threatened from other quarters: according to Sozomen, he at first appeared undecided. Socrates mentions the theological conference. There is also an allusion to this in the letter of the emperor Constantine to Alexander and Arius, cited by Eusebius, de vita Constantini, l. II. c. 69, when he says, that the bishop Alexander had asked all his presbyters, how they understood a certain passage of scripture.

in which he represented the doctrines of Arius as being altogether unchristian; and although he described these doctrines as they must have appeared to him from his own point of view, yet it cannot be said that he indulged himself in charging against them his own inferences. But Arius also sought, on his own part, to gain over to his side the suffrages of the more eminent bishops of the Eastern church; and this he could not have felt to be a very difficult task: for the majority of them, though not friendly to *his* own doctrines, were yet not any more favorably disposed to the doctrine of the Homoousion, which Alexander maintained. They were inclined rather, for the most part, to the Origenistic system, which occupied the middle place between the two schisms; — that system from which afterwards sprang the so-called Semi-Arianism: and in the opposition to the system of Alexander, Arius could find many a point of concurrence with his own doctrines, of which he would not be slow to avail himself. He affirmed that he took ground only against *those* heretical doctrines which attributed to the Son of God the same want of beginning as to the Father,[1] and which taught a sensuous emanation, a partition of the divine essence.[2] His doctrine, that the Son of God was produced ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, he explained in the sense in which it was, in fact, customary to understand this expression with reference to the doctrine of the creation out of nothing, viz., that by it, was simply excluded the supposition of a preëxisting matter, or of an efflux out of the divine essence. The Son was produced by the will of the Father, before all time, as perfect God, only-begotten, unchangeable.[3] These explanations, of which, it is true, it cannot be said that they contradicted the real doctrines of Arius, in which, however, it is impossible not to recognize the moderating influence of a respect to the ruling doctrine of the Eastern church,—these explanations were unquestionably suited to gain over the dominant party in his favor. Men of great influence in the Eastern church exerted themselves to bring about a compromise between Arius and his bishop — a compromise of this sort, that the bishop Alexander should allow Arius to retain his parochial office, without requiring that his views of the faith should agree in all respects with his own. Two individuals, in particular, sought, by their negotiations, to bring this about: Eusebius of Nicomedia, who as bishop of that city which, under the government of Dioclesian, had become the imperial residence for a main division of the East-Roman empire, possessed considerable influence, who was, moreover, an old friend of Arius, and, still more than many others, agreed with him in doctrine; and Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had acquired great reputation in the Eastern church as a learned and accomplished theologian.[4]

[1] Styled him συναγεννήτος.

[2] Οἱ τὸν υἱον λέγοντες, οἱ μὲν ἐρυγὴν, οἱ δὲ προβολήν.

[3] Consistently, indeed, Arius could not apply to Christ such an expression as πλήρης θεοῦ; but he might doubtless say this, according to the vague and indefinite manner in which he applied the name of God. The greatest difficulty he must have found, from his own point of view, in attributing to Christ the predicate of immutability; but here also the whole depended on the question, — how this was to be understood. He must have understood it as meaning, that Christ was immutable, not in his essence, but by virtue of the bent of his will as foreknown by God.

[4] The system of Eusebius — as it had already been matured previous to the commencement of the Arian controversies, and

The latter was, from the first, disinclined to public dialectical disputes on divine things: he was anxious to avoid and suppress them; resembling in this respect another great church-teacher from the school of Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria. He dreaded, and not without good reason, the intrusion of profane passions into investigations on such matters, which, beyond all others, required, in order to any right understanding, the purity, calmness, and quiet of a soul consecrated to God. Holding the generation of the Son of God from the Father to be a subject which transcended the limited powers of all created minds, to say nothing of the human, the more unwise and mischievous did he consider disputes on such matters as these. Convinced that only a mind the most practised in thinking, and freed from the sphere of sensuous and temporal relations, could approximate to any worthy representation of a matter in its very essence incomprehensible, it seemed to him the more absurd and perverse to make such things a subject of dispute among men whose minds had not been trained to speculation, and even to introduce this controversy among uneducated laymen, who could understand nothing at all about such matters. He was more distinctly conscious than others, of the limits fixed to the human knowledge of divine things, and of the distinction between speculative, dogmatic explanations, and the practical doctrines of faith. "What are we men," he argued, "who are unable to understand a thousand things that lie immediately at our feet! Who knows how the soul became united with

as he exhibits it in his work written before this time, the demonstratio evangelica — coincides entirely with that of Origen; and, from this circumstance, we may form a judgment of its relation to the Arian system. He was, with Origen, inclined to favor the theory of subordination, — the notion of an *ἀπαύγασμα τοῦ πρώτου φωτὸς*, of a *φῶς πρῶτον*, and a *φῶς δεύτερον*, — *οὐσία πρώτη* and *δεύτερα*; to consider the Son as the perfect reflection of the original light, in the most perfect manner, like in all things to the Father, his most perfect image, revealing himself, *ἀφομοιώμενος τῷ πάτρι κατὰ πάντα*; moreover, *ὁμοίος κατ' οὐσίαν*, as he is in fact the *εἴκων τῆς ἀγεννήτου καὶ πρώτης οὐσίας*. See, for example, lib. IV. præparat. evangel. c. 3. Eusebius was of the opinion, that the Son of God could not be called absolutely eternal (*ἁπλῶς ἀΐδιος*), like the Father; that it was necessary to ascribe to him an origin of existence from the Father, — since thus only was it possible to hold fast the doctrine of the *mon*archy; and that it was impossible to express the truth *after the manner of men*, in any other way than by saying the existence of the Father precedes the existence and the origin of the Son (*ὁ πατὴρ προϋπάρχει τοῦ υἱου καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προϋφέστηκεν*); but yet it was necessary here to remove away all relations of time. In a word, the idea of the origin of the Son of God was one which transcended the conceptions of all created beings, and of which none but the most acute intellect, abstracting from the relations of time and sense, could form any adequate representation (*ὀξυτάτη διανοία φαντάζεται υἱον γεννητὸν, οὐ χρόνοις μὲν τισὶν οὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δέ ποτε γεγονότα, ἐξ αἰώνος μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, ἀῤῥητῶς καὶ ἀνεπιλογίστως ἡμῖν*. In that work, written before the time of the Arian controversies, he does not hesitate, it is true, to call the Son of God the *τέλειον δημιῶργημα τοῦ τελείου*, and so consequently he could name him also the *κτίσμα τέλειον*; but, before the Arian controversies, men did not, in fact, as a general thing, distinguish so carefully, in the Eastern church, the doctrinal expressions employed on this point. But it may be gathered from the whole connection and train of ideas in Eusebius, that he made an essential distinction between the Son of God and created beings; and in the work de ecclesiastica theologia, written after the Arian controversies, he declared himself expressly as being against those who reckoned the Son of God among the *κτίσματα*; he taught that God was the *Father* of the Christ alone,—the God and Creator of all other beings; that the Son of God had come into existence in a way wholly different from that of all other beings (*οὐχ ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς γεννητοῖς ὑποστάντα*), — consequently that there was an essential difference between the notion of a Son of God and that of a created being. Ecclesiast. theol. l. I. c. 8.

the body, and how it leaves it? What is the essence of the angels, and the essence of our own soul? And why, then, do we presume, when we see ourselves, even here, already surrounded, on all sides, by so many difficulties, to search after the perfect knowledge of the essence of the eternal Godhead? Why do we not rest satisfied with the testimony of the Father respecting his beloved Son: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased — hear ye him'? But the latter tells us himself, what we should know concerning him: 'God so loved the world, as to send his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.' We must believe on him, then, in order to be partakers of everlasting life. *For whosoever believes on him*, he says, hath eternal life; not *whosoever knows* how he was begotten of the Father. Were the latter the condition, none could obtain the promise; for the same Lord also declares, 'No man knoweth the Father except the Son, and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father only.' Sufficient therefore for us, in order to salvation, is the faith which enables us to know the Almighty God as our Father, and to receive his only-begotten Son as our Saviour."[1]

But as it often happens with those who would wish to be moderate, that they forget their character whenever an immoderate zeal, however honestly meant, comes to oppose them in another; as it often happens in such cases even to *them*, that, instead of placing themselves in their opponent's point of view, they judge him entirely from their own, and thus treat him with unfairness; so it turned out with Eusebius. It sometimes happened with him, that he could not appreciate the weight which a doctrinal difference must have had when regarded from some other point of view than his own; and that hence he allowed himself in the great error of passing unjust and censorious judgments on a zeal which, though inordinate, still proceeded from the deep consciousness of such importance. Doubtless he was right in maintaining that faith in Jesus as a Redeemer, and God as a Father, constitutes the Christian; but he could not transport himself to another man's point of view, to whom an error, which he accounted unessential, seemed to stand in entire contradiction with this faith. Hence he could be so far misled as to trace *everything* to passion, in cases where a purely Christian interest at bottom was not to be mistaken.

Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote a letter to the bishop Alexander, in which he sought to convince him that he was doing Arius injustice; and that, if he would but rightly conceive him, he would find no difficulty in coming to an agreement with him.[2] Now Arius might well be inclined to

[1] Ecclesiast. theol. l. I. c. 12.

[2] A fragment of this letter is to be found in the 6th Act of the second Nicene council, Hardouin. T. IV. f. 407. Arius, in his letter drawn up in common with certain other presbyters, which is to be found in Epiphanius, had called the Son of God a κτίσμα θεοῦ τελείου, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων. Now, with this explanation, the complaint urged by the bishop Alexander seemed to Eusebius to stand in contradiction; viz. that, according to Arius' doctrine, the Son of God had come into existence, ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων. But Alexander might rightly deem himself justified — regarding the matter from his own doctrinal point of view, and in the coherence of those explanations with the whole Arian scheme — in saying that he could find in those words nothing but the statement of a difference in degree between the Son of God and other created beings. He could conceive of nothing that could

accept of the proposed conditions of agreement, since, being a subordinate pastor opposed to the bishop, he could not but gain by any such compromise. Besides, from the very nature of the case, he who, in any doctrinal dispute, is chiefly contending as Arius was for a negative interest, can afford to be more tolerant than he can who is defending a positive interest. The negative and the positive, however, were in this case intimately connected; for Arius, in contending, as he supposed he was, against the deification of a creature, was defending, in his own opinion, the interests of pure Theism — though in a way, to be sure, that savored rather of a narrow Jewish spirit than of genuine Christianity; since, indeed, the idea of a God not self-included, but self-*revealing*, and — without which the full revelation of God cannot be — *communicating himself*, is the fundamental idea of Christianity, and moreover the basis of all vital Theism. It is often seen, too, that the negative interest, where it acquires dominion, is not less intolerant and inclined to persecution, but, on the contrary, even more so than the positive. Arius said respecting the definitions of his opponents: "We could not even listen to these blasphemies, if the heretics threatened us with a thousand deaths."[1] After such asseverations, we may well conceive that Arius, in case his doctrines could have gained the ascendancy, would not have been the most tolerant of men. But neither can we greatly censure the bishop Alexander — to whom the doctrines of Arius, regarded from his own point of view, must have appeared to undermine the very essence of Christianity — if he believed it incompatible with a conscientious discharge of his office, as a shepherd over the flock, to suffer that Arius who certainly, to judge from the above-cited avowal, and from his songs before alluded to, could not keep his peculiar system to himself in discharging his public duties as a teacher, and who was assuredly not wanting in a zeal for making proselytes — to suffer such a man to remain as pastor over his community.

When Constantine, in the year 324, after his victory over Licinius, had obtained the sovereignty over the entire Roman empire, and it became his favorite plan to unite all his subjects together in one worship of God; he must have been greatly annoyed to see so important a schism, which found many to take an active share in it, even among the laity, germinating within the church itself. He considered it incum-

possibly intervene betwixt the conception θεός and the conception κτίσμα; and, if the former of these predicates was not attributed to the Son of God in its strict sense, according to the idea of the unity of the divine essence, then nothing was, in his opinion, gained for Christian truth. Again, Alexander had objected to Arius that he taught, ὁ ὢν τὸν οὐκ ὄντα ἐγεννήσε; for Alexander considered in fact the being of the Son as grounded from eternity in the being of the Father, and derived from it according to the conception, not according to time. The attaining first from non-existence to existence belonged, according to his view, to the essential and distinctive mark of the κτίσμα. But, according to the Origenistic mode of apprehension on which Eusebius proceeded, God the Father was the ὢν absolutely (the ὄν of Plato.) In so far as the existence of the Son was derived from the Father, it was necessary to conceive of him — although not in respect to his beginning in time, yet in reference to the absolute causality which was to be ascribed to the Father alone — as in the conception once not existing, οὐκ ὤν, — as having come into being by the causality of the Father, who alone is ἁπλῶς ἀίδιος, or we must suppose two absolute causalities, two absolutely eternal beings, two ὄντες, — all which are identical expressions with Eusebius.

[1] Theodoret. I. 5.

bent on him, therefore, at the very outset, to take every possible measure for removing it. To this end, in the year 324, he despatched the bishop Hosius of Cordova, who then stood high in his confidence and favor, to the bishop Alexander and to the presbyter Arius with a letter,[1] expressing his displeasure at the outbreak of this whole controversy, and calling upon them mutually to recognize each other as Christian brethren, without insisting, either of them, upon the other's adopting his own peculiar convictions. The party of Eusebius of Cæsarea must have succeeded, at that time, in bringing the emperor wholly over to their own views of this dispute; and to an emperor who looked upon the matter in its outward aspects, and to whom the preservation of quiet was the most important consideration, such views would be likely to appear the most plausible. Constantine represented the questions in dispute as being nothing but rash, speculative questions, standing in no connection whatever with the essence of Christianity. He found fault alike with those who had propounded, and with those who had busied themselves in answering, such questions. He expressed his special displeasure that such matters, which so few were capable of understanding, should be brought publicly before the people. He held up to them the example of the philosophers, who, even while differing on particular points of doctrine, could nevertheless reckon themselves as belonging to one and the same school. The doctrinal impartiality, or rather indifference, of the emperor, or the individual who wrote in his name, went, however, still further than even the moderation of a Eusebius would have approved, had he allowed himself to make clear to his own mind what was implied in the emperor's language; for the latter then made the essentials of Christianity, in which all should agree, to consist simply in the faith on a Providence.[2] Considered from this point of light, the matters to which this controversy related must indeed have appeared as in the highest degree insignificant.[3] But as a matter of course, a letter of this description could have no influence in bringing the contending parties any nearer together.

The attempt of the emperor Constantine in this way to restore the peace of the church having failed, and the two controversies which broke out in Egypt at the same time, the Arian and the Meletian, (see vol. II. sect. 1, p. 219,) having produced violent movements even among the laity, which threatened serious consequences of a political nature,[4] the emperor was forced to look round for some radical means of restoring quiet. As the bishops appeared to him to be the representatives of God and Christ, the organs of the divine Spirit that enlightened and guided the church; as he had before him the established custom of deciding controversies in the single provinces by assemblies composed of all the provincial bishops, it would, according to this analogy, appear to him to be the most natural means of disposing of the present controversy, which had become so widely diffused, to con-

[1] To be found in Euseb. II. de vita Constantini, c. 64.

[2] Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς θείας προνοίας μία τὶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστω πίστις.

[3] Ἐλαχίσται ζητήσεις.

[4] See Euseb. vit. Constantin. III. 4.

voke a council composed of all the bishops of his empire; and the employment of such a means seemed, in fact, to be required for the decision of another important matter connected with the religious interest in the mind of the emperor, viz., the bringing about of a general agreement as to the time of holding the Easter festival (see vol. II., sect. 2, p. 302.) He summoned, A.D. 325, a general council to meet at Nice, in Bithynia. It is stated, that three hundred and eighteen bishops here came together, of whom by far the greater part were Orientals; and the emperor himself took an active part in the transactions on this occasion.[1]

To form a correct notion of the order of business at this council, we must, in the first place, present clearly before our minds the relation of the parties who were present; — those who agreed entirely with the doctrine of Arius, which was but a small party;[2] — then the advocates

[1] As no complete collection of the transactions of this council has come down to us, the only means left for obtaining a knowledge of the true course of its proceedings is to take the accounts given by those reporters of the different parties who were present at the deliberations, and form our conclusions from a comparison of them all. These were more particularly Athanasius and Eusebius of Cæsarea. Even if we could suppose, that Athanasius, who only accompanied his bishop in the capacity of archdeacon, was in a situation to obtain as *accurate* a knowledge of the intrigues which influenced the course of the council, as the bishop Eusebius, who stood in such close connection with the court; yet it is important to remark, that, in the case of Athanasius, there were many things which would render it difficult for him to take an unbiassed view of the proceedings. Regarding the council as the organ by which the divine truth expressed in the *ὁμοούσιον* had obtained the victory over the Arian error, disposed to look upon the determinations of this council as simply expressing the consciousness of Christian truth, which then inspired the majority of the bishops, everything would naturally be suppressed by him which might cause the matter to be considered in an altogether different light, and exhibit the Nicene creed as an instrument forced upon the majority of the council by the influence of a court-party, which governed the emperor. This holds good especially of the tract written by Athanasius in defence of the Nicene council. In the next place, as to his Epistola ad Afros, it is to be remarked, that although Athanasius reports in this letter many important circumstances relating to the internal history of the council, yet he distorts the true form of the facts, by persisting to recognize only two parties at the council, — avowed Arians, and adherents of the doctrine of the unity of essence. But that these two parties were not the only ones at the council, but, on the contrary, the party which held the middle ground between these two must have been the dominant party there, may be easily gathered from looking at the situation of the Eastern church in this period, as well as from its whole course of development up to this time. But it was natural that Athanasius, looking at the matter from *his own* doctrinal position, would be inclined to take cognizance of but two parties, Arians and advocates of the Homoousion. Between these there was *for him* no neutral ground; and hence, indeed, we may account for the fact, that he could reckon Eusebius of Cæsarea with the Arians. He comprised them all under one name, that of *οἱ περὶ Εὐσεβίον*, (Eusebius of Nicomedia.) Hence he could attribute what he ought to have transferred to two different parties, to one and the same party, and — inasmuch as he confounded the interests of two different parties — so represent the matter, as if every opposition to the Arian opinions proceeded from those who favored the Homoousion. In respect to Eusebius, on the other hand, he speaks, in the pastoral letter which he sent from the council of Nice to his own community, of the influence of the emperor without concealment and without shame; — a fact which reflects no honor on himself, or on those friends of his who allowed themselves to be, for the most part, governed by such influence. But he was too much of a court theologian, though belonging to the better class of this party, to be conscious of the dishonor. If the majority at the council did in fact declare for the Homoousion, in a way so entirely independent of foreign influence as Athanasius represents, the next following events in the Eastern church would be incapable of explanation. These testify more decidedly in favor of the correctness of the representation given by Eusebius, than of that given by Athanasius.

[2] So Athanasius, in the epistola ad Afros, § 5, justly calls the Arians at the council, *τοὺς δοκοῦντας ὀλίγους*.

of the Homoousion, who likewise in the Eastern church composed but a comparatively small party;[1]—and finally those who occupied the middle ground between the two parties, and entertained similar views with those of Eusebius of Cæsarea, of whose system we have spoken above. From these last sprang up afterwards the party called Semi-Arians. It was the wish of these last, that the doctrine of Christ's divinity should be settled only in such general expressions as had hitherto satisfied the Christian want, so that, with regard to the difference which divided the two contending parties, nothing was to be defined, and each of the parties might be allowed to interpret the language according to its own meaning. Many of the decided expressions of Arius concerning the nature of the Son of God must, beyond question, have appeared offensive even to the dominant middle party at the council; and such expressions could easily be laid hold of, to represent him to the Orientals as an opponent of the old church doctrine of the Triad.[2] A condemnation of these Arian propositions might doubtless have been easily carried through, if, on the other side, the party defending the Homoousion had not also raised an opposition to the dominant church doctrine of the East, and if certain individuals had not come out as mediators between the contending parties. Several bishops who belonged to that second (afterwards denominated the Semi-Arian) party, zealously exerted themselves to establish peace, and to reduce to silence those who were earnestly opposed to the doctrines of Arius.[3] They endeavored to show, that the expressions of Arius did not, at least, have any such offensive sense, as they appeared to have on the first glance; and they proposed certain general formulas of agreement, with which both parties might be satisfied. The leaders of the Arian party, entering into these forms of agreement, declared themselves ready to retract the offensive expressions, and to adopt the doctrinal technology hitherto in use in the Eastern church, which in truth they could very well explain according to their own sense. A prominent part was taken among the authors of peace, especially by the learned bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea. He laid before the council a confession of faith, containing the doctrine which, as he said, had been held forth from the first by the bishops in his church,—the confession which he had received in his earliest religious instruction and at his baptism, and which as a presbyter and a bishop he had constantly preached. This creed distinctly expressed the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but in such expressions as, although, according to the full import of the conceptions thereby denoted, they stood in contradiction with the Arian tenets consistently understood, yet might be very

[1] Which Athanasius, to be sure, nowhere intimates, since he makes all the opponents of strict Arianism advocates of the Homoousion, and wholly overlooks the middle party.

[2] Accordingly that may be perfectly true, which Athanasius, in the epistola ad episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ, § 13, says with regard to the general murmur of disapprobation with which the explanations of Arius were received, as well as what he says also in the epistola ad Afros, § 5, with regard to the agreement in the condemnation of the Arian dogmas, except that, owing to the confusion of parties already alluded to, he inferred too much from this circumstance.

[3] Eustathius of Antioch, as cited by Theodoret. I. 8. Ὁμοῦ τινες ἐκ συσκεύης τοὔνομα προβαλλόμενοι τῆς εἰρήνης κατεσίγασαν μὲν ἁπάντας τοὺς ἀρίστα λέγειν εἰωθότας.

well united with those tenets by Arius, without giving up his own point of view.[1]

This confession had the advantage of being composed, for the most part, of scriptural phraseology, which was considered by the party of Eusebius as being a peculiar merit. In the creed of Arius, as in the formula of the Homoousion, they especially censured the use of expressions not conformed to the language of scripture, but certainly not on altogether good grounds; for as the forms of expression employed by the scriptures have quite another purpose in view than the close definition of doctrinal conceptions, and as, moreover, new forms of error require to be met by new forms of doctrinal expression, so the scriptural phraseology cannot always be exactly the best adapted for the antithetic determination of a dogmatic conception, and the fact that the expressions employed are *not* to be met with in scripture cannot be considered as exactly a valid objection to their employment. The advocates of the Homoousion might very properly reply, on their own part, that the *only important* thing was to determine that if not the *language*, yet the conception which it designated, was derived substantially from the Bible.[2]

But although this symbol appeared satisfactory to the doctrinal interest of the ruling party in the Eastern church, yet the advocates of the Anti-Arian system of unity had still this very circumstance to object to in it, that it still left a foot-hold for the whole Arian doctrine.[3]

[1] Christ *ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς, πρωτότοκος πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννήμενος.* That Christ was a Divine Being, the Creator of all other existence, that he came into existence prior to the whole temporal system, Arius also certainly supposed; and between a *γεννήσις ἐκ θεοῦ* and *κτίσις*, there was, in fact, according to his view, no difference.

[2] *Ὅτι εἰ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰσιν αἱ λέξεις, ἄλλα τὴν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν διανοίαν ἔχουσι καὶ ταυτὴν ἐκφωνοῦμεν αι σημαίνουσι.* Athanas. de decretis synodi Nicenæ, § 21.

[3] Eusebius observes, in his pastoral letter, that nobody could bring any objection against this confession of faith. But Eustathius of Antioch says, that this creed was received with marks of universal disapprobation, and demolished before the eyes of all. Eustathius, however, the warm opponent of Eusebius, is liable to suspicion in what he here says. Moreover, his report stands in contradiction with all we know respecting the predominant tendency of the Eastern church in this and the next succeeding times. It is impossible to see what could give offence to the Eastern bishops in this symbol of faith. The fourth Antiochian creed, which afterwards obtained especial authority with the major portion of the Eastern church, coincided in the main with this creed of Eusebius. The Nicene creed itself manifestly grew out of this Eusebian formula, with the simple additions of the antitheses to Arianism, and of the Homoousion. Besides, the account of Athanasius evinces that the council was in the first place satisfied with those general definitions which alone Eusebius meant to express. In his epistola ad Afros, § 5, he says, that the bishops originally would have established, instead of the Arian definitions, the expressions more generally recognized, which were contained in the scriptures themselves, (*τὰς τῶν γραφῶν ὁμολογουμένας λέξεις,*) as, for example, the expression *ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι τῇ φύσει*, the expression that the Son was the *δύναμις σοφία μονὴ τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸς αληθινός*, and this in fact agrees entirely with that which Eusebius designed. In the book de decretis s. n., Athanasius says, the intention at first was simply to establish, that the Son of God was the *εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁμοίος τε καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτος κατὰ πάντα τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι ἀδιαιρέτως.* These definitions, too, agree very well with the Eusebian system of doctrine, and with the objects which he wished to accomplish at the council. Had these articles only been established, then, *for the present*, the internal controversies in the bosom of the Oriental church would have been hushed. It is also possible to reconcile the account of Eustathius with the other accounts which

The party of the bishop Alexander was satisfied, it is true, with these articles of faith; but at the same time they declared, that, as the expressions of this creed could still be explained by the Arians after their own sense, it was absolutely necessary to add such other propositions as would effectually exclude the blasphemous doctrines of Arius; and this party had on its side the powerful suffrage of the emperor himself.[1] Constantine had, without doubt, been brought to a decision, by the influence of those bishops who happened last to possess the most authority with him, namely, Hosius and his associates; and he decided in favor of the addition of the Homoousion. If we may credit the report of Eusebius, the emperor himself even dogmatized on the question, how the Homoousion ought to be understood; how it was not to be conceived under any image of sense, as if the one divine essence had been separated into several homogeneous parts. This might have been a point

we have cited, if we suppose that he is speaking, not of a creed proposed by Eusebius of Cæsarea, but of one proposed by Eusebius of Nicomedia, in which this latter, to judge by the fragment quoted in Ambrose, l. III. de fide, c. 7, had endeavored to defend the Arian conception of the Son of God. Comp. Theodoret. I. 7. Everything goes, then, to confirm the fact of the preponderance which originally existed of the Eusebian, or, as it was afterwards styled, Semi-Arian party. In accordance with the truth, and agreeing with Eusebius, Athanasius also reports, that the council was not satisfied with these articles, for the very reason that it was remarked that the Arians understood and interpreted them in their own way. But when now he proceeds to derive the additions inserted in opposition to Arianism, and with a view to preclude the possibility of its introduction, from the same bishops who had at first proposed these other articles, he must, without any doubt, have here confounded the two parties together. In truth, it is, abstractly considered, in the highest degree improbable, that those who aimed at a marked opposition to Arianism, would, in the first place, propose articles respecting which they knew beforehand, that the Arians would be willing to subscribe to them. Besides it might not be so easy, in considering the transactions of so numerous an assembly, where everything perhaps did not proceed according to the strictest order, accurately to discriminate what belonged to the different parties, especially for one who himself contemplated the whole under the bias of a party interest. So, in fact, Eustathius of Antioch says himself: Τὸ σαφὲς διὰ τὸν τῆς πολυανδρίας ὄχλον οὐχ' οἷός τε εἰμι γράφειν.

[1] Athanasius represents everything as proceeding solely from the bishops themselves, and makes no mention whatever of the influence of the emperor; — which, at his particular point of view, was natural. But Eusebius represents everything as proceeding in the first place solely from the emperor. The latter calls upon the bishops to adopt the creed of Eusebius, and simply to add to it the word *Homoousion*, the right way of understanding which he explains. From these additional clauses, recommended by the emperor himself, the bishops were led to make several other antithetic additions; and thus arose the Nicene creed. Athanasius and Eusebius may both be right, and both be wrong, — both, according to their different party-interest, giving prominence to one thing, and suppressing another. The proposal concerning the Homoousion may first have come from the part of the bishops. But as it met with opposition, the emperor, whom the bishop Hosius of Cordova and others had made familiar with the part which, in pursuance of their objects, he was to play at the council, took up the word, recommended the Homoousion, and declared himself to be satisfied of the inoffensiveness of this expression. There may be some truth at bottom in the account of Philostorgius, I. 7, that Alexander, previously to the opening of the Nicene council, had combined with the party of the bishop Hosius of Cordova, that is, with the court-party in Nicomedia, at a synod to establish the Homoousion. The voice of the emperor had, with many bishops, more weight than it ought to have had according to the principles of the gospel. The party of Alexander now ventured with the more boldness to press the other antithetic definitions, which followed, as a matter of course, the Homoousion. But Eusebius preferred rather to have it appear that he yielded to the authority of the emperor, than to that of the other bishops; and he imagined also that he could best justify his conduct to his community, if he adduced the authority of the emperor, — if he declared that he had yielded to a formula proposed and recommended by the emperor himself.

often discussed in his presence; since it was well known, that the occasion which it gave for sensuous representations was the common objection of the Orientals to the Homoousion. The party of Alexander, who now had on their side the weight of the imperial authority, proceeded to require in addition to the Homoousion, still other antithetic clauses, which had the same object in view. Perhaps it had been agreed on by the heads of the dogmatical court-party at that time, that the declaration of the emperor in favor of the Homoousion should be made the watch-word for proposing a still more complete antithesis to Arianism. In this way, by the union of the antithetic clauses with the articles of faith proposed by Eusebius, was produced the famous Nicene creed.[1] Moreover, the condemnation, by name, of the main characteristic propositions of Arius was adopted into this creed; and the condemnatory sentence was passed not merely upon *the doctrines*, but, according to the previous custom, doctrines and persons were put together, and the individuals condemned also, who had proposed such offensive things.

Now although the majority of the council might perhaps agree in the articles against that part of the Arian creed which placed the Son of God on a level with creatures,[2] yet the definitions of the *ὁμοούσιον* and of the *γεννήσις ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* were at variance with the prevailing Oriental type of doctrine. Hence there arose much opposition to these definitions: on the first day after they were presented, Eusebius of Cæsarea absolutely refused his assent to them.[3] But after many explanations, he yielded for the sake of peace, as he says in the pastoral letter to his church, which he sent from Nice,[4]—interpreting the new articles of the creed according to the sense of his own doctrinal system, not without some degree of disingenuous sophistry.[5] The principal article respecting the Homoousion, which, in fact, had already been approved, even by the peace-loving Dionysius of Alexandria, in another sense than that in which it was intended to establish it at Nice, Eusebius, by taking advantage of the unsettled use of philosophical and doctrinal terms in

[1] To the phrase *θεός ἐκ θεοῦ* was added, in opposition to the Arian mode of understanding the idea of the Godhead in reference to Christ (see above) the word *ἀληθινός*;—to *γεννηθέντα*, with a view to guard against the Arian practice of identifying it with *κτίσθεις*, was added *οὐ ποιηθέντα*.

[2] The opposition between *θεός* and *κτίσμα*—*γεννᾶν* and *ποιεῖν*.

[3] Athanas. decret. S. n. § 3. Πρὸ *μίας ἀρνοῦμενος, ὅμως ὕστερον ὑπογράψας*.

[4] Τοῦ *τῆς εἰρήνης σκόπου πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν κειμένου*.

[5] This properly betrays itself only in the case of *one* article, if Eusebius could approve the condemnation of the Arian proposition, that the Son of God *πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν*. This proposition of Arius does in fact perfectly agree with Eusebius's system of faith, (see above;) and at least some similar proposition seemed to himself necessary, in order to hold fast the notion of absolute causality, which was to be attributed to God the Father alone. It was a dubious matter, then, for him to join in this anathema. He got along by a sophistical interpretation, referring the *γεννηθῆναι*, in the condemned proposition, to the *human* birth; and so he found no difficulty, as he himself declared, in receiving this also; as in truth the doctrine of Christ's divine existence before his birth was one universally acknowledged. By this last remark, however, he in fact refuted his own interpretation; for how could it have occurred to any one to set up a counter proposition to an erroneous doctrine which nobody maintained? Athanasius was not slow to take advantage of the weak spot which Eusebius here exposed; and objected to him that, by such an interpretation, he threw the suspicion of entertaining such an erroneous doctrine on his friend Arius himself, against whom this condemnatory article had been framed.

those times, could easily explain in accordance with his own views. This proposition, according to his interpretation, denoted nothing else than the exaltation of the Son of God above all comparison with created beings, and his perfect likeness to the Father.[1] It perhaps may be the case, that Eusebius, as he avowed in his pastoral letter, explained himself before the council of Nice itself, with regard to the sense in which he received the Homoousion. The important point with the emperor Constantine was, that the proposition regarding the Homoousion, of the importance of which he had been persuaded, should be received by all: what the properly orthodox and what the heterodox sense might be, in the interpretation of this article, it is hardly probable that he could so nicely distinguish.[2] With perfect honesty, Eusebius might condemn the Arian formulas, especially since they contained distinctions not to be met with in scripture; and since all the strife and confusion in the church had grown out of the employment of such distinctions, the use of which, therefore, he himself had always carefully avoided.

There were many others who adopted the Nicene creed in the same sense with Eusebius, interpreting it in accordance with their own doctrinal system; so that the ὁμοούσιον was for them nothing more than a designation of the ὁμοιότης κατ' οὐσίαν (likeness in respect to essence.) At first, seventeen bishops, who probably belonged to the strictly Arian party, declined to go with the majority. But as the creed was to be made known under the imperial authority, and threatened all who would not adopt it with the loss of their places and condemnation, as refractory subjects,[3] the greater part of these yielded through fear; and there remained, finally, but two bishops, besides Arius, namely Theonas of Marmarica in Libya, and Secundus of Ptolemais, who declared without reserve against the Nicene creed. The two zealous personal friends of Arius themselves, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, subscribed the creed; declaring with Eusebius of Cæsarea, that they yielded for the sake of peace, after having expressed their views as to the way in which it ought to be understood, so as to be free from all objection.[4] Still they refused to subscribe, with the rest, the condemnatory clauses against the Arian doctrines, not, as they avowed, because they did not agree with the others as to the doctrinal matter, but because, according to the way in which they had learned to understand

[1] Παραστατικὸν τὸ μηδεμίαν ἐμφερείαν πρὸς τὰ γεννητὰ κτίσματα τὸν υἱον τοῦ θεοῦ φέρειν, μόνῳ δὲ τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ὁμοίον εἶναι. When Athanasius, then, (de decret. synod. nic. § 3,) accuses Eusebius of having, by his approbation of the Homoousion, in his pastoral letter, revoked his earlier doctrine as being incorrect, the charge is altogether untrue; for, as Eusebius expresses himself, it is clear that he interpreted this distinction only in accordance with the doctrinal system which he had constantly taught.

[2] If it is true, as Eusebius reports, that the emperor interpreted the condemnation of the proposition, πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, in the sense that the Son of God, before he came into existence in ἐνεργείᾳ, already existed, like all things else in the Father, in δυνάμει, — it would, we must admit, be exceedingly plain, how little familiar Constantine was with the system he would defend, and how easily he could be satisfied with any interpretations, provided only the forms were adhered to.

[3] Contra divina statuta venientes, i. e. statuta imperatoris, according to the diplomatic language of those times. So Rufinus expresses it, I. 5, in the sense of the emperor.

[4] For they were afterwards able to appeal to the fact that they had done this, in their memorial sent to the bishops, cited in Socrates, I. 14.

the doctrines of Arius from his written and oral communications, they could not believe that he had actually taught the doctrines he was accused of teaching. At that time the thing was overlooked; but Arius and his two faithful friends were excommunicated, as teachers of error, from the church, deposed from their spiritual office, and by the emperor Constantine condemned to banishment. The latter was at this time overflowing with a fanatical hatred of the doctrines of Arius, which now appeared to him as blasphemous, and subversive of all Christianity; and this fanaticism impelled him already to apply all the expedients of the Byzantine despotism to suppress these doctrines entirely. In an edict issued at this time, he places Arius in the same class with Porphyry, the antagonist of Christianity; and directed that all the writings of Arius, as those of Porphyry, should be burned, — the penalty of death even being threatened against those who should be detected in any clandestine attempt to preserve these writings. While Constantine was in this state of feeling, Eusebius and Theognis, who had already rendered themselves suspected by the emperor in refusing to subscribe the condemnatory clause, could not long remain protected against his displeasure; but it turned out, as Theonas and Secundus had foretold them, that they soon shared the same fate with the latter. Three months after the close of the council,[1] they also were deposed from their places and banished.

In fact, however, the manner in which the controversies had been decided by the council of Nice could only contain the seeds for new disputes; for there was here no cordial union springing freely, by a natural course of development, out of inward conviction; but a forced and artificial union of men, still widely separated by their different modes of thinking, on a creed which had been imposed on them, and which was differently expounded according to the different doctrinal interests of the several parties. Thus it happened, that while for the present no party ventured as yet to come out decidedly against the Homoousion, still those who had received it, explaining it to mean Homoiousion, accused the others, who interpreted it and held it fast in its proper and original signification, of Sabellianism; while the latter accused the former of Tritheism. We have an illustration of this in the disputes between the bishop Eustathius of Antioch, and the bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea, — two men radically opposed to each other before, in their whole theological bent; the former being a zealous opponent, the other a no less zealous adherent, of the school of Origen.

Yet the major part of the Eastern church would naturally strive to rid themselves of the imposed articles of the Nicene creed; and as Constantine, without an independent judgment of his own and a well-grounded insight into these doctrinal controversies, was governed by the changing influence of the different parties at court, so that which had procured for the Homoousion a momentary victory in the Eastern church might soon take a turn in the very opposite direction. Constantine's sister Constantia, the widow of Licinius, who possessed great

[1] Philostorg. I. 9.

influence with her brother, maintained the best understanding with Eusebius of Cæsarea; and she had taken as her spiritual guide a presbyter who had attached himself to the Arian party, and who found means of convincing her that Arius had been unjustly condemned.[1]

On her death, in the year 327, Constantia very earnestly recommended the presbyter above mentioned to her brother. He acquired the confidence of the emperor, and succeeded in persuading him also, that injustice had been done to Arius, and that personal passions had had much more to do in these disputes, than any interest in behalf of sound doctrine. Constantine had already once invited Arius to visit the court; but the latter, it seems, could not feel confidence enough in the emperor's intentions. He now sent a second express message, assuring Arius that it was the emperor's purpose to show him favor, and send him back to Alexandria. Arius presented to the emperor a confession of faith, in which, without entering into the points of difference, he expressed in very general language his belief in the doctrine of the Father, Son,[2] and Holy Ghost, taught by scripture and by the common tradition of the church. He besought the emperor to put a stop to these idle controversies on mere speculative questions,[3] so that schisms might be healed, and all, united in one, might pray for the peaceable reign of the emperor and for his whole family. Constantine was satisfied with this confession. Arius was again received to favor, (between the years 328 and 329;) and his two friends, Theognis and Eusebius of Nicomedia, were now easily enabled to obtain their recall.[4] We perceive from the confession of Arius, and from the satisfaction with which Constantine received it, what were the prevailing views of the latter respecting these matters at the present time. After having been enlisted but for a short period in favor of the Homoousion, he had been drawn back again to those earlier views, which would so much more readily present themselves to a layman contemplating the matter simply in its outward aspects, that personal passions and a self-willed, disputatious spirit had given to these *questions*, which did not pertain in the

[1] Might we place any reliance on the testimony of the Arian historian, Philostorgius, h. e. I. 8, the advice of Constantia had had some influence on the issue of the Nicene council itself. As she must have been well acquainted with her brother's habits, she advised her friends at the Nicene council to receive for the present the Homoousion, which her brother was now firmly resolved to hold fast, and give it their own interpretation; — means would very soon be found to draw him off from it again.

[2] On this point the identity of the κτίσις and γεννήσις was presupposed, entirely in accordance with his doctrine: Τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων γεγεννημένον θεὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

[3] Ζητήματα καὶ περισσολογίαι.

[4] The arguments which have been urged against the genuineness of the above-cited letter of these two bishops, by which they sought to be restored to favor, are not decisive; many of them being simply grounded on the view which must be taken of the Nicene council in the Catholic church. This letter possesses, on the contrary, every mark of genuineness. But, according to this letter, we must necessarily place the recall of Arius before the return of these two bishops, as the letter expressly presupposes it. The reasons which induced Walch to place the recall of Arius at a later period, even so late as A.D. 330, are not important; for although Socrates says that Arius had been called by the emperor to Constantinople, yet it by no means follows from this, that the consecration of the new residence, A.D. 330, had preceded; for first, as it respects the place, Socrates might easily be in an error, and by an anachronism substitute Constantinople for Nicomedia; or it may even be, that Constantine happened at the very time that he sent for Arius, to be at Byzantium, before that city had as yet been converted into the imperial residence.

least to the essentials of Christianity, an undue importance. The emperor entertaining this view of the matter, all who agreed in representing the doctrinal differences as unimportant would especially recommend themselves to his favor; while all who were unwilling, for the sake of gratifying the emperor, to moderate their zeal in behalf of a truth which they found to be intimately connected with the essence of Christianity, would easily become suspected and hated by him, as uneasy, contentious, and disorderly men.

Hence may be explained the contests which, first and preëminently, the remarkable person had to pass through who had now become the head of the Homoousion party in the Eastern church. For soon after the conclusion of the council of Nice, the bishop Alexander had died, and was succeeded by the archdeacon Athanasius, a man far his superior in intellect and resolute energy. Athanasius had probably been already, up to this very time, the soul of the party in favor of the Homoousion; and it was by his influence that the bishop Alexander had been led to decide that nothing should be yielded in order to the restoration of Arius.[1] Moreover, he had already distinguished himself at the Nicene council, by the zeal and acuteness with which he defended the doctrine of the unity of essence, and combated Arianism. By pursuing, with strict consistency and unwavering firmness, during an active life of nearly half a century, and amid every variety of fortune and many persecutions and sufferings, the same object, in opposition to those parties whose doctrinal views were either unsettled in themselves, or liable to veer about with every change of the air at court, he contributed in a great measure to promote the victory of the Homoousion in the Eastern church. If we consider the connection of thoughts and ideas in the doctrinal system of this father, we shall doubtless be led to see, that, in contending for the Homoousion, he by no means contended for a mere speculative formula, standing in no manner of connection with what constitutes the essence of Christianity; that, in this controversy, it was by no means a barely dialectic or speculative interest, but in reality an essentially Christian interest, which actuated him. On the holding fast to the Homoousion depended, in his view, the whole unity of the Christian consciousness of God, the completeness of the revelation of God in Christ, the reality of the redemption which Christ wrought, and of the communion with God restored by him to man. "If Christ," so argued Athanasius against the Arian doctrine, "differed from other creatures simply as being the only creature immediately produced by God, his essence being wholly distinct from the essence of God, then he could not bring the creature into fellowship with God, since we must be constrained to conceive of something still, intermediate between him, as a creature, and the divine essence which differed from him, something whereby *he* might stand in communion with God; — and this intermediate being would be precisely the Son of God in the proper sense. In analyzing the conception of God communicated to the creature, it would be necessary to arrive at

[1] For one of the charges brought against him by his opponents, see Athanas. apolog. c. Arianos, § 6.

last at the conception of that which requires nothing intermediate in order to communion with God; — which does not participate in God's essence as something foreign from itself, but which is itself the self-communicating essence of God.[1] This is the only Son of God, the being who can be so called in the proper sense. The expressions Son of God, and divine generation, are of a symbolical nature, and denote simply the communication of the divine essence. It is only on the supposition that Christ is, in this sense alone, the proper Son of God, that he can make rational creatures children of God. It is the Logos who imparts himself to them, dwells within them, through whom they live in God — the Son of God within them, through the fellowship with whom they become themselves children of God." It is here seen how to Athanasius the idea of the Homoousion presented itself in connection with what constitutes the root and groundwork of the entire Christian life. While the Arians maintained, that it was impossible to distinguish the conceptions Son of God and a generation from God, from the conceptions created being and a creation, without falling into sensuous, anthropomorphic representations, Athanasius, on the contrary, taught that all human expressions of God were of a symbolic nature, taken from temporal things, and therefore liable to be misconceived, unless the idea lying at the bottom were freed from the elements of time and sense, and the *same attribute*, predicated of God, understood in a different manner from what it would be when predicated of creatures. Even God's act of creation, in order not to be misconceived, must be distinguished from the human mode of producing and forming. As the Arians admitted that, according to John 5 : 23, divine worship belonged to Christ, Athanasius accused them of showing that honor to a creature, according to their notions of Christ, which was due to God alone; consequently, of falling into idolatry. From this coherence of the doctrines which Athanasius here defended with his whole Christian consciousness, it may be well conceived that he must have considered himself bound by his duty, as a pastor, not to admit into his church a teacher who held forth a system which appeared to him to be so thoroughly unchristian.

After the patrons of Arius had resorted in vain to friendly representations, petitions, and threats, for the purpose of inducing Athanasius to receive back the former into the church, the emperor *commanded* him to receive Arius, and all his friends who were willing to connect themselves once more with his church; and, unless he did so, informed him that he should be deposed from his station, and sent into exile.[2] Athanasius, however, was not to be intimidated by such threats, but firmly declared to the emperor, that his duty as a pastor did not permit him to receive the teachers of false doctrines into the fellowship of the church; and this steadfast refusal of a man acting under the consciousness of his vocation, and in the feeling of his duty, produced so much

[1] See e. g. Athanas. orat. I. c. Arianos, § 16. Τὸ ὅλως μετέχεσθαι τὸν θεὸν, ἴσον ἐστι λέγειν ὁτὶ καὶ γεννᾷ. — Αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ υἱος οὐδενὸς μετέχει, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μετεχόμενον, τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ υἱος, αὐτοῦ γὰρ τοῦ υἱοῦ μετέχοντες, τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχειν λεγόμεθα.

[2] A fragment of the letter is preserved in Athanasius, apolog. c. Arian. § 59. The threatening words of the emperor are: Ἀποστελλῶ παραύτικα τὸν καὶ καθαιρήσοντά σε ἐξ ἐμῆς κελεύσεως καὶ τῶν τόπων μεταστήσοντα.

effect as this, that Constantine did not urge him farther, nor carry his threat into execution. But still this incident could not have left an altogether favorable impression on the emperor's mind, since Athanasius appeared to him in the light of an obstinate recusant; and hence his enemies would be more easily listened to in bringing their new accusations against him. The most weighty charge was, that Athanasius had sent to a person in Egypt — otherwise unknown to us, but who was reported to have harbored a design of conspiracy against the emperor — a sum of money to aid him in the prosecution of his purpose. Constantine ordered him, A.D. 332, to present himself personally, at Psammathia, a suburb of Nicomedia, where the emperor was residing at that time. The personal appearance of Athanasius, a man of remarkable power over the minds of others, seems for the moment to have over-awed the soul of Constantine. He not only acknowledged the above-mentioned accusation to be groundless; but such was the effect left on him by the presence of Athanasius, that, in his letter to the church at Alexandria, he styles him a man of God.[1] In this letter, he lamented the existing divisions, and recommended charity and concord. It is easy to see, that the preservation of peace and unity in the church was of far more importance, in the estimation of Constantine, than all matters pertaining to doctrine. For the moment, the enemies of Athanasius now appeared to him to be the authors of the disturbances and divisions; but this impression was of no long duration, and he continued to be governed by the influence sometimes of this and sometimes of the other party. Occasions were not wanting for bringing new accusations against Athanasius; for in the circumstances by which he was immediately surrounded, there existed abundant materials for agitation, which was sometimes rather excited than quelled by his zeal not unmixed with passion. It happened, for instance, that the Arian and the Meletian schisms, though originating in widely different interests, yet broke out there at one and the same time. The efforts of Athanasius to bring back the Meletians to the dominant church might, besides, especially amidst so excitable and passionate a people as the Alexandrians, easily lead to scenes of disturbance, proceeding to a greater length than those who were the occasion of them, intended. But he was sometimes induced to resort even to forcible measures for suppressing divisions in his archepiscopal diocese.[2] The frequent tours of visitation, which as a conscientious bishop he made to the various parts of his diocese, and in which he was usually accompanied by individuals belonging both to the clergy and laity of the churches which he visited, gave frequent occasion for such disputes between the two heated parties, which led to scenes of violence. Passionate party hatred would, of course, take advantage of these occasions to collect against him a mass of extravagant charges. Although the emperor could not give credence to the various and strange things which were brought against him, yet he believed, doubtless, that Athanasius, by his passionate and violent proceedings, might have

[1] Apolog. c. Arian. § 62.

[2] Epiphanius, who assuredly would say nothing tending to the disparagement of Athanasius, says of him in this respect, hæres. 68, Meletian. ἠνάγκαζεν, ἐβιάζετο.

given some occasion for these charges.[1] He at first, in the year 335, appointed a synod to be held under the presidency of Eusebius of Cæsarea, with full powers to inquire into the charges laid against Athanasius, and to restore things to quiet. Athanasius might, not without good reason, protest against the decision of a spiritual tribunal, at which his declared antagonist presided as judge. But as it had been determined by the emperor to celebrate the *tricennalian* festival of his reign by dedicating, on that occasion, the magnificent church which he had erected over the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem, and many bishops had been invited to participate in this celebration, Constantine directed, in order that they might be prepared to engage in these solemn rites with quiet minds, that they should first take earnest measures for putting an end to the divisions in the church. For this purpose, the bishops were to assemble, first, at Tyre, in the year 335, and there inquire into the charges brought against Athanasius. The latter might, indeed, very justly, for the same reasons as in the case of the first synod above mentioned, protest also against this spiritual tribunal, whose members belonged, for the most part, to the opposite party; but Constantine threatened to enforce his obedience by compulsion, if he presumed again to treat with contempt the imperial command.[2] Athanasius succeeded, before this tribunal, to refute a part of the charges which were laid against him. With regard to the rest, a committee was nominated, who should repair to Egypt, and investigate everything on the spot. But it was unfairly decreed, that no one belonging to the party of the accused should be allowed to accompany this commission, so that he was curtailed of the means of proving his innocence, and wholly abandoned to the party proceedings of his antagonists. This investigation, conducted in so partial a manner, would of course turn out unfavorably for Athanasius. He therefore appealed to the emperor himself, and proceeded to Constantinople. On his entrance into the city, he rode straightway to meet the emperor, accompanied by a few attendants. Constantine at first refused to allow

[1] In the letter to the synod at Tyre, he speaks only of some, who, through the rage of a morbid disputatious spirit, embroiled everything. Οὐχ ὑγίους φίλονεικίας οἴστρῳ τινὲς ἐλαυνόμενοι πάντα σύγχεειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν. Euseb. vit. Constantin. l. IV. c. 42. Even Eusebius of Cæsarea, whose delicacy deserves respectful notice in touching so lightly upon the Arian controversies in his life of Constantine, even he sees, in this instance, only the taunting insinuations of an immoderate disputatious spirit L. c. c. 41.

[2] We may here introduce a characteristic anecdote from the history of this tribunal. Among the witnesses who appeared in favor of Athanasius, was an old confessor of Egypt, by the name of Potamon, who, in the time of the Dioclesian persecution, had been thrown into prison at the same time with Eusebius, and who had had one of his eyes bored out. This person, full of zeal for Athanasius, said to Eusebius: "Who can tolerate this? Thou sittest there to judge Athanasius, who stands before thee an innocent person! Dost thou recollect, that we were in the dungeon together, and that I was deprived of an eye? But thou didst not become a martyr, and hast all thy members still unharmed. How couldst thou have so escaped from the prison, unless thou didst either do what was not permitted, or else profess thy willingness to do it?" This was unquestionably an inference on very slender grounds; for many circumstances might operate to cause favor to be shown to one which was denied to another. Eusebius thought it not proper to vindicate himself against this charge, but simply said, losing for a moment the equanimity, indeed, which it behooved him to possess as a judge: "Shall we not now believe your accusers? If you venture to exercise such tyranny *here*, how much more will you do it in your own country!" See Epiphan. l. c.

him a hearing ; yet, as he received accounts from other quarters of the party proceedings of the synod at Tyre, he saw no way in which he could decline a revision of the previous investigation. But a few members of that synod, the most violent enemies of Athanasius, appeared at Constantinople, to take part in this new investigation. On the present occasion they let the earlier accusations drop, and brought against him a new one, which was altogether suited to exasperate the feelings of Constantine against Athanasius.[1] He was reported to have said, that it lay in his power to hinder the arrival of the convoy of grain necessary to be sent semi-annually from Alexandria to supply provisions for the city of the imperial residence.[2] Whether the truth really was that Constantine in some sort believed this charge, or whether he only deemed it necessary to affect that he believed it, in order to get rid of a man who was a constant mark and butt of contention, and thus restore quiet, it is enough that he banished him, A.D. 336, to Triers.[3]

As nothing now stood in the way of the restoration of Arius to the Alexandrian church, he was, after having been solemnly received back into the communion of the church by the synod convened at Jerusalem for the purpose of consecrating the new edifice, sent back to Alexandria. But in the community, which was devoted with an enthusiastic attachment to their bishop Athanasius, new disturbances arose. Constantine, to whom the preservation of peace was the main thing, sent, A.D. 336, for Arius to come to Constantinople, in order that it might be examined how far he had been concerned in these disturbances. He was obliged to present to the emperor a confession of faith ; and drew up one in simple language, couched in scriptural expressions, without doubt similar to the former one already mentioned. He needed not to deny his convictions in order to satisfy the emperor; for although the latter was unwilling absolutely to relinquish the Homoousion, since it had been once published under the imperial sanction, yet, notwithstanding all this, he was far from being inclined to the views of Athanasius. But the sincerity of Arius in his confession had been suspected by him. He required of him an oath to testify his sincerity ; and, as the confession Arius had laid down contained nothing, judged from his own point of view, which was at variance with his doctrines, he would take such an oath with a clear conscience.[4]

[1] For, according to Eunapius, (see above,) he is said to have caused the pagan philosopher, Sopatros, to be executed on a similar charge.

[2] Whether this had reference to the political influence of Athanasius, or to the magical arts ascribed to him, is uncertain.

[3] The observation of Constans, in the letter written after his father's death, respecting the disposition of the latter towards Athanasius, and the vacancy of the episcopate at Alexandria, may render it rather probable than otherwise, that it was Constantine's intention to remove Athanasius only for a short season, with a view to the restoration of quiet.

[4] In comparing the different accounts of these events, we perceive how the truth here became continually more and more distorted by the prejudices of party hatred. Socrates, I. 38, following Sozomen and Theodoret, relates that Constantine asked Arius, whether he abode by the articles of the Nicene council. Arius immediately declared himself ready to subscribe the Nicene creed. The emperor, surprised at this, required of him an oath, and Arius gave it; but, in so doing, resorted to the following artifice. He had a confession, drawn up by himself, which truly expressed his convictions, concealed under his shoulders; and in giving the oath, that he so believed as he

Constantine being now perfectly convinced of the orthodoxy of Arius, the latter was to be solemnly received back to the fellowship of the church at the celebration of public worship in Constantinople. It happened to be a Sabbath, (Saturday;) on which day, as well as Sunday, public worship was held at Constantinople (see above.) Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, a zealous advocate of the Homoousion, resolutely refused to admit him. But the patrons of Arius, among the ecclesiastical court party, threatened to bring it about forcibly, by an imperial command, on the following day. Alexander was thus thrown

had written, he sophistically understood by this, not the Nicene creed subscribed by him at the requisition of the emperor, but that which he carried concealed about his person. This story will appear, on closer examination, to be wanting in the internal marks of probability. How should Constantine, who before this had been so easily satisfied with the confession of faith laid down by Arius, and had required of him no declaration whatever respecting the Nicene creed, have now made on him so much higher demands? How could he propose to him the question, whether he honestly followed the Nicene council, when Arius had given no occasion whatever for presuming any such thing? Nothing, moreover, could at that time certainly lie more remote from the intentions of Constantine, who at this very moment stood in the closest relations with those bishops that were decidedly opposed to the Nicene creed, than such a zeal for its articles. Everything went right with *him*, provided only the Nicene creed as to its form was not publicly attacked; — provided only it was ignored. It may be conceived, therefore, that Constantine might be easily satisfied with a confession of faith from Arius similar to that which he had handed over to him on the former occasion. Besides, how insufficient is the voucher which Socrates gives for the truth of this story! That Arius had at that time drawn up a confession of faith and given his oath to it, this Socrates knew from letters of the emperor himself; and this, therefore, was an undeniable fact. But the rest he had derived from the most impure of all sources, from mere hearsay, — ἀκόη. If, then, we had only *this* account of the matter, we might even then be enabled to infer, that the confession of faith subscribed by Arius was in no sense the Nicene creed, but that, merely in flattery to the reputation of Constantine for orthodoxy, it was converted into the Nicene creed, and that on this was fastened the charge of deception against the heretic. This conjecture respecting the true history of the matter, to which the analysis of Socrates' account would itself conduct us, is confirmed by consulting the report of Athanasius. In his epistola ad episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ, § 18, he says, Arius, when called upon by the emperor to present a confession of his faith, concealed hypocritically his godless way of thinking under simple expressions borrowed from the scriptures: Ἔγραψεν ὁ δόλιος, κρύπτων μὲν τὰς ἰδίας τῆς ἀσεβείας λέξεις, ὑποκρινόμενος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς, ὡς ὁ διάβολος, τὰ τῶν γραφῶν ῥήματα ἁπλᾶ καὶ ὡς ἐστι γεγραμμένα. And when the emperor thereupon required him to take an oath that he had nothing else in his mind, he swore that he had never otherwise taught or conceived. In the same manner he speaks in the epistola ad Serapionem, § 2, with this difference only, that he represents him here as swearing that he had not really taught those doctrines, of which the bishop Alexander had accused him. At all events, it is evident that Athanasius brings against Arius the charge of deception and hypocrisy in a way altogether unjustifiable, when he proceeds on the false assumption, that Arius was obliged to understand the words of scripture in which he expressed his confession, precisely after the same manner as he himself (Athanasius) understood them; and that, in swearing to the doctrines therein expressed, he therefore incurred the guilt of hypocrisy and perjury. The fact having now been once assumed, that Arius, in this case, descended to trickery, and the confession of faith then drawn up by him having been lost, the Nicene creed was easily substituted in its place, and the way in which the heretic had managed to deceive was ever liable to receive new decorations. We might even be tempted to venture a step farther. The confession of faith drawn up the first time by Arius, agrees so perfectly with all the characters which Athanasius in the passage above cited ascribes to the second, that we might believe that there had been but this one confession of faith; and that either Athanasius, failing to express himself in those passages with chronological accuracy, had transposed the confession of faith which Arius presented immediately after his return from exile, on his first residence at Constantinople, to his second residence in the same city; or Socrates committed an anachronism in making Arius present such a confession of faith directly on his first residence at Constantinople.

into great perplexity and embarrassment. He prostrated himself, as it is related, on the pavement before the altar, and prayed God either to remove *him* from this life, that he might not be compelled to act contrary to his conscience, or else to remove Arius; which, it must be confessed, was not a very Christian prayer. On the evening of this same day, Arius suddenly died.[1] Well might this turn of events, which no human sagacity could have foreseen, be regarded as demonstrating the vanity of all human machinations, since all that which was to be enforced by imperial power was thus frustrated at a blow. But it showed a sad want of Christian charity, when men were seen triumphing over the sudden death of the supposed blasphemer, as a divine judgment. It argued narrow-minded presumption, that they should think of measuring the unsearchable ways of holy, all-wise, and eternal love, according to visible appearances and by the standard of human passions and prejudices; should be disposed to see, in this event, a declarative sentence from on high, deciding between truth and error, a divine judgment on perjury and impiety; when the truth was, that Arius erred from honest conviction; that he had sworn to nothing but what he sincerely believed; and that he may possibly have had, at least in his internal life, more of the Christian temper, than exhibited itself in the defective exposition of his belief. Even Athanasius was, in this instance, borne along with the prevailing current of opinion in his age; yet we remark with pleasure, that when he was about to describe the death of Arius, as connected with this controversy, his Christian feelings recoiled. Thmuis, the bishop of Serapion, having made several inquiries of him respecting the Arian controversy, and also respecting the death of Arius, he declared that to the first he had cheerfully replied, but to the last not without a struggle; for he feared lest it might seem as if he triumphed over the death of the man. And in another place, he introduces this account with a remark which surely ought to have led him to suppress it altogether:[2] — "Death is the common lot of all men. We should never triumph over the death of any man, even though he be our enemy; since no one can know but that before evening the same lot may be his own." The adherents of Arius, on the other hand, sought to account for his sudden demise by a supernatural cause of another kind, which implicated their opponents. They spread it abroad that Arius had been cut off by the sorceries of his enemies.[3] This accusation is of some importance, as *it shows there was no possible ground for suspecting that he was poisoned.*

With the death of Arius, this contest could not cease; for the personal character of the man had little to do with it. It was, in truth, a contest between different doctrinal tendencies springing up out of the

[1] Here, too, we have an instance of the exaggeration of rumor. According to Socrates' report, the death occurred while Arius was proceeding in triumph from the imperial palace. On his way to the church, he was suddenly seized with extreme pain, accompanied with relaxation of the bowels: in discharging from them, he expired. The last-mentioned fact had some foundation; but the order of time has been altered to favor the miraculous aspect of the occurrence; for, according to the report of Athanasius, the death of Arius took place on the evening of this Sabbath.

[2] Ad episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ, § 19.

[3] Sozom. hist. eccles. l. II. c. 29.

development of Christian doctrine, to the outbreak of which Arius had only given the first impulse ; and it was not until *this contest* itself had been decided, that peace could be restored again to the church. Add to this, that the contest between proper Arianism and the doctrine of the Homoousion gradually passed over into the contest between the major part of the Eastern church, and the minority who adhered firmly to the Homoousion creed. The death of Arius made a difference in but one respect, that, while before several important men of the middle party above described had been deterred, by their personal interest in favor of Arius, from distinctly condemning his peculiar doctrines, they now hesitated no longer to renounce all manner of connection with him, so as to be able simply to declare — what to them seemed the only important thing — *their opposition to the Homoousion.* In addition to this, another event, connected with consequences of more universal moment, soon ensued, — the death of Constantine, in 337. His son Constantius, who succeeded him in the empire of the East, was inclined, even much more than his father had been, to intermeddle with the internal affairs of the church. The emperor Constantine had not, at least, in the theologian forgotten the emperor, — had not lost sight of the political interest, in his concern for matters of doctrine. But this easily came to be the case with Constantius. If Constantine had, for a moment, suffered himself to be drawn into too warm a participation in theological controversies, yet, after he was made aware of the mischievous consequences of such a course, he soon reverted to the principle of holding fast *simply to the interests of peace and quiet.* It was not so with Constantius. The latter engaged in doctrinal controversies in the same way as if he were a bishop, only clothed with the power of an emperor. His mistake with regard to the limits of his princely authority — which he extended to things lying beyond its rightful province — brought its own punishment along with it ; for, while he imagined everything was directed by his own will, he was only the servant of others, who knew how to govern him,[1] and particularly of the *eunuchs*, who, in their capacity of chamberlains,[2] possessed unbounded power at his court.[3] Now it was precisely in this quarter that the Anti-Nicene party acquired the greatest influence. That very Arian presbyter, for instance, who stood so high in the confidence of the emperor Constantine, had handed over his will to his son Constantius, and thus opened for himself a way of access to the latter. He was attached to the court, and succeeded in gaining over to the interests of his own system of faith the first chamberlain Eusebius, and by his means the other eunuchs, the empress, and finally the emperor himself.[4] Thus the doctrinal controversies of the day became the fashionable topic of conversation at court. Hence, it spread to the people of high rank, and then still lower down ; so that, as Socrates expresses it, a war of dialectics was carried on in every family ; or, as Gregory of Nyssa relates, the Homoousion came to

[1] Athanas. hist. Arianor. ad monachos. § 70. Μετ' ἐλευθέρου σχήματος καὶ ὀνόματος δοῦλος τῶν ἐλκόντων αὐτόν.

[2] Præpositi sacri cubiculi.

[3] Athanas. l. c. Πόλλοι δὲ, μάλλον δὲ τὸ ὅλον εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι παρὰ Κωνσταντίῳ καὶ πάντα δύνανται παρ' αὐτῷ.

[4] Socrat. II. 2.

be discussed in the baker's shops, at the tables of the money-changers, and even in the market for old clothes. These effects, however, did not develope themselves in their whole extent, till at a somewhat later period.[1]

The immediate consequence of the change of government was, that Constantine the younger, who had obtained the government over a part of the West, sent back Athanasius once more to Alexandria, with a letter to his community, in which he declared, that his father had already entertained the same purpose, and had been prevented from executing it only by his death. Athanasius was received by his community with enthusiastic expressions of love, and entered once more, with his wonted zeal, into his former field of labor. He could not fail, however, to come into frequent collision with the small remaining party of the Arians and the Meletians. The enemies of Athanasius, who at the synod of Tyre had pronounced upon him the sentence of deposition, and who still refused to acknowledge him as a regular bishop, strove to kindle the fires of discord into a fiercer flame. They had given to the Arian party, as their bishop, a presbyter named Pistus, who never succeeded, however, in establishing his own authority. They afterwards accused Athanasius of resorting to violence at his restoration, — of procuring executions and the infliction of civil penalties, and of employing for this purpose the provincial magistrates as his instruments. But the friends of Athanasius[2] were enabled to show, that what was imputed to him had been done by the provincial magistrates, independently of Athanasius, while he was still on his journey, and without any connection whatever with the doctrinal controversies; and, beyond question, the passion and rancor of a portion of his antagonists prepared them to believe anything. Meantime, the last-mentioned party, assured of their power over the emperor Constantius, took advantage of a festival at the dedication of a church recently erected by him at Antioch, to open there, in the year 341, a new ecclesiastical assembly. Here the sentence of deposition, previously passed upon Athanasius, was confirmed, partly under the pretext that he had allowed himself, after having been removed by a spiritual tribunal, to be restored to his place, without any new ecclesiastical inquiry and barely by the secular power,[3] — although Athanasius had not recognized that former council as a regular spiritual tribunal, and although his opponents did not scruple, in other matters, to carry out many of their measures by the hand of regular power, — and in part by bringing up several new charges against him. As it was known how confidently Athanasius might rely on having the coun-

[1] A remarkably vivid picture of this rage for doctrinal dispute among all ranks of people in Constantinople, is drawn by Gregory of Nyssa, in his Oratio de Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti, T. III. f. 466: "Every corner and nook of the city is full of men who discuss incomprehensible subjects; the streets, the markets, the people who sell old clothes, those who sit at the tables of the money-changers, those who deal in provisions. Ask a man how many oboli it comes to, he gives you a specimen of dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, you are answered, 'The Father is greater than the Son, and the Son subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready, and you are answered, 'The Son of God was created from nothing.'"

[2] See the Alexandrian synodal letter, apolog. contra Arian. § 3.

[3] To this the twelfth canon of this council refers.

tenance of the Western church, in which the doctrine of the Homoousion predominated; how much sympathy he met with during his first residence there, inasmuch as the power of Constantius did not extend into the West; it must have been feared, that what was undertaken to be done against Athanasius would occasion a breach between the two churches of the East and of the West. This it was desired, if possible, to avoid. Delegates therefore were sent to the Western emperor Constans, and to the bishop Julius, of Rome. These delegates set forth the charges which had been laid against Athanasius, and sought to gain the assent of the Roman bishop, and, through him, of the more important bishops of the West. But Athanasius also sent some presbyters of his own clergy to Rome, to defend him against these charges. They succeeded in refuting the accusations; and the deputies of the other party, in their embarrassment, let fall certain expressions which the Roman bishop[1] could, at least, so interpret as if they had appealed to the decision of a new and larger synod. He at once accepted this appeal; for very welcome to him was such an opportunity of establishing his own supreme judicial authority. He invited both parties, by their delegates, to present their cause before a synod to be assembled under his own presidency. But it had never entered the thoughts of the dominant party among the Orientals to concede to him any such supreme judicial authority. They looked upon it as a very strange affair, that he should so have misunderstood them. As their predecessors had not obtruded themselves, in the Novatian disputes, as judges over the Western church, so neither did it become him to obtrude himself as a judge in these controversies of the Eastern church: he was not to suppose, that, because he presided as bishop over a larger city, that he was on that account of any more consequence than other bishops.[2]

Meanwhile, as the above-mentioned Pistus found it impossible to acquire any authority at Alexandria, having been perhaps from the first jostled along to that office by the intrigues of a few, the bishops who were now assembled at Antioch named as bishop of Alexandria, in place of Athanasius, a certain Cappadocian of a violent and headstrong temper, by the name of Gregorius. In the name of the emperor, he was installed as bishop of Alexandria by an armed force; and those

[1] We have in this case, to be sure, only the report of one party; viz. the Roman-Athanasian.

[2] To this objection the Roman bishop, Julius, gave a very adroit and keen reply, which doubtless must have been felt by many of these bishops, whose unclerical ambition interested them so much in the business of exchanging their bishoprics in small towns for those in the principal cities and capitals; as, for example, Eusebius of Nicomedia, who contrived to get his bishopric of Berytus in Phœnicia exchanged for that of Nicomedia, once the imperial seat of the East Roman empire, and then this bishopric for that of Constantinople. "If you really consider," he writes to them, § 6, "the dignity of the bishops to be equal; and if, as you write, you do not estimate bishops by the greatness of the cities where they preside, then he to whom a small town has been entrusted should remain in the place to which he was appointed, and neither despise the flock committed to his care, nor pass over to those which have not been entrusted to him; thus despising the honor which God confers on him, (I suppose that in this place the word δόξης must have fallen out after δοθείσης,) and betraying a thirst for the vain honor that comes from man."

who refused to acknowledge him were treated as rebels against the imperial authority. The greatest part of the community being strongly attached to Athanasius, whom they regarded as their spiritual father, while the civil and military authorities, who made no distinction between this business and any other which they are called upon to perform in the name of the emperor, proceeded to enforce obedience to the bishop who had been thrust upon the people, various acts of insurrectionary violence would naturally be the result. The places which had been consecrated to the service of the God of peace were profaned by the rudest passions. Amid these scenes of disorder, the persecuted Athanasius had still time to escape. He repaired, at first, to a place of concealment in the neighborhood of Alexandria. From this spot, he issued a circular letter to all the bishops, in which he described in strong colors the illegality and injustice of all the proceedings against him. Next, in compliance with an invitation of the bishop Julius, he repaired to Rome. There, by a synod convened near the close of the year 342, he was recognized as a regular bishop, having resided for the space of a year and a half in Rome; and no delegates from the part of the Orientals, who did not acknowledge the tribunal erected by the Roman bishop, having appeared to prove the charges laid against him. The Roman bishop announced to them this decision in a letter, which was written with the feeling of superiority that springs from the consciousness of right in opposition to illegal, arbitrary will.

All the opponents of Athanasius being looked upon by the Western church as Arians, they were now solicitous to vindicate themselves from this reproach; and many of them, without doubt, as plainly appears indeed from their own avowal, were in no wise devoted to the strictly Arian doctrines; though, at the same time, they were not in favor of the Nicene creed. The hierarchical spirit was expressed in a very remarkable manner, in the introduction to the first confession drawn up at Antioch, where the bishops allege the following as a reason why they could not be called Arians: "How possibly could we, who are bishops, follow the leading of a presbyter?"[1] Very justly, however, could the majority of them say, that from Arius they had received no new doctrines of faith; but rather, after a previous examination *of his* faith, had admitted him to church fellowship. At assemblies convened at Antioch in the years 341 and 345, five creeds were drawn up, one after the other. It was agreed to condemn the peculiar Arian formulas, whereby the Son of God was placed in the class of created beings, and whereby a beginning of existence was ascribed to him; and to assert, in the strongest terms, a *similarity* of essence between the Son and the Father. There still remained but two points of difference betwixt the doctrines here expressed by the Eastern bishops, and the doctrines of the Nicene council, understood according to their logical connection; — the recognition of the unity of essence, or identity of essence, in contradistinction to resemblance of essence, — against which latter conception, Athanasius remarked, with great logical acute-

[1] Πῶς ἐπίσκοποι ὄντες ἀκολουθήσομεν πρεσβυτέρῳ;

ness, that it was not applicable to the relation to God at all, but applied only to the relation of temporal and earthly things to each other—and the doctrine of a generation of the Logos having its ground in the divine essence, not conditioned on any single act of the divine will, but rather preceding all individual acts of the divine will.[1] The Western bishops did not proceed to discuss and compare these confessions of faith, but simply stood fast by the council of Nice. Indeed, they were inclined to consider all the opponents of Athanasius in the East as Arians, and to suspect an Arian element in all their confessions of faith. The difference of languages, moreover, stood in the way of their coming to any mutual understanding; the Greek language not being, at the present time, so generally understood among the people of the West as it had been in former days.

Through the influence of the Roman church, the two emperors, Constantius and Constans, were induced to unite in calling a general council to meet at the city of Sardica in Illyria, in the year 347, for the purpose of deciding these disputed questions, and of healing the breach which now existed between the Eastern and the Western churches. Of the Orientals, comparatively but a few attended; partly, because they took no special interest in the disputes; partly, because they had no desire of joining in common deliberation with clergy of the West; and in part because the distance was inconvenient for them. There were present but seventy-six of the Eastern, and more than three hundred of the Western bishops. Where party interests were so opposite, and the excitement of feelings was so great on both sides, it was impossible to effect a union: the meeting served rather to make the breach still more marked and decided, than it was before. The bishops of the West having demanded that Athanasius and his friends should be allowed to attend the assembly as regular bishops, and those of the East having refused to grant this, a total rupture took place between the two parties. The Western bishops continued to hold their session at Sardica; the Orientals drew off to Philippopolis in Thrace. The latter there renewed their sentence of deposition against Athanasius and his friends, and extended it also to the Roman bishop Julius; and again composed a new symbol of faith.[2]

[1] According to the Athanasian system, the following dilemma necessarily presents itself: either the Logos is placed on an equality with the creatures produced by a particular fiat of the divine will out of nothing, or he is acknowledged to be one with the divine essence, his generation proceeding from the essence of God, and being as inseparable from it as his holiness, wisdom, etc. All that God wills and decrees, he wills and decrees in the Logos as such. This distinction Athanasius considered necessary, not for the popular exposition of doctrine, but for the systematic exhibition of it. But to the major portion of the Eastern church-teachers these propositions appeared offensive; for, from misconception and want of the gift for speculative apprehension, they were led to suppose that God was thereby subjected to constraint or natural necessity. In the *μακροστίχος ἔκθεσις* at Antioch, those therefore were expressly condemned who taught: *Ὅτι οὐ βουλήσει οὐδὲ θελήσει ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν ὁ πατήρ.*

[2] According to the report of Socrates, they expressed therein the doctrine of the *ἀνόμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν*, therefore the proper Arianism. In this case, we must suppose, that not the Semi-Arians, as in the ecclesiastical assemblies at Antioch, but the proper Arians, here had the preponderance; and that it was not the endeavor here, as it had been there, to lessen the doctrinal differences between the churches of the East and of the West, but rather to express them in the most marked manner. The fact, how-

The council of Sardica, on the other hand, confirmed the decisions which had been already made by the Roman synod. A few among the assembled bishops had, moreover, proposed a new confession of faith in opposition to Arianism,[1] extending not solely to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but also to the doctrine of his becoming man, and to the relation of the divine and human natures in Christ to each other. But, by the wisdom of such men as Athanasius, who did not wish to furnish occasion for new controversies, but only to hold fast the essential thing in the doctrine of Christ's divinity, just as it had been expressed in the Nicene creed, it was so managed that this confession was rejected, and it was declared, that the custom of the Arians to multiply and alter confessions of faith should not be followed.[2] The only consequence, for the present, which resulted from this issue of the council of Sardica, was, that the bond of fellowship between the two churches was completely severed. But subsequently, the council sent delegates for the purpose of recommending to the emperor Constantius the cause of the exiled bishops of the East. Meanwhile, the Western emperor Constans endeavored to conciliate his brother to the party of Athanasius. The Oriental court-party ruined their own cause by exposing the mean intrigues of some of their leaders, of whom Constantius himself began to be ashamed; and the ferments among the ever-turbulent people of Alexandria, who were longing after their beloved Athanasius, and who had become still more irritated by the atrocious acts of Gregory,—these ferments, which finally, in 349, led to the assassination of Gregory, doubtless aroused the political anxieties of the emperor. All these things coöperated to prepare the way for a change in the Eastern church.[3] Constantius wrote to Athanasius, who perhaps could not be

ever, appears otherwise according to the report of Sozomen, (3, 11,) who, notwithstanding it was his usual practice to follow Socrates, yet in the present case appeals to the synodal letter appended to the confession of faith. By his account this latter seems to have borne a considerable resemblance to the Antiochian symbol, and to have sprung out of the same doctrinal interests: for the Homoousion is not mentioned; the anathema is pronounced on those who supposed three gods, or identified Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and also on those who taught that there had been a time when the Son of God did not yet exist. Here then, also, we find nothing, it is true, which the proper Arians might not have subscribed; and perhaps it may have been, that the proper Arian party had in the present case possessed greater influence than they did in the drawing up of the several Antiochian creeds.

[1] This may be found in Theodoret. I. 8.

[2] Athanasii tomus ad Antiochen. § 5. *Ἵνα μὴ πρόφασις δόθῃ τοῖς ἐθέλουσι πόλλακις γράφειν καὶ ὁρίζειν περὶ πίστεως.*

[3] Socrates, Sozomen, and Philostorgius, represent the matter as if the emperor Constans had procured the recall of Athanasius, by threatening to bring about his restoration to Alexandria by force of arms. Unquestionably this account is confirmed by certain indications belonging to the time of the council of Sardica, which presuppose such a connection of events. Lucifer of Calaris (Cagliari) says, in his l. I. pro Athasio, c. 35, that, if Athanasius were really a heretic, it would be no sufficient excuse for Constantius, that he had been moved to recall him through the fear of being involved in a war with his brother Constans. Again, Athanasius was, at an early period, accused by his enemies of attempting to create enmity between the emperor Constans and his brother Constantius. Apolog. ad Constant. § 3. Theodoret, it is true, mentions also the threats of Constans against his brother, but attributes the change of feelings in that emperor towards the Athanasian party, to the fact that Constantius discovered the base intrigues of the worthless Arian bishop, Stephanus of Antioch, against Euphrates, bishop of Cologne. Athanasius, in his hist. Arianor. ad monachos, § 20, 21, simply remarks, that Constans had given to the two bishops who had been sent from the council of Sardica to Constantius, a letter of recommendation; but

so easily induced to place confidence in the emperor's promises, three letters, in which he invited him to return back to his bishopric; and, in 349, Athanasius actually returned, and was received by his flock with great demonstrations of joy. But in the same year in which Athanasius came back to Alexandria, a political change occurred which was unfavorable to him. He lost his patron, the emperor Constans, who was assassinated by the usurper Magnentius. Now, inasmuch as it was only a combination of circumstances that had coöperated to produce a momentary change, without much foundation for it, in the disposition of Constantius towards Athanasius; — as the flatterers of the Arian court-party, favored by the eunuchs and chamberlains of the palace, ever found it more easy to gain the emperor's ear, than Athanasius, whose obstinacy made him an object of suspicion; [1] — it followed, as a matter of course, that the attacks upon him were soon renewed. Ecclesiastical and political charges were laid against him at once. It was asserted, that, for the purpose of deposing bishops who had been accused of some Anti-Nicene doctrine, he had stretched his ecclesiastical power beyond all lawful bounds; — that he had held divine service on the Easter festival in a large church at Alexandria,[2] before its consecration had been finished by the emperor's command; and especially that he had intermeddled with political affairs in which he had no concern, and endeavored to involve the emperor in a quarrel with his brother Constans.[3] Various precautionary steps, however, were taken

he looks upon it as a consequence of that discovery made at Antioch, that Constantius was brought to his senses. Hence he, in the first place, forbade the persecutions going on against the Athanasians at Alexandria; and then, ten months later, after the assassination of Gregory at Alexandria, recalled Athanasius to that city. Still, however, the silence of Athanasius would prove nothing against the truth of the above-mentioned account; for he would naturally be unwilling to acknowledge a fact which might have served as a confirmation of the suspicion set afloat against himself, that he fomented enmity between the two brothers. It is true, Constantius himself seems to testify, in his first letter to Athanasius, that he had resolved on recalling him at his own motion; and he says, indeed, that it was his intention to write to Constans, with a view to obtain his consent to the proposed recall. But it is plain of itself, that this public declaration of a supreme magistrate meant but little; and since, at all events, even according to the report of Athanasius, it is not to be denied, that Constans had backed the demand of the council for the recall of Athanasius, with his letter of recommendation, the application of Constantius to his brother for the recall of Athanasius, could be nothing more than a mere formal proceeding. Besides, Constantius, although compelled to take this step, would naturally be unwilling to have it appear that he acted by compulsion. Constantius himself declared, in a document addressed to the Alexandrians, after the assassination of Constans, that he had recalled Athanasius to Alexandria out of respect to his deceased brother. Hist. Arian. ad monachos, § 50. But it is not probable that Constans was actually on the point of engaging in a war for this purpose, or that Constantius should have felt so much apprehension from a mere threat of his unwarlike brother; unless we are willing to suppose, that the former had to fear the landing of troops by his brother in Alexandria, on account of the exasperated state of feeling which then existed among the people. But it is easy to see, also, that the enemies of Athanasius would take pains to spread the rumor that he had persuaded Constans to threaten war against his brother; and that others would repeat it after them, for the purpose of giving a more brilliant coloring to the zeal of Constans for pure doctrine. The most probable supposition of all is, that different causes were here combined together.

[1] Ammianus Marcellinus says, hist. l. 15, c. 7. Constantio semper infestus.

[2] See above.

[3] Even Amm. Marcellinus was aware, that political charges chiefly were brought against Athanasius. Athanasium ultra professionem altius se offerentem sciscitarique conatum externa.

before they ventured to attack directly this important man himself. The first attack was directed against two church-teachers, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, and Photinus, bishop of Sirmium in Lower Pannonia, of whom the former had, from the beginning, been intimately connected with the Athanasian party. It was easy to fix suspicion on the latter, on account of his intimacy with the first, and thus accuse them both as false teachers.

Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, had from the first been one of the most zealous defenders of the Nicene Homoousion. Being a decided opponent to the theology of Origen's school, he would of course oppose also that system of the Triad derived particularly from the Origenistic scheme of faith, which prevailed in the Eastern church. All subordination, which was opposed to the Homoousion, appeared to him to be Arianism; and he traced the whole of this to the confusion of Platonic, Hermetic, and Gnostic ideas with Christianity. He declared Origen to be the author of this confusion. But Marcellus, by pushing to the extreme his opposition to Arianism, in a work against the rhetorician Asterius, became suspected himself, as usually happens where opposition is carried to excess, of the contrary error, and of denying, as a Monarchian — which he came very near doing — the personal distinctions in the Triad. While the Arians distinguished the Logos dwelling in God from the Logos so called in an improper sense, he maintained, on the other hand, that this very name Logos was the only one which belonged to Christ according to his divine essence. This Logos was to be conceived, either as remaining quiescent and hidden within the divine essence, as the thinking reason of God, or as that reason proceeding forth into manifestation by means of outward acts,[1] as in the creation generally, so in the different revelations; particularly and pre-eminently in the highest of all revelations by the Redeemer, when the Logos, by virtue of a certain *ἐνεργεία δραστική*, assumed a human body as a ministerial organ in accomplishing the redemption of mankind. While the Arians asserted, that the titles applied to the Logos,— such as the *πρωτότοκος τῆς κτισέως*, the Son of God, the image of God,— signified a relation of dependence and a beginning of existence; Marcellus admitted they were right in this last particular, but denied the consequence which they believed themselves warranted to draw from this premise in reference to the essence of the Logos himself. All these predicates he would refer, not to the Logos per se,— respecting whom, considered alone, the evangelist John predicates only the being in and with God, — but to the particular active efficiency by which the Logos proceeded forth from God, communicated himself outwardly, and in a special manner to his radiation in human nature.[2] Christ had called himself distinctively the Son of man, in order to show thereby that he transferred to himself the name Son of God only in reference to the men who, through his irradiation in human nature, were to be made sons of God.[3]

[1] The *ἡσυχάζειν* and the *ἐνέργειν δραστικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ*, resembling the earlier distinction between a *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός*.

[2] The *γέννησις τοῦ λόγου* has reference only to the *δραστικὴ ἐνεργείᾳ προέρχεσθαι*. He was the first who referred the passage in Coloss. 1: 15, to Jesus considered as man.

[3] *Ἵνα διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ὁμολογίας ὑέσει τὸν*

Marcellus at first had stood in high authority with the adherents of the Nicene council, at which he had zealously contended in behalf of the Homoousion. The Arians and Semi-Arians, on the other hand, eagerly took advantage of the weak spots which his exhibition of the Triad exposed to them, for the purpose of accusing him of Sabellianism. At an assembly held by this party at Constantinople in 336, the sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. The business of refuting him was entrusted to Eusebius of Cæsarea, who, as an Origenist, would be a decided opponent of Marcellus. Hence arose the two works of Eusebius against him,[1] which, containing important fragments from the writings of Marcellus, have become the principal sources of our information respecting his doctrines. He found, however, as did also his friends, an affectionate reception in the Western church: the Roman bishop Julius was satisfied with the confession of faith which he presented to him. He probably, as Athanasius, was, in consequence of the decisions of the council of Sardica, restored to his bishopric.

It was assuredly altogether contrary to his knowledge or his will, that Marcellus had approached to the Sabellian or Samosatenian theory, in pushing to the utmost length his favorite doctrine of the Homoousion; but his disciple Photinus, (Φωτεινός,) who had received from him the first impulse in his own theological career, did not shrink from plainly expressing the Samosatenian or Sabellian doctrine of the Trinity. Thus, from this quarter, an unfavorable light was reflected on the source whence his doctrines had sprung, the system of Marcellus himself,— a circumstance of which his opponents were not slow to avail themselves.

The renewed attack upon these two men at the synod of Sirmium in 351, where both were deposed from their places, was the first thing to seal the union of the Anti-Athanasian party,[2] and to show their power.

In the next place, as there was reason to fear the union of the Western church with Athanasius, advantage was taken of the residence of Constantius in the West, occasioned by the war with Magnentius, to prevail upon the Occidentals, by deceitful representations, and by exciting their fears of the despotic power of Constantius, to whom the Western empire was now subjected, to join with the East in the condemnation of Athanasius. The court-party pretended that the present question did not relate at all to any interest of doctrine, but only to the person of Athanasius. By this statement of the case, many bishops who had not reflected much upon the matter, might suffer themselves to be persuaded that they could yield what was required without compromising their orthodoxy; that they needed not to sacrifice the quiet of their church to an individual man, who perhaps might in many respects be guilty, whom, at any rate, they could not protect by their single and feeble voices. To the emperor the matter might be so represented, that the bishops who refused to acquiesce in the condemnation, would

ἄνθρωπον, διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτον κοινωνίας υἱον θεοῦ γένεσθαι παρασκευάσῃ. Euseb. de ecclesiastica Theol. l. I. c. 20, p. 87, ed. Colon.

[1] C. Marcellum and de ecclesiastica theolog.

[2] Here was drawn up the first *Sirmian* creed, as it was called, — analogous to the fourth Antiochian.

appear to have acted, in an affair having no connection whatever with the system of faith, in disobedience to the imperial commands; to have shown a disposition, in spite of the emperor, to defend his declared enemy; hence, to be deserving of punishment as refractory and disobedient subjects. Thus was it contrived, at the church assemblies held in Arles and in Milan, to attain, by force or by fraud, a great number of signatures. Some did not, in truth, really know what was required of them; the others were bribed by princely favor; and others were unmanned by their fears, and excused themselves to their consciences by the plea of ignorance.

At such a time, when all that is most sacred was given up and abandoned to the arbitrary will of despotism, it is the more gratifying to observe a few, who, raised by the power of faith above all that human power could offer or threaten, constantly opposed themselves to that arbitrary will; who, doubtless, with clear and calm discernment, saw through the arts of the court-party, which assuredly were aimed, not barely against the person but also against the doctrines of Athanasius; and were prepared to devote and to sacrifice everything they had, in the defence of truth, of innocence, and of the freedom of a church threatened with the most humiliating slavery. It was not the state, it was only the church, which, in these times of despotism and servility, had such men to show — men inspired with the genuine spirit of freedom, and who never consented to do homage to mere power.

Among these men may be named particularly, Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli, distinguished for the zeal with which he administered his pastoral office; also Lucifer of Cagliari, and Hilary of Poictiers. The latter, who was distinguished among the doctrinal writers of the Western church for a profoundness of intellect and a freedom of spirit peculiarly his own, had for many years lived quietly and undisturbed in the administration of his episcopal office, to which he had come about the year 350, without concerning himself about the doctrinal controversies of the East, until the arrival of the emperor in the West, in 355, introduced disquiet also into the Gallic church. Now, for the first time, he heard of the Nicene creed, and found in it the doctrine of the unity of essence in the Father and Son, which he had before this ascertained to be the true doctrine from the study of the New Testament, and had received into his Christian experience, without being aware that the faith which he bore in his heart had been laid down in the form of a creed.[1] He now held it to be his duty to sacrifice all else to the confession of the truth. "I might," says he, "have enjoyed all earthly advantages to overflowing, might have boasted of familiar intercourse with the emperor, and like others, abusing the episcopal name, have exercised a dominion in the church intolerable to the community and to individuals, had I only been disposed to falsify the gospel truth, to shield my guilty conscience under the pretext of ignorance, and to excuse a bribed judg-

[1] He says of himself, lib. de Synodis, § 19: Regeneratus pridem, et in episcopatu aliquantisper manens, fidem Nicænam numquam nisi exulaturus audivi; sed mihi homousii et homœusii intelligentiam evangelia et apostoli intimaverunt.

ment with the plea that it was forced by the judgment of another."[1] He presented a memorial to the emperor,[2] in which, with the frankness becoming a Christian and a bishop, yet without overstepping the limits of a just respect, he told him many truths worthy of grave reflection, such doubtless as in any other way could not have easily come to his ears. He assured him, that sedition existed nowhere, as the court-party pretended, in order to excite his alarm;[3] the Arians were the only ones who disturbed the public peace; there was no other means of healing the evils of the distracted church, but by putting an end to constraint in spiritual things, and leaving each one at liberty to live entirely according to the convictions of his own conscience. It was his earnest prayer, he said, that the emperor would graciously be pleased to allow the churches to attend on the preaching of those whom they preferred, whom they themselves had chosen; to receive from such the sacraments, to pray with such for the emperor's welfare and salvation." But, far different from Hilary, Lucifer of Cagliari, a man of stormy vehemence and fanatical zeal, did not understand how to unite to Christian frankness and love of truth, that respect for the existing order of the state, and that fulfilment of the duties of the citizen, which Christianity prescribes, and the genuine spirit of Christianity superinduces. True, he spoke in a beautiful and high-minded strain against the unreasonable expectations of the emperor, that the bishops should, at his command, condemn unheard an absent, and, in their opinion, an innocent man; and nobly he calls on the emperor to acknowledge Athanasius as his Christian brother, and as such to forgive him, even though he supposed him guilty of personal offences against himself. On this occasion, too, he said many fine things about the universal Christian brotherhood, which should embrace all without distinction of earthly rank. "Are you ashamed," says he to the emperor, "to call Athanasius your brother? If you profess to belong to Christ, you are bound to call all Christians your brethren, not only Athanasius, but even those whom you see begging an alms of you; for we all, all I mean who belong to the church of the Lord, are one, since with the Lord there is no respect of persons."[4] But with all this, it must be allowed, his intemperate passion blinded him to his obligations of respect to the emperor. He called him an Antichrist, a servant of Satan, and addressed him in a tone which might well be regarded as exciting to sedition, and as tending to confirm the accusations of the Arian court-party. Besides this, Lucifer contended for the independence and freedom of the church, not *in the spirit of the gospel*, which keeps spiritual and worldly things wholly separate from each other, but from another, *unevangelical* point of view; for, mixing together spiritual and secular things in another sense, confounding the theocratic forms of the Old and the New Testaments, he required that the secular power should be

[1] Opus historicum fragment. I. § 3.
[2] Lib. I. ad Constantium.
[3] Nulla suspicio est seditionis.
[4] Pro Athanasio, l. II. c. 29. Si Christianum te profiteris, debes omnes Christianos fratres dicere, et quidem non solum Athanasium, sed et eos quos videris stipem petentes. Omnes etenim in ecclesia Domini constituti unum sumus apud quem non sit acceptatio personarum.

outwardly subordinated to the spiritual, that the church should possess the outward sovereignty, and consequently was in favor of setting up a priestly despotism in opposition to that of the emperor.[1] Finally, the emperor once more used his power to destroy two bishops who stood in high authority,— the one on account of the seat of his episcopacy, the other on account of his venerable age, being more than a hundred years old,— both of whom he had more cause for sparing than others, the bishops Liberius of Rome, and Hosius of Cordova. Liberius had orally declared, in opposition to the emperor's delegates, to his dogmatizing chamberlains, and to the emperor himself, that nothing should move him to condemn an innocent man, and subject the affairs of the church to the judicial decisions of the emperor. So also Hosius, in a spirited memorial to the emperor, wherein he represented to him that he ruled over his equals, and had one and the same judge with them in heaven. Both, we must admit, acted on the narrow and unevangelical principle, that as the emperor ruled independently in the secular province, so the bishops ought to rule independently in the spiritual. Liberius was banished to Beræa in Thrace, Hosius to Sirmium. Thus all who refused to obey were banished to different places, for the most part in the East ; and many of them were very harshly treated.

When the victory was supposed to be already secured over the Western church, the next step was to attack Athanasius himself, the preëminent object of hatred to the episcopal court-party and to Constantius. But Constantius, purposely, without doubt, sought to lull Athanasius into security, partly that he might have him more certainly in his power, and partly in order to guard against disturbances among the people of Alexandria. When Athanasius first heard of the plots of his opponents, the emperor in a brief letter promised him perfect safety, and bade him not be alarmed, and not to allow himself to be disturbed in the quiet administration of his office. When, therefore, the summons requiring him to leave the church was first sent to him by men who professed to have full powers from the emperor, he declared, that, as he had been directed by an imperial writ to remain at Alexandria, he held himself neither bound nor authorized to abandon the church entrusted to him by the Lord, except by a written order coming from the emperor himself, or at least in his name. He quietly proceeded, therefore, to discharge his episcopal duties in the same manner as before. But, while engaged in the church during the night of the ninth of February, A.D. 356, amidst a portion of his flock, who were preparing by prayer and song for the public worship, which, according to the Alexandrian usage, was to be celebrated on Friday morning, the Dux Syrianus burst sud-

[1] When, for example, he says to the emperor, (pro Athanasio, l. I. c. VII.:) "So far was he from having any right to rule over the bishops, that he was rather, according to the laws of God, guilty of a crime worthy of death, if in the spirit of pride he refused to obey their decisions." Ut si subvertere eorum decreta tentaveris, si fueris in superbia comprehensus, morte mori jussus sis. Quomodo dicere poteris, judicare te posse de episcopis, quibus nisi obedieris, jam quantum apud Deum, mortis pœna fueris mulctatus. Hence, too, in his writings, he quotes from the Old Testament, whence he derived his ideas respecting the church theocracy, more often than he did from the New. We perceive already in Lucifer a spirit of altogether the same cast with that of Hildebrand.

denly into the church, with a troop of armed men, regardless of all reverence for sacred things. Athanasius, amidst the din and tumult of the brutal soldiery, perfectly retained his presence of mind: he endeavored first to preserve peace among the assembled members of his church, and to provide for their safety, before he thought of his own. He remained quietly on his episcopal throne, and bade the deacon proceed in the recitation of the 136th Psalm, where the words "For His mercy endureth for ever," were continually sung by the choir of the church. Meanwhile, however, the soldiers pressed forward continually nearer to the sanctuary. Monks, clergy, and laity, therefore, bade Athanasius save himself. But not until the greatest part of his flock had departed, did he slip out with those that remained, and escape the hands of the soldiers who were sent to arrest him.[1] Once more, by an armed force, the Alexandrian church were compelled to submit, and receive as their bishop an altogether unclerical, rude, and passionate man, Georgius of Cappadocia. Every sort of atrocity was committed under the name of religion; while Athanasius, threatened with death, and pursued as far as Auxuma in Ethiopia, found refuge among the Egyptian monks.

Thus, then, the Arian party had obtained the victory throughout the whole Roman empire; but this victory was destined to work mischief on themselves. The party was, in fact, composed originally of two constituent portions; those whom we have designated already by the name Semi-Arians, who constituted the majority of the Oriental church, and the Arians properly so called, who formed by far the smaller number. Both parties had been, till now, united by their common opposition to Athanasius and to the council of Nice, and the peculiar differences between themselves had therefore no opportunity for expression. More especially had they whose views were completely Arian a strong interest in attaching themselves to the *dominant* party of the Oriental church. But as the external opposition which had held both parties together was removed, the opposition within their own body would now begin more distinctly to manifest itself. In addition to this, two men appeared on the stage, who gave to strict Arianism, in contradistinction as well to the Homoiousian as to the Homoousian scheme, a more precise and logically consistent expression than had hitherto been done. These were Aëtius and his disciple Eunomius.[2] Particularly deserving of notice is the latter, as well on account of his steadfast zeal in defence of his own convictions, and the purely dogmatic interest, untroubled by any secular motives, by which he was eminently distinguished from the Arian court-party, as on account of the complete individuality of his doctrinal bent of mind, which was altogether original and of one piece.

As it respects the doctrine of Eunomius concerning the Son of God, he coincided entirely on this point with Arius, and here brought forward nothing that was new; but the peculiarity in his case was the decided

[1] See Athanas. apolog. de fuga sua, § 24. Hist. Arian. ad monachos, § 81.

[2] Concerning the early education which shaped the life of Eunomius, we have small means of information; for the accounts of Gregory of Nyssa spring from a too hostile and party interest to be of any use.

character of his whole intellectual bent, by which he was led to take ground against the reigning religious and doctrinal tendencies of his time, on many sides even where Arius had fallen in with them.[1] A doctrinal tendency which narrowly confined itself within the province of the understanding; which set itself to oppose the mystical and contemplative element, the element of feeling in theology, and hence also the predominant influence of the Platonic philosophy on theology; a tendency to conceive everything in a manner altogether too outward and mechanical, — this tendency, which we remarked already in Arius, appeared still more decidedly pronounced in the character of Eunomius.

Arius agreed with his opponents in acknowledging the incomprehensibleness of the divine essence and of divine things; but Eunomius endeavored not only to describe the manner in which the Son of God came into existence, and his relation to the Father, as matters quite comprehensible, but he asserted also the *comprehensibleness of the divine essence* generally: he combated the reigning principle, especially of those doctrinal writers whose views were shaped by the Platonic philosophy, that there was no possible form of knowing which comprehended the essence of divine things, but only a symbolical knowledge of them for the human understanding. With the presumption which most often accompanies narrowness of mind, he said of those who defended the incomprehensibleness of divine things: "If some men's minds are so obtuse that it is beyond their power to comprehend anything, either of that which lies before their feet or of that which is above their heads, yet it would not follow from this, that the knowledge of true being is unattainable by all the rest of mankind."[2] In perfect consistency with his own views, that the Son of God was but the first of created beings; that there was no manifestation or appearance of God in Christ, but that Christ was only the most perfect of creatures, destined to conduct other creatures to the original source of all existence, as a being without himself; in entire consistency with these views and principles, he taught therefore that the minds of believers ought not to stop with the generation of the Son of God; but, although they should follow him at first as the guide to the way, they ought to soar above him, as above all created beings, to that Being who is the original source of eternal life, as well as the author of all things, as their final aim. "The minds of those that believe on the Lord," says he, "should by their very nature, rising as they do above all sensible and spiritual beings, not stop even with the generation of the Son of God. They soar above this, in striving, out of an earnest desire for eternal life, to attain to the Highest."[3]

[1] Arius was himself an ascetic, as we have observed before; Eunomius was an opponent of the ascetic tendency, as also of the worship of martyrs and relics. See Hieronym. adv. Vigilantium. There is floating in my memory a passage, where he taunts Basil of Cæsarea on his haggard figure, emaciated by ascetic practices; but I cannot at this moment recall it.

[2] Gregor. Nyssen. orat. 10, adv. Eunom. near the beginning: Οὔδε γὰρ εἰ τινὸς ὁ νοῦς διὰ κακονοίαν ἐσκοτημένος μηδενὸς μήτε τῶν πρόσω, μήτε τῶν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐφίκνοιτο, καὶ διὰ τούτο μήτε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ἐφίκτην εἶναι τὴν τῶν ὄντων εὕρεσιν. I set down the passage here with an emendation of the text, the correctness of which will be obvious to every one.

[3] Ὁ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν εἰς τὸν κύριον πεπιστευκότων, πάσαν αἰσθητὴν καὶ νοητὴν οὐσίαν

From the position, thus assumed, of a supranaturalizing dogmatism of the understanding, Eunomius was led to misconceive, in a remarkable manner, the nature of religion generally, and of Christianity in particular; — placing it in an *illumination of the understanding*, in a *theoretical knowledge* of God and divine things. Thus, in opposition to those who defended the doctrine of the incomprehensibleness of God, he said: "In vain did our Lord call himself the door, if no one enters through this door to the knowledge and contemplation of the Father: in vain did he call himself the way, if he has not made it easy for those who would do so, to come to the Father. How could he be the light, if he did not enlighten men?"[1] But the gospel speaks of the coming to God, of the enlightening of the soul, in quite another sense from that in which Eunomius here conceives it. A fellowship of *life* with God, and an enlightening of the understanding which comes from this, — not a certain abstract and formal knowledge of divine things, as Eunomius supposes, is the true subject of discourse there. To such an extreme, in fact, did he go in the heat of his polemical zeal, without distinguishing at all *the different forms of knowing*, as to charge those who denied the possibility of knowing God and the generation of the Son of God in the sense in which he conceived it, with denying generally the *objective truth of every possible knowledge of God*. He accused them of preaching *an unknown God; — and, since without the knowledge of God there could be no Christianity, he held that, accordingly, they were not even to be called Christians.*[2] The predominant tendency in the church, which, beyond question, may have proved unfavorable to the purity of the Christian doctrines, — the tendency which assigned to the *liturgical* element a so much higher place than to the *didactic* and the *doctrinal;* which exalted the *sacraments* above the *word*, — Eunomius combated; not, however, on purely evangelical, but on other, partial principles, placing an over-valuation of the logical development of the doctrinal conception, in opposition to the exclusiveness of the tendency above mentioned. The essence of Christianity, in his opinion, did not depend on certain sacred names or customs, but on the accuracy of doctrines.[3]

Gregory of Nyssa maintained, on the contrary, that Christianity proceeded from, and had its root in, the inner life, inward experience, the fellowship of life with Christ; but all this, we must add, depending on the mediation of the visible church, of a visible priesthood, through participation of the sacraments within the church. "We," says he, "have learned from the words of our Lord, that whosoever has not been born of water and of the Spirit, cannot enter into the kingdom

ὑπερκύψας, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ γεννήσεως ἱστάσθαι πέφυκεν. Ἐπεκείνα δὲ ταύτης ἵεται πώθῳ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς ἐντυχειν τῷ πρώτῳ γλιχόμενος. In opposition to this, says Gregory of Nyssa: "If, then, eternal life is not in the Son, *he* spoke falsely who said: I am the eternal life." Orat. 10. 674, 675.

[1] Gregor. l. c. 671.

[2] Μήδε πρὸς τὴν τῶν χριστιάνων προσηγορίαν οἰκείως ἔχειν τοὺς ἄγνωστον ἀποφαινομένους τὴν θείαν φῦσιν, ἀγνωστον δὲ καὶ τὸν τῆς γεννήσεως τρόπον. Gregor. l. c. XI. f. 704.

[3] L. c. 704. Οὔτὲ τῇ σεμνότητι τῶν ὀνομάτων, οὔτε ἔθων καὶ μυστικῶν συμβολῶν ἰδιοτήτα κυροῦσθαι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, τῇ δὲ τῶν δογμάτων ἀκριβείᾳ.

of heaven; and that whosoever eats the Lord's body, and drinks his blood, shall live for ever. Even such men as in their inner life are not Christians, may nicely argue on the doctrines of the Christian faith; as in fact we hear of those who are not Christians making the doctrines of Christianity a subject for logical disputations." l. c. 704. Had Eunomius and Gregory of Nyssa carried out still further this remarkable difference of views,— which, however, in the vast compass it embraces, was at that time impracticable, — they would have been led back to the question, whether the essence of religion consists in a form of knowing, or in a certain species of inward life and feeling; — which difference in the mode of conceiving the essence of Christianity, according to the different peculiarities of men's individual characters, according as the heart or the understanding has predominant sway, or at least according as they have been conducted to religion more by the one or by the other of these, is a thing of very frequent occurrence. But when Gregory of Nyssa says, it is a peculiarity of Paganism to place religion in doctrinal knowledge, this certainly is altogether incorrect; for, on the contrary, the predominant element in Paganism was feeling, — a feeling neither guided nor accompanied by any clear consciousness, but which confounded God with nature, things divine with things natural. It was not until Christianity had made religion an object of *clear consciousness*, that the one-sided tendency could also make its appearance, which placed religion in the δογμάτων ἀκριβεία (accuracy of doctrines.)

Eunomius, however, was in nowise conscious of the new doctrinal tendency which would have gone forth from him, in case he had been able to gain preponderance in the church. It was by no means his intention to set up a new doctrinal system. He supposed he was teaching no other doctrines than those contained in the old simple creeds of the Eastern church; he believed that he was only clearly developing the included contents of the doctrine concerning the Son of God transmitted in them. Had it not been for the starting-up of the errors on another side, he was of opinion that men would have been perfectly satisfied with those simple articles which already embraced within them all that was necessary for right knowledge.[1] It is easy to see, too, how, from his own point of view, he *must* have so considered it, that his doctrines were none other than what necessarily resulted from the development of the ancient doctrines of the church, "concerning the faith in one God, the Almighty Father, from whom proceeded all existence, and the one only-begotten Son of God, the God Logos, by whom all things were brought into existence." Is God the Almighty the alone author, himself without beginning, of all existence? Accordingly, then, everything, including the Son of God himself, came into existence from him. A communication from the essence of God cannot be conceived, without transferring to the divine being the representations of sense. A production, a bringing forth, cannot be conceived without beginning and end: the generation of the Son of God, which it is impossible to conceive different from any other production, any other work, must have

[1] See Eunomii apologia Basil. opp. ed. Garnier. T. I. f. 619.

had its beginning, as it must have been completed, at a definite point of time.[1]

The idea of an eternal generation appeared to the understanding of Eunomius, who could not divest himself of the forms of temporal and sensuous intuition, as a thing altogether absurd, self-contradictory. This idea of an efficiency flowing out of the essence of God was borrowed, as he supposed, from the pagan philosophy; and this idea had led the *philosophers* also into the false notion of a creation without beginning.

Again, it seemed to Eunomius to follow from the relation above mentioned of the Supreme essence to all things else, that God, who is without beginning, is, by his essential nature, infinitely exalted above all other existences, and also above the Son; and that he can be compared with nothing else. But, by this supposition, he imagined nothing further was determined, as yet, respecting the essence of the Son of God, except in this relation. The difference of created beings among one another depended on the divine will, which had fixed for each being the specific limits of its particular existence; and God had brought forth the Logos alone, the first and the most perfect of created beings, and conferred on him the greatest possible likeness to himself, (but, of course, not a likeness of essence,) divine dignity and creative power, since it was his will to employ him as his instrument in creating all other existences. This is the ground of the immeasurable difference between him and all other creatures. God produced him alone *immediately*, but all other creatures indirectly through him. In this respect, too, Eunomius believed he could appeal to the agreement of his doctrine with that of the old creed respecting the Logos.

The Arianism which was expressed in this manner would of course bring out in stronger relief the opposition between the Arian and the Semi-Arian parties.

The Antiochian church, over which the Arian Eudoxius presided as bishop, became the gathering place for the adherents of the Arian doctrine, so distinctly expressed by Aëtius and Eunomius. Against these, a violent opposition was excited on the part of the Semi-Arian party; and several of the bishops who stood at the head of it,—such, for example, as Basil, of Ancyra in Galatia — possessed great influence with the emperor Constantius, to whom it was easy to represent the Eunomian doctrines as blasphemous.

At the head of the Arian court-party stood, at that time, two men, versed in all the intrigues of the court, who had already shown how well they understood the art of changing their principles and convictions according to circumstances, and particularly according to the

[1] L. c. 650. Πάσης γεννήσεως οὐκ ἐπ' ἀπείρον ἐκτεινομένης, ἀλλ' εἴς τι τέλος καταληγούσης ἀνάγκη πᾶσα καὶ τοὺς παραδεξαμένους τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν γεννήσιν τό τε (not τότε, as the editions have it) πεπαύσθαι τούτον γεννώμενον, μήδε πρὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπαύστως ἔχειν. He conceived the creating act of God after an altogether anthropopathic, temporal manner. God had instituted the Sabbath for the purpose of showing that his creation, as it had an end, must also have had a beginning: Οὐ γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς γενέσεως ἡμέρᾳ, ἄλλα τῇ ἑβδόμῃ, ἐν ᾗ κατεπαύσεν ἀπο τῶν ἔγρων, ἐδώκε τὴν ὑπομνήσιν τῆς δημιουργίας.

prevailing tone of the palace.[1] These were Ursacius, bishop of Singidunum in Mœsia, and Valens, bishop of Mursa in Pannonia. These persons contrived an artifice, by which, for a time, they hoped to conceal the differences between the Eunomian party and the ruling majority of the Oriental church, and perhaps by degrees to get entirely rid of the articles of doctrine opposed to that party. It could be plausibly represented to the emperor, that all the controversies which, for so long a time, had distracted the church, had been occasioned by the wretched term οὐσία; it was only needful to remove this unhappy term from the vocabulary of the church, and peace would be restored; and the term οὐσία, about which there had been so many disputes, did not even once occur in the sacred scriptures in that metaphysical sense; the attempts to define what belonged to the essence of God exceeded, in fact, the limits of the human faculties of knowledge;[2] and it was possible, indeed, to settle finally, in a manner which all must approve, everything that was necessary for maintaining the divine dignity of our Saviour, without keeping alive that unholy strife about the οὐσία, provided only that due prominence was everywhere given to the resemblance between him and the Father. Such reasons, of course, could easily be represented in a convincing light to the emperor and the followers of the court. It was first at an assembly of the court-party, held at Sirmium in Lower Pannonia, in 357, that a symbol of faith was drawn up to this purport: "Whereas so many disturbances have arisen from the distinction of the unity of essence or the likeness of essence, (concerning the difference of essence, which the Eunomians maintained, a wise silence was observed,) so from henceforth nothing shall be taught or preached respecting the essence of the Son of God, because nothing is to be found on that subject in the holy scriptures, and because it is one which surpasses the measure of the human faculties."[3] The venerable Hosius, who had passed his hundredth year and now lived in exile, was wrought upon to subscribe this confession, and was even reported to be its author: thus it was hoped to give it additional weight. Nor was any labor spared to bring over the Roman

[1] These two men, disciples of Arius, who thus far had been concerned in all the intrigues against Athanasius, presented, when, through the influence of the emperor Constans, the Athanasian party began to conquer, a writing to the Roman bishop, Julius, in which they declared all the charges brought against Athanasius to be false, testified their repentance, and pronounced the anathema on the Arian doctrines. See Athanas. apolog. c. Arian. § 58.

[2] It is quite evident, that such explanations could not proceed from those who really had at heart the principles of the Eunomian system, or who had not been long since ready to sacrifice them in part to policy. But the latter we are not justified in supposing; for the doctrine concerning the comprehensible nature of the οὐσία was, in truth, a thing *altogether new*, peculiarly Eunomian, wherein, besides, the Arians, properly so called, were not entirely agreed. It may be a question, moreover, whether this new plan of conciliation was not a continuation of the older one which had come from Eusebius of Cæsarea; whether it did not perhaps spring from his disciple and successor, the bishop Acacius of Cæsarea.

[3] Quod vero quosdam aut multos movebat de substantia, quæ Græce οὐσία dicitur, id est, ut expressius intelligatur, homoousion aut quod dicitur homœusion, nullam omnino fieri oportere mentionem nec quenquam prædicare; ea de caussa et ratione, quod nec in divinis scripturis contineatur, et quod super hominis scientiam sit, nec quisquam possit nativitatem ejus enarrare, de quo scriptum est: Generationem ejus quis enarrabit? Jes. 53: 8. (According to the Alex. vers.)

bishop Liberius. His earnest longing for perfect freedom, and wish to return to his bishopric, finally prevailed on the man who had exhibited so much firmness at first, to abjure his own convictions. He subscribed a creed drawn up by the court-party at Sirmium, which perhaps was none other than that second Sirmian confession.[1] In a letter to Ursacius and Valens, and another to the Oriental bishops at large, he testified his acquiescence in the condemnation of Athanasius; and only begged most earnestly, that they would prevail on the emperor to let him speedily return to Rome.

But the leaders of the Semi-Arian party saw in that Sirmian creed a cunningly-contrived device to effect the suppression of *their* peculiar doctrines, and to secure the triumph of the Eunomian. The attempt to unite the contending parties by expunging the disputed articles, and introducing general formulas, became, as usually happens, but the seed of new and still more violent schisms. Two of the most respectable bishops of the Semi-Arian party, Basil of Ancyra and Georgius of Laodicea in Phrygia, published, in conjunction with other bishops assembled in a synod at Ancyra, A.D. 358, a long and copious document, of a doctrinal and polemical nature, in which the doctrines of this party concerning the resemblance of essence, as well in opposition to the Nicene as to the Eunomian articles, were fully unfolded; at the same time that the church was warned against the artifices of those who, by expunging the term οὐσία, were seeking to suppress the doctrine of the resemblance of essence itself. It was here very clearly shown, that true resemblance in all other things presupposed resemblance of essence; and that without this the notion of a Son of God, essentially different from created existences, could not be maintained. The emperor Constantius heard of these controversies. It was contrived to prejudice his mind against several of the leaders of the Eunomian party; so that he who possessed the inclination — no less expensive to the state, than it was injurious to the church — of convoking synods,[2]

[1] That he subscribed a creed drawn up at Sirmium, Liberius himself says in Hilarius, fragm. VI. ex opere historico, § 6; but the signatures of the bishops to this creed, which Hilary himself notices, do not, it must be admitted, seem to belong to the second Sirmian creed. Yet the conclusion which some who would fain pass a milder judgment on the conduct of Liberius, have drawn from this circumstance, viz. that he only subscribed the *first* Sirmian creed, of the year 351, which proceeded from the Semi-Arian party, and was extremely moderate, (see above,) — this is in the highest degree improbable. The then dominant court-party were in fact not looking after authorities to support Semi-Arian creeds; but, on the contrary, their entire efforts were directed to the procuring of influential signatures in favor of their new conciliatory creed. Now as Liberius, to judge from his way of speaking against his own conscience in the affair of Athanasius, and from the illiberal spirit which betrays itself in his letters to the Eastern bishops, Ursacius and Valens, was surely ready, in this state of feeling, to submit to anything, provided only he could be released from his confinement, and be able to return to Rome; it is impossible to see, why the court-party should not have required of him what it must have been most important for them to secure. Unless we suppose, then, that Hilary or his scribe committed an error in the title, but one other supposition remains, — which, beyond question, has much in its favor, — viz. that the *third* Sirmian creed is here meant. The only difficulty is, that it does not perfectly accord with the testimony of Athanasius, that Liberius spent two years in exile; which statement, however, need not be considered as claiming to be strictly correct in point of chronology.

[2] The moderate Pagan, Ammianus Marcellinus, says of him, l. 21, c. 16, that, by the multitude of synods which he convened

held it to be necessary once more to convene a general council, at which the bishops of the East and of the West should assist, for the restoration of unity to the church. Such a reünion the leaders of the Arian court-party had much reason to dread; for as it was the case before, that the common opposition to the Nicene Homoousion had united together the Arians and the Semi-Arians, so it might easily happen now, that the common opposition to strict Arianism would cause the difference between the Semi-Arians of the East and the Homoousians of the West to retire into the back-ground; and, in that case, the far inferior strictly Arian party would have to yield to the overwhelming majority of the Orientals and Occidentals, belonging to the two parties. The bishops Ursacius and Valens, therefore, employed every art in their power to prevent the assembling of such a general council from the two quarters of the world. As various circumstances came to their aid, they so far actually succeeded as to procure, that two councils should be assembled instead of one; an Oriental council to meet at Seleucia in Isauria, and a Western council to meet at Ariminum (Rimini) in Italy.

Next, Ursacius and Valens entered into negotiations with several bishops of the Semi-Arian party, for instance, Basil and Georgius, whom they accidentally met at the emperor's court in Sirmium, respecting a creed which was to be laid before the councils soon to be assembled. This took place in the evening before Pentecost, A.D. 358.[1] Just as in the case of political compromises, something was sacrified, and something was conceded on both sides, for the sake of union. To the Semi-Arians it was conceded, that the Son of God was before all time, and before all conceivable existence generated of God, — which conception was to be apprehended only in a spiritual manner.[2] It was conceded to them, that the Son was in all respects like to the Father, as the scriptures taught. Under this "all," the Semi-Arians might understand the οὐσία to be also included; but the Eunomians, looking at the article from their own point of view, instead of finding in the clause "according to the scriptures," or "as the scriptures teach," a confirmation of that resemblance extending to all respects, might, on the contrary, consider themselves warranted so to interpret the clause, as if it contained a limitation of what went before, to wit, in all respects, so far as the holy scriptures extended this *all;* and in their opinion, God the Father, according to the scripture doctrine, was to be compared, so far as his essence was concerned, with nothing besides himself. To make out this interpretation, they may also have availed themselves of the article which the Semi-Arians, making concessions on the other side, allowed to pass, — that the term οὐσία, for as much as it only served, from not being understood by the laity, to create disturbance, and for

for the purpose of imposing on all his own religious opinions, (the bishops travelling at the public expense, and in the public vehicles,) he interrupted the business of the public conveyances, rei vehiculariæ succidisse nervos; and, in accordance with this, Hilary says: Cursus ipse publicus attritus ad nihilum perducitur. Frag. III. ex opere historico, § 25.

[1] Of these transactions Epiphanius speaks, hæres. 73, and moreover gives the date.

[2] Yet the Eunomians also might admit this, understood in their own way. (See above.)

as much as the holy scriptures did not contain this word, should for the future never be employed in explaining the doctrine concerning God. As this confession of faith was a production of clerical court-policy, so too it renounced altogether the ecclesiastical form in its conclusion; being drawn up in the form of a decree proceeding from the emperor's privy council; and when it was mentioned that this confession had been drawn up in the presence of the emperor, the attribute which pagan flattery had given to the head of the Roman empire — that of the Eternal — was applied to Constantius.[1] The weak spot here exposed by this court-party, Athanasius well knew how to take advantage of: he said of the Arians, that, in affixing with so much precision the date to their confession of faith, a thing that was customary only in political transactions, they let it be known that this was their faith only for this particular moment; and they did not hesitate to give to the emperor Constantius the epithet "Eternal," which they refused to Christ.

The court-party, whose intention was, in the first place, by means of such a creed, to hush up all differences, now distributed their friends and organs in both the councils; but their artful plots came near being overthrown by the firmness and harmony of the *Homoousians* of the Western, and the *Homœousians* of the Eastern church on the other side. The majority in the two councils which assembled in 359 — one at Ariminum, the other at Seleucia — was far too great to be overreached at once. In both councils, there was an unwillingness to have any thing to do with the new articles, though they contained nothing heretical, and bore on their front only the love of peace. Those, especially in the Western church, who, owing to their ignorance of the relation of the church pastors to each other, could not penetrate the designs which the authors of such forms had in view, were still full of mistrust, and joined the side of those who understood the real motives. So, by the majority of the council at Rimini, the Nicene creed, and by the majority of the council at Seleucia, the fourth Antiochian creed, were maintained in opposition to all those proposals. But when the court-bishops found that with all their arts they were defeated in the councils themselves, they still endeavored to carry out their designs in another way, by those low artifices in which they were not to be excelled. The two councils, by the direction of the emperor, were to lay before him their decisions, each sending ten delegates chosen from the body of assembled bishops. The bishops at Rimini had earnestly petitioned the emperor for a speedy decision, in order that they might return to the communities where their presence was needed. But the delegates of the West could not obtain an audience from the emperor, who pretended that he must first dispose of the political business on his hands, so as to have his mind perfectly free to deliberate on sacred things. Under this pretence, they were put off from one time to another, and obliged to pass the winter in Adrianople. The bishops meanwhile must quietly remain assembled at Rimini, and leave their communities in the lurch; yet there were several who left, without waiting to obtain permission of

[1] Ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ καλλινίκου βασιλεως.

absence from Constantinople. After the ten bishops had become pretty well weary of journeying from one place to another, and of waiting for the emperor's pleasure, and when they were longing to get back to their country and to their churches, Ursacius and Valens began to urge them with motives, taking advantage of their impatience at any longer residence in the East, as well as of their ignorance of the relation in which the church parties of the East stood to each other. They prevailed upon them at Nicæ in Thrace, to subscribe their names to a creed, which, according to the plan so often mentioned, forbade all propositions respecting the οὐσία, as being unscriptural, and merely stated in general that the Son of God was like the Father, *as the holy scriptures taught*. With this creed they repaired to Rimini, and there also, by artful representations and threats, succeeded in carrying through their design with the majority. The happy issue of these proceedings was now used as an argument in treating with the deputies of the Oriental council who were staying at Constantinople. It was represented to them, that the object was at last attained, which had, for so long a time, been sought in vain, — to banish the Nicene creed and the Homoousion from the Western church. Such an opportunity ought not to be suffered to pass without advantage ; and in the article which set forth a resemblance between the Father and the Son, as the scriptures taught it, everything was in fact contained which they could reasonably require. Besides this, the emperor Constantius, though busily engaged in making preparations for a great festival,[1] yet took an active part in these transactions. He spent an entire day and most of the night in the council of bishops, sparing no efforts of his own to persuade the delegates to yield. By his authority and influence, which perhaps had more weight than his reasons, it was finally brought about, that the deputies of the Oriental council also subscribed a creed similar in all respects to that proposed at Rimini. A council which assembled at Constantinople in 360 re-confirmed this creed. Moreover, Eudoxius, the principal mover of the Eunomian party at Antioch, had succeeded in getting himself made bishop of Constantinople ; the bishop Macedonius, who belonged to the Semi-Arian party, and who had made himself unpopular by his violent measures, having been deposed. Eudoxius, who now, as bishop of Constantinople, enjoyed the greatest influence, united his efforts with those of Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, a man whose personal character gave him considerable authority, to bring it about in the first place, that the creed from which the articles concerning the οὐσία were expunged, should be everywhere adopted. The emperor Constantius detested as blasphemers those who openly taught and defended the Eunomian doctrines ; and as refractory, as the disturbers of good order, and enemies to the peace of the church, those who advocated the Homoousion and the Homoiousion. Both parties must inevitably incur his displeasure, if they ventured on a free and open expression of their opinions, — if they refused to comply with the humors of the court. The emperor had resolved to put an end to all

[1] In celebration of his entrance into the consular office.

doctrinal disputes by means of the artificial arrangement above described: deposition and exile, or even a worse fate, threatened the bishops who refused to acquiesce. Eudoxius himself must consent to desert his favorite Aëtius of Antioch, who had become offensive to the emperor by too open a display of his Arian logic. Eudoxius had procured for Eunomius the bishopric of Cyzicus; but he advised him to accommodate himself to the times. Eunomius, however, neglected to follow this counsel of a prudent church policy; and, having openly taught his doctrines, was complained of to the emperor, who manifested the warmest displeasure. His friend Eudoxius, who told him that he must ascribe this misfortune to the neglect of his own good advice, warned him of the persecution which lay in store for him, and he fled. He now became the leader of the party which went by his name, the other important members of it being governed more by political than by doctrinal motives. If the dominion of that party which procured the adoption of the creed of Nicæ and Rimini could have lasted longer, still it would have been hardly possible for the two contending parties to continue holding this undefined and neutral position. The strict Arian or Eunomian party would doubtless have at length taken advantage of the expunging of the articles relating to the *οὐσία*, to make their own openly expressed doctrines the dominant creed of the church; as, in fact, an attempt of this sort had already been made at Antioch, which was only suppressed through fear of the emperor.[1]

This artificial union created in many churches the utmost confusion. Many, who really agreed with each other in their system of faith, were in this way separated by misunderstandings; for many, who, out of weakness or ignorance of the relations of the contending doctrinal parties to one another, had subscribed the creed which left out the articles respecting the *οὐσία*, were now regarded by the zealots of their own party as apostates, as betrayers of the true doctrine, as Arians. They seemed to stand in church fellowship with those who, in their system of faith, were not one with them; and by those who should have borne with them as brethren weak in the faith, brethren erring through ignorance, they were treated with hostility, as false teachers.

But an arrangement which had been carried through by outward force, and imposed on the church by arbitrary human will, in defiance of her own natural course of development, could have no substantial basis, but must dissolve of itself, as soon as the outward force was removed from which the whole had proceeded. With the death of the emperor Constantius, every thing took an entirely different direction; and under the reign of the pagan emperor his successor, who gave equal liberty to all the Christian parties, the relations of these parties to each other, after throwing off what had been imposed upon them, could proceed to shape themselves after a manner conformed to the actual course of church development. The party attached to the Homoousion were prepared to derive the greatest advantage from their former oppressions, and from the period of freedom which now followed; for many had, in fact,

[1] Sozom. l. IV. c. 29.

been estranged from it merely by force or by misunderstanding, and these were now willing to break loose again from their connection with the Arian party, and unite themselves with those to whom they had always remained bound by the ties of faith. In the next place, Semi-Arianism was well suited to form a transition-point to the more consistent system of the Homoousion; and the collision into which Semi-Arianism had fallen with Eunomianism would naturally tend to promote this transition. But the persecutions which the zealous professors of the Homoousion had been obliged to undergo, might easily engender a repulsive fanaticism, which would tend to multiply divisions and misunderstandings, as we see in the case of Lucifer of Cagliari. The great Athanasius, however, was not less distinguished for his prudence and moderation in the time of peace, than he had been for his firmness and consistency in the season of conflict; and through his influence, which was supported by that of others of like temper, such as Eusebius of Vercelli, this danger was averted from the church.

Several of the bishops, on their way home from their banishment in different countries, met together under the presidency of Athanasius at Alexandria. Here it was resolved to do all that was possible in the way of meeting those who were desirous of uniting once more with the orthodox church. Those who, under the preceding government, had, through weakness, allowed themselves to be hurried into fellowship with the Arian party, might without any further steps be acknowledged and received as members of the Catholic church, and be retained in the same offices which they had hitherto filled in their respective communities.[1] To those only who had been among the *leaders* of the Arian party, this privilege was not conceded; but yet they might be received as members of the Catholic church, on renouncing their spiritual offices. This ecclesiastical body expressed its views in a noble spirit of Christian charity: "We wish all who still stand aloof from us, and who seem to have united with the Arians, would give up their delusion, so that all in every place might say, 'One Lord, one faith;' — for what is so glorious and lovely as that, in the words of the sweet singer, brethren should dwell together in unity? Ps. 133 : 1; for so we believe the Lord also will dwell with us according to his promise, 'I will dwell in them, and walk with them.'" Divisions also, which had arisen from disputes about words, it was attempted to heal by coming to a mutual understanding respecting the conception denoted by the words. In respect to one schism alone, which had arisen in the Antiochian church, but where, in like manner, there was no real difference of doctrinal views at bottom, this aim was frustrated, through the want of impartiality; and so the germ was nourished of a long-continued and — in its consequences — important schism, of which we must now speak in brief.

[1] It was thought that indulgence could the more properly be employed in this case, inasmuch as several of the bishops had yielded only in form, in order to retain possession of their churches, and preserve these from the infection of Arianism, which would otherwise have been spread through them by Arian bishops placed over them by force, as Aaron yielded for the moment to the Jewish people, in order to keep them from returning back to Egypt and falling irrecoverably into idolatry. See Athanas. epist. ad Rufinianum.

The beginning of this schism is to be traced back to a much earlier period. About the year 330, the already mentioned Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, had been deposed from his office by the Anti-Nicene party; but a majority of the community remained faithfully attached to him. They refused to acknowledge as their bishops the Arians who were thrust upon them, and formed a separate church party under the name of Eustathians. When, in 360, the Arian bishop Eudoxius resigned the bishopric of Antioch, to become bishop of the imperial city of the East-Roman empire, Meletius, then bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, was, after a long contest, chosen his successor. Meletius was attached to the Nicene doctrine, or at least inclined that way; but he did not belong to the zealots who made the essence of Christianity to consist in this or that formula of belief, and who in their sermons treated of nothing else than the current doctrinal questions of the day.[1] It is probable that, without entering into controversies of doctrine, he presented in his discourses the gospel truths in the way best suited to the wants of his flock. The Arians, who could not understand the spirit of such a man, interpreted this moderation as a proof of his agreement with their own doctrines, or at least supposed they might reckon, that, if he had hitherto appeared neutral, he would now, out of gratitude for so important a bishopric, openly preach Arianism in his sermons; but they found themselves mistaken.

Meletius preached an inaugural discourse in 361,[2] characterized by a spirit of Christian moderation entirely free from the fear of man. His starting point was, that fellowship with Christ[3] is the foundation of the whole Christian life; that he only who has the Son, can have the Father also. "But we shall continue," said he, "in fellowship with the Son and with the Father, when before God and the elect angels, nay, also before *kings*, we *confess* him, and are not ashamed of our confession." This brought him to lay down his own confession of faith concerning the Son in decided opposition to strict Arianism; yet in so moderate expressions, that even Semi-Arians could have nothing to find fault with, as he did not touch upon the disputed Homoousion. Perhaps Meletius belonged to the class who, like many of the Orientals, had gradually gone over from the moderate Semi-Arianism which we find in a Cyrill of Jerusalem, to the doctrines of the Nicene council. He purposely took care not to give way too much to the doctrinal tendency of his hearers, not to venture upon too nice distinctions; and for this reason, he even rebuked the speculative pride which affected to know and determine too much concerning these incomprehensible things. He reminded them of the apostle's word, that human knowledge was but in part, and that perfect knowledge was to be expected only in the life to come.

[1] Thus, doubtless, sermons were often preached, which were entirely barren of profit to the hearers. An example of bad taste, carried to a singular extreme, is given in the case of a discourse preached by an Arian at Antioch. Hilar. c. Constant. § 13. The point was, that God, in the proper sense, could not have a son; for if he had a son, he must also have had a wife, with whom he could live and have intercourse; and so on after the same absurd and irreverent manner, little to the edification of his flock.

[2] Preserved in Epiphan. hæres. 73. Galland. T. V.

[3] The Χριστὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

When the Arians saw they had been deceived in their expectations from Meletius, they deposed and banished him, after he had been in the active duties of his office scarcely a month. Now the friends of Eustathius, who in the mean time had died, instead of attaching themselves to Meletius, as they ought to have done, since he agreed with them in doctrine, had contracted a prejudice against him, and suspected him because he had been instituted bishop by the Arian party, and perhaps also because, as he did not belong to the number of blind zealots, he appeared to them not sufficiently decided. Hence they did not acknowledge him as bishop, and remained a separate party under the presbyter Paulinus, who had already for a long time conducted their public worship. The document of the Alexandrian council was now sent separately to the flock of Paulinus. This community was invited, with all love, to receive those of the other party who were willing to unite with them, dismissing controversies on unessential matters and verbal disputes, which hindered union; but no mention was made of Meletius. All this plainly showed, that only the church of Paulinus was acknowledged to be in the right, and that there was no inclination to recognize Meletius. In addition to this, Lucifer of Cagliari was sent to hush the disputes, a man the least of all fitted to be a mediator of peace. It was wholly in character with his ignorant zeal, that he should pronounce Meletius an Arian, and give a head to the opposite party, by ordaining Paulinus as their bishop. Thus was laid the foundation of a schism, which was propagated for a long time, and which, on account of the general sympathy of the other churches, came to have important consequences: for the Western and the Alexandrian churches declared in favor of Paulinus; the Oriental church, for the most part, in favor of Meletius.

The same Lucifer, who gave to the Antiochian schism a duration which, without his interference, it perhaps never would have had, proceeded, in this same spirit of ignorant zeal, to lay the beginnings of another important schism. The moderation which reigned in the decisions of the Alexandrian council could not, of course, be very pleasing to a man of his character. He was for receiving no one who had been connected with the Arian party, so long as he retained his office; and, as he believed that the catholic church was defiled by the reädmission of unworthy ecclesiastics, he became the founder of a separate party, the Luciferites, who regarded themselves as constituting the only pure church.

Under the reign of the emperor Jovian, the relation of the parties to each other continued, in the main, to be the same; for although this emperor espoused the Nicene doctrine, yet it was his principle (see above) never to interfere, by his political power, either in the affairs of religion generally, or in the internal concerns of the church in particular. The same principle was followed by his successor, the emperor Valentinian; but his brother Valens, to whose hands he had entrusted the government of the East, being a pupil of the bishop Eudoxius, from whom he had received baptism, was a zealous Arian; and, as by natural disposition he was inclined to harsh, cruel, and despotic measures, he

allowed himself to be used as a tool of the fanaticism and of the ambitious designs of the Arian clergy. Then followed a period of most deplorable desolation in many of the Oriental churches. Worthy bishops were persecuted and driven away; worthless men, who had their friends and patrons among the imperial eunuchs and chamberlains, were imposed on the churches as clergymen and bishops. Still, however, this persecution turned out to be rather favorable than prejudicial to the interest of the Nicene party; for the Semi-Arians were driven more and more, by the persecutions which they had to suffer from the dominant Arian party, to the party of the Homoousians. It was only by uniting with the last party, now dominant in the West, that they could expect to obtain help in their oppressed situation. Aversion to the strictly Arian party, the wish to be united with the party which in many quarters offered them the hand, and which could afford them the most powerful assistance, — all this led many among the Semi-Arians to measure the difference which separated the two parties by another standard than that which they had hitherto applied. They explained to themselves the Homoousion at first in their own sense, just as many had already done at the Nicene council; but with this difference, that the approximation was then the effect of outward constraint, while at bottom there was an earnest desire that this compulsory union might be dissolved; but here, on the contrary, the approximation grew out of inward inclination. Add to this, that all that was distinguished on the side of science and intellect inclined to the doctrine of the Homoousion; and that this party accordingly, which must finally prevail on account of the consistency of their system, obtained also increasing consequence by the superiority of the character and talents enlisted on its side.

It was especially the three great church-teachers of Cappadocia, Basil of Cæsarea, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory of Nazianzen, who, with the like prudent zeal, guided by freedom of spirit and moderation of temper, contributed to procure the victory for the Nicene doctrines in the Oriental church. The labors of Basil fall more particularly within the period of the reign of Valens. Not only by his energy and firmness, but also by his high standing in the opinion of the people, he offered a successful resistance to the tyranny of Valens; and by his means the entire province of Cappadocia was preserved from those desolations occasioned by the influence of arbitrary will, which befell other provinces of the East. The emperor Valens, when he visited Cæsarea, was for compelling him to receive his Arians into the fellowship of the church. The præfect Modestus sent for him, and, on the principles of the Roman state religion, demanded whether he alone, when all others obeyed the emperor, dared to wish to have any other religion than that of his master.[1] Basil replied that he had nothing to be afraid of: possessions, of which men might deprive him, he had none, except his few books, and his cloak. An exile was no exile for him, since he knew that the whole earth is the Lord's. If

[1] Ὅτι μὴ τὰ βασιλέως θρησκεύεις.

torture was threatened, his feeble body would yield to the first blows, and death would bring him nearer to his God, after whom he longed. Valens himself was constrained to show respect for Basil. Many times he was on the point of condemning him to exile,[1] but he did not venture on that step. In general, the great love and the great consideration in which many of the bishops stood with the people was a means of security to their churches. The ardent desire of the people of Alexandria for Athanasius, who, for a wise purpose, had for some months withdrawn himself, induced the emperor Valens, from the apprehension of a tumult, to recall him; and Athanasius enjoyed, in the last years of his toilsome and stormy life, until 373, the quiet which had before been denied him.

By Basil's freedom of spirit and moderation, the union also was promoted between the divided church parties — the union of the Western and Eastern churches, which had been thrown into still more violent hostility to each other in consequence of the Antiochian schism; and he would have accomplished still more, had he been able to overcome the pride and obstinacy of the Roman bishops. The alliance between the East and the West had, however, the effect, at last, of inducing the emperor Valentinian, in conjunction with his brother, to publish an edict, in the year 375, in which they protested against those by whom the name and power of the princes were wrongly made use of in persecutions under pretext of religion.

The victory of the party attached to the Nicene council, the way for which had been prepared by the free development of the church doctrine out of itself, was fully established externally also under the emperor Theodosius the Great. Already, by a law of the year 380, he directed that only those who agreed with the bishops, Peter of Alexandria, or Damasus of Rome, in their system of faith, — that is, who were in favor of the Nicene doctrine concerning the identity of essence, — should remain in possession of the churches; and this law the emperor sought gradually to carry into execution. When, in the month of November of this year, he made his triumphal entry into Constantinople, the Anti-Nicene party was there dominant, as it had been for forty years. There was one individual who had been engaged for two years in collecting together, and continually making additions to, the bereaved, scattered community of those who, in the midst of the reigning Arian party, professed the Nicene doctrine. This was the before-mentioned Gregory of Nazianzus, whose whole life took a character of instability from oscillating between the contemplative bent and practical activity in the discharge of official duties. As he had often already withdrawn from the contemplative life to embark in ecclesiastical affairs; and then, without due regard to propriety, had deserted his post and retired again to the life of seclusion; so now he had finally withdrawn from the pressure of affairs, from the administration of the bishopric left vacant by the death of his father at Nazianzen, to a retreat near Seleucia in Isauria. It then came about, that he must be called from this quiet

[1] Gregor. Naz. orat. 20.

seclusion to an unquiet public life of conflict and trial. He was summoned to preside over that small and forsaken community consisting of the oppressed adherents to the Nicene doctrine in Constantinople. Renouncing once more the contemplative life, he undertook this mission, partly because he deemed himself bound not to let the opportunity pass unimproved, of effecting so much for the victory of pure doctrine as might be accomplished at Constantinople; in part also perhaps, because the prospect of entering upon so wide and splendid a field of labor as might be opened for him at Constantinople had more attractions for a man who was not wholly free from vanity, than the narrow field at Nazianzen. As, in large cities, splendid gifts of oratory were in no small request, Gregory might, by that means, effect much for the spread of the Nicene doctrine at Constantinople. Far-famed are the five discourses which he preached there in defence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity against the objections of the Eunomians, and which gained for him the surname of *the theologian*.[1] By the way in which he distinguished himself from other impatient, violent bishops, who abandoned themselves to the impulses of a passionate zeal; by uniting moderation with zeal for pure doctrine; by shaming his passionate and fanatical enemies through his own gentleness and forbearance, he might doubtless effect more than by his eloquence. It is also the merit of Gregory, that he did not, like other church-teachers of this period who had been drawn into the field of controversy, forget, in his zeal for those views of doctrine which he had found to be correct, that the essence of Christianity does not consist in speculative notions, but in the life; that he did not suffer himself to be misled by an exclusive zeal for orthodoxy of conceptions, to neglect practical Christianity. Much rather did he make it a matter of special concern to combat that exclusively prevailing tendency to speculation in religion, which tended to the injury of a living, active Christianity, — a tendency which was so very agreeable to the mass of worldly men, because it made it easy for them to put on the appearance of zeal for piety and orthodoxy, and to deceive the judgment of others, and in part also their own conscience, while they spared themselves from the contest with sin in their own hearts and in the world without them. He often declared strongly against the delusive notion, that all manner of frivolity might be united with zeal for sound doctrine, and often presented before his hearers, with pointed earnestness, the truth that, without a holy sense of divine things, men could have no understanding of them; that sacred matters must be treated in a sacred manner. He often spoke against the perverse manner of those who looked upon discussions on divine things as any other conversation[2] on topics of ordinary discourse, and often declared to them, that the full and perfect knowledge of divine things was not the end of the present earthly life, but that its end was, "by becoming holy, to become capable of the full intuition in the life eternal." Gregory at first held the

[1] Ὁ θεολόγος, because θεολογία, in the stricter sense, was the term applied to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, as contradistinguished from οἰκονομία, the doctrine of his incarnation.

[2] Ὥσπερ τὰ ἱππικα καὶ τὰ θέατρα, οὕτω καὶ τὰ θεία παίζειν.

meetings of his church in the hall of a private house belonging to a kinsman of his. This being the spot whence the triumph of the Nicene doctrine at Constantinople began, the private place of assembly was subsequently converted into a large church, which, in commemoration of the resurrection of the pure doctrine there commenced, received the name of *Anastasia*.

Thus the emperor Theodosius, on his entering into Constantinople, found the community whose faith he acknowledged as his own, with its bishop, Gregory, not even in possession of a church, but assembled in one corner of the city in a private house; while the Arian bishop Demophilus was in possession of all the churches. The emperor left it to the latter's choice, either to subscribe to the Nicene creed, or to give up the churches. Demophilus was not a man who regarded the favor of princes and earthly prosperity as of more account than the interests of religion and of the truth. He chose to do the latter; and the Arians, from this time onward, were obliged to hold their assemblies at Constantinople without the city walls, which they continued to do until into the sixth century.

Gregory was then conducted by the emperor, surrounded by his nobles, and the imperial body guard, which was necessary to protect him from the insults of the fanatical multitude still devoted to Arianism, into the cathedral. The heavens were overclouded and dark, when this took place, which was interpreted by the superstition of the bigoted zealots as a token of the divine anger. But, as the clouds scattered, and the sun broke through, this delusion was refuted, and a favorable impression produced. The emperor now resolved to assemble a second general council in the capital of the East Roman empire, which should settle the hitherto-disputed questions, seal the triumph of the Nicene doctrine, and at the same time solemnly inaugurate the new patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzen, according to the original plan. In the beginning, when for the most part none but Asiatic bishops were present at the council, Meletius, bishop of Antioch, venerable on account of his great age and his opposition to the Arian doctrines, stood at the head of the assembled body; and by him Gregory of Nazianzen was consecrated bishop of Constantinople. Meletius soon after died; and Gregory came in possession of the highest authority, which, moreover, his new position, as patriarch of the second capital of the world, would give him.

To Gregory had been bequeathed, by his friend Basil, the favorite plan of bringing about, between the two great portions of the church, a restoration of the peace which had been disturbed, especially by the Antiochian schism. The death of Meletius, during the session of the council, furnished a favorable opportunity for effecting this object. Paulinus, too, was very old; and if no successor was chosen to Meletius, the steps probably might soon be taken for a new choice, in which both the parties could unite, and the schism would be brought to an end. Gregory used every possible argument to persuade the other Oriental bishops, although, as the friend of Meletius, he might be more prejudiced than others on this side. But his arguments were defeated by

the ambition and obstinacy of many, who would yield none of their rights, and who chose the bishop Flavianus as Meletius' successor. Thus a new prop was given to the schism, which continued to propagate itself till the beginning of the fifth century, although the influence of the Eustathian party was ever on the wane. The manner in which this division was at last wholly removed, stood in direct contrast to the manner in which it had been elicited and maintained; evincing how, in matters of this sort, the advances of love will accomplish vastly more than all force and all arguments of persuasion. The venerable bishop, Alexander of Antioch, on a festival day, conducted his whole flock, clergy and laity, to the church where the Eustathians held their assemblies. All united together in prayer and song; even the crowd who, as the church was insufficient to contain them, stood assembled in the streets. Devotion and brotherly love met together; all hearts were one; a feast of charity was celebrated, and the division was thought of no longer.[1]

To return to the point from which we digressed: Gregory, disgusted at seeing his colleagues sacrifice in this way the good of the church to their private passions, withdrew himself entirely from public transactions, vitiated by so many impure motives. When afterwards the Egyptian and the Western bishops arrived, who belonged to the Anti-Meletian party, they took no pains to conceal the dissatisfaction which they felt at the appointment of Gregory as patriarch of Constantinople, because Gregory was a friend of Meletius, and had been ordained by him; and for various other reasons. They could bring at least an apparent argument, on grounds of justice, against the validity of Gregory's appointment, namely, that he had, at all events, been earlier instituted and regarded as bishop over another community (either at Nazianzen or at Sasina;) and therefore, according to the laws of the church, could not be transferred to another bishopric; — an ecclesiastical rule, which, it must be owned, was often enough transgressed in the East, without any such weighty reasons as might be urged in the present case, and which assuredly, when appealed to, must have served, on the part of the Orientals, as a cover for other motives. The bishops of the Roman church, which was more strict in its observance of this law, may have been more sincere in appealing to it. But Gregory of Nazianzus had no desire to enter into a profane quarrel about a splendid church office. He requested the emperor and the bishops that he might be allowed to resign this office, since he would very readily, like Jonah, sacrifice himself for the ship of the church; although this request perhaps was not designed in the first place to be so seriously taken. His petition being at once universally accepted,— which perhaps, being what he had not expected, chagrined him,— he delivered, before the assembled council of a hundred and fifty bishops, a farewell discourse, in which he dealt out many a hard truth against the worldly-minded bishops. Gregory of Nyssa seems now, by the superiority of his well-trained intellect, to have acquired special influence over the doctrinal transac-

[1] Theodoret. V. 35.

tions of the council. The result of it was precisely what the preceding struggles had been preparing the way for, that the Nicene creed, which before had been *forced* on the Oriental church, and therefore repelled by it, was now voluntarily adopted by a great majority of that church, where it found a more general welcome. In the provincial cities, where the dogmatizing spirit was not so prevalent, the transition from Arianism to the Nicene doctrine often took place in a very imperceptible manner. For when the people heard Christ called from the pulpits, "God and the Son of God, the begotten before all time," they were led by their Christian feelings to place in these words more than was meant by the Arian preachers, according to their own connection of ideas, into which the people did not enter; and so Hilary remarked, that "the ears of the audience were more pious than the hearts of the preachers." Accordingly, when Homoousian preachers took the place of the Arians, the people remarked no very great change.[1]

The Nicene creed, in the new form in which it was here made known, departed but slightly from the original one. The most important change was an addition to the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, which was brought about by the farther progress in the development of the church system; which leads us now to throw a glance on the history of this doctrine, the determination of which belonged with the rest to the complete and established form of the doctrine of the Trinity.

As it concerns the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, a much longer time transpired before the idea of the unity of essence was consistently carried out in its application to this part also of the Christian consciousness of God. The system of subordination would of course extend itself also, after the due measure and proportion, to this doctrine; as was apparent in the church-teachers of the preceding period. The views of Origen on this point also were the prevailing ones in the system of the Eastern church; until they were suppressed by the consistent development and the triumph of the doctrine concerning the Homoousion. It is remarkable that, at the Nicene council, the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit was expressed only in very vague and general terms. Yet the opposition to Arius ought naturally to have led to a more exact determination here; for, while Arius regarded the Holy Spirit as being the first created nature produced by the Son of God, he placed the same distance betwixt the Son and the Holy Spirit which he had supposed between the Father and the Son.[2] But this point possessed as yet no very great interest in doctrinal polemics; and many who saw their way clear to subscribe to the Homoousion as it respected the Son of God, would have scrupled to extend this same determination also to the Holy Spirit. The unity of the Christian consciousness of God had here so little permeated as yet the apprehension of the idea, that Gregory of Nazianzen could still say, in the year 380: "Some of our theologians

[1] Hilarius Pictav. c. Auxentium liber § 6. Hoc putant illi fidei esse, quod vocis est. Audiunt Deum Christum, putant esse, quod dicitur. Audiunt Filium Dei, putant in Dei nativitate inesse Dei veritatem. Audiunt ante tempora, putant id ipsum ante tempora esse, quod semper est. Sanctiores aures plebis, quam corda sunt sacerdotum.

[2] See Athanas. orat. I. c. Arian. § 6.

consider the Holy Spirit to be a certain mode of the divine agency (as, for instance, Lactantius had done in the preceding period;) others, a creature of God; others, God himself. Others say, they do not know themselves which of the two opinions they ought to adopt, out of reverence for the holy scriptures, which have not clearly explained this point." Hilary of Poictiers held it best to remain fast by the simple scripture doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, which, as it seemed to him, furnished no materials for exact logical definitions of this doctrine. He believed that he found in the sacred scriptures no such exact definitions concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father, as he found concerning the relation of the Son. He supposed that he found the name God nowhere used expressly of the Holy Spirit, and he did not venture therefore expressly so to name him; but yet a great deal seemed to him to be already implied, when the Holy Spirit is called in scripture the Spirit of God, and it is said of him that he searches the deep things of God. He was well aware, as he expresses it, in his own original way, that nothing could be foreign from God's essence which penetrates into its depths.[1] "Should one ask us," says he, "what is the Holy Spirit, and we knew of nothing further to reply than that he exists by and from Him by whom and from whom are all things, that he is the Spirit of God, but also God's gift to believers, — and this answer displeased him, then might the apostles and prophets also displease him; for they affirm only this of him, that he *exists*."[2]

The system of Eunomius discovers itself on this point also to be a dead, narrow theory, which had by no means sprung from the depth of the inner Christian life. The Holy Spirit, according to Eunomius, is the first among the created natures, formed according to the command of the Father, by the agency of the Son; which Spirit, as being the first after the Son, has received indeed the power to sanctify and to teach, but wants the divine and creative power. But yet how could the power to sanctify, to enlighten, be rightly conceived, unless it was referred back to the divine fellowship of life of which the redeemed are made partakers? And how could this be held fast, if men separated the power to sanctify and to teach from the essence of God, and from the power of creating? We perceive here an arbitrary severance of conceptions, which is in contradiction with the unity of the Christian life. But this unity was, in opposition to Arianism, from the first everywhere foremost in the systematically consistent Athanasius. He was led, particularly and expressly, to unfold this doctrine, because many of the Semi-Arians were on the point of adopting the Homoousion, explaining it to themselves according to their own meaning, but without being able to make up their minds to apply this determination to the Holy Spirit. The latter appeared to them a being created by the Son, as an instrument for carrying into effect the divine purposes; a ministering spirit, like the angels. In opposition to these, Athanasius sought to show that Arianism could be consistently renounced, only when men

[1] De Trinitate l. 12, c. 55. In an address to God: Nulla te, nisi res tua, penetrat; nec profundum majestatis tuæ, peregrinæ atque alienæ a te virtutis causa metitur.

[2] L. II. de Trinitate, § 29.

acknowledged in the Triad, nothing foreign to God's own essence; when men acknowledged but *one* essence agreeing with itself, self-identical. He adduces in proof of the divinity and identity of essence of the Holy Spirit, to the testimony of the Holy Spirit and to the witness of the universal Christian consciousness, unfolding what is contained in both these testimonies: "How could that *which is sanctified by nothing out of itself*, which is itself *the source of sanctification* for all created natures, be of the same essence with *that* which is sanctified by it? In the Holy Spirit we receive fellowship with God, participation in one divine life; but this could not be so, if the Holy Spirit were a creature. As certainly as we are by him made partakers of the divine nature, so certainly must he himself be one with the divine essence.[1] As he who has seen the Son sees the Father, so he who *has the Son has also the Holy Spirit;* and he who has the Holy Spirit has also the Son, and is a temple of God. As the Son, being in the Father, and the Father being in him, cannot be a creature, so neither can the Holy Spirit, being in the Son, and the Son being in him, be a creature.[2] From this time forward, the identity of the essence of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son was maintained by the most eminent teachers of the Oriental church, by such men as Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, Amphilochius and Didymus; and at length this doctrine also passed over into the synodal articles. After the Alexandrian council, already mentioned, and an Illyrian one of the year 375[3] had set the example in this matter, the extension of the ὁμοούσιον to the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit was adopted also into the new form which the Nicene creed received through the second general council at Constantinople. The Holy Spirit was described by this Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed, in the scriptural phraseology, as "the Spirit proceeding from the Father; the governing, quickening Spirit, who is to be worshipped and honored at the same time with the Father and the Son."[4]

On the first clause of this formula, there arose, in later times, a difference of views between the two portions of the church, the Eastern and the Western, the germ of which we discover even in the present period.

In the Eastern church, it was according to the prevailing view to consider God the Father as being "the sole efficient cause (causa efficiens) of all existence; the Logos as being the revealing and mediatory principle; and the Holy Ghost as being the completive divine principle in the creation. God the Father effected all through the Son in the Holy Spirit."[5] As connected also with this view of the matter, in the Oriental

[1] Ep. I. ad Serapion, § 24. Εἰ δὲ θεοποίει, οὐκ ἀμφίβολον, ὅτι ἡ τουτοῦ φύσις θεοῦ ἔστι.

[2] See Athanas. ep. I. III. IV. to the bishop Serapion of Thmuis.

[3] Which was the first to extend the ὁμοούσιον to the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit.

[4] Τὸ κυρίον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύον, σὺν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον.

[5] Athanas. c. Serapion. l. I. c. 24. The Father creates and renews all through his Logos in the Holy Spirit. Basil. Cæsar. de Sp. S. c. 16. By the will of the Father all spirits have received their existence, by the agency of the Son they were brought into existence, by the presence of the Holy

church, the unity of the divine essence rested upon this as its basis, that God the Father should be acknowledged as "the sole efficient cause (the μία ἀρχή) from whom all else was derived, from whom the Son was generated, and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeded, and who effects all through the Son and in the Holy Spirit." This formula, so connected with the views of the Oriental church, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, "was made especially prominent and held fast in opposition to the doctrine of *the creation of the Spirit*—that the Holy Spirit is not related, after the same manner as the Son, to the essence of God, but is a creature of the Son." The opposite to this doctrine was expressed as follows: "that the Holy Spirit does not derive his essence from the Son in the way of dependence, but is related after the like independent manner to the Father, as the common *ground*; that as the Son is begotten of the Father, so the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father."

As it concerns, on the other hand, the exposition of this doctrine in the Western church, it was believed, especially ever since the time of the more precise logical carrying-out of the conception of the unity of essence in the Triad by Augustin, that, in order to hold fast the doctrine in a consistent manner, the inference must necessarily be drawn, that as the Son of God was in all respects identical in essence with the Father, and as the Father had communicated all to the Son, so, too, the Holy Spirit proceeds as well from the Son as from the Father. There are not two different Spirits, one belonging to the Father, the other to the Son: but there is one Spirit of both; — as he is called in the holy scriptures sometimes the Spirit of the Father, sometimes the Spirit of the Son. How, then, could it be otherwise than that he, the Spirit of both, proceeds from both?[1] As the Homoousion was made prominent in opposition to Arianism, so it was believed necessary also, in the same opposition, to express this definition, viz., that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and from the Father, and the contrary appeared as being a remnant of the Arian system of subordination.[2] Added to this was Augustin's speculative theory concerning the doctrine of the

Spirit they are completed in their existence. There are not τρεῖς ἀρχαί, but μία ἀρχή, δημιουργοῦσα δι' υἱοῦ καὶ τελειοῦσα ἐν πνεύματι. Gregory of Nyssa, T. III. de baptismo Christi, represents the Father as the ἀρχή, the Son as the δημιοῦργος, the πνεῦμα as the τελειωτίκον τῶν πάντων. Basil of Cæsarea endeavors, in his 38th letter, to show how it is necessary, from the operations of God in man, one should mount, step by step, to the idea of the Trinity. All good which is wrought in us by the power of God, we recognize as the operation of the Holy Spirit. From this we pass to the idea of the author of all the good which is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, who is the Son of God. But he is not the supreme and highest ground-cause, (ἀρχή,) but this last is the Father; thus we ascend from the Son to the Father.

[1] See e. g. Augustin. Tract. 100, in evangel. Joh. §. A quo autem habet Filius, ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus,) ab illo habet utique, ut etiam de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus, ac per hoc Spiritus Sanctus, ut etiam de Filio procedat, sicut procedit de Patre, ab ipso habet Patre.

[2] Keeping at a distance all notions of time, and everything that bordered on *subordinationism*, Augustin was unwilling to let even the representation pass, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father to the Son, and then first proceeds from the Son, to sanctify the creature. Spiritus Sanctus non de Patre procedit in Filium, et de Filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit, quamvis hoc Filio Pater dederit, ut quemadmodum de se, ita de illo quoque procedit. L. c.

Trinity, by which this definition was favored; where we must confess that his confusion of metaphysics with religion led him astray. Although a profound experience of the Christian life ever lay at bottom, yet, notwithstanding this, he transported the doctrine of the Trinity very much away from its proper historico-practical ground to a speculative one; and the confusion of two heterogeneous provinces met its appropriate punishment in leading him to mistake a play of analogies for a demonstration. God the Father is the divine Being; the Son is knowledge, as a self-manifestation of this being, — hence the Son is begotten of the Father; Will, love, as that wherein being and knowing embrace each other, is the fellowship of both, the exhibition of the divine unity; hence the Holy Spirit, as the fellowship, is the love in which both embrace each other, and which proceeds from both. And since the Holy Spirit denotes the fellowship of both, he is also that whereby we may be made partakers of the fellowship with the Father and Son. In all nature too, as a manifestation of God, Augustin believed that he saw a symbol of this Trinity, there being everywhere to be observed a universal being, the particular being, and the unity and harmony of the whole.[1]

Moreover, the opposition between the two theories came, even already, to be publicly expressed; although, on the part of the Western church, it was not the Oriental church doctrine, but Arianism; and although, on the part of the Oriental church, it was not the Western church doctrine, but the doctrine of the creation of the Spirit, which constituted the matters of dispute. Nevertheless, the way was thereby prepared for a struggle betwixt the two tendencies. Thus, the great Syrian church-teacher, Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his confession of faith, contended against the representation that the Holy Spirit did not derive his essence immediately from God the Father, but had received his existence through the Son.[2] Cyrill of Alexandria having, in the ninth of his anathemas, pronounced sentence of condemnation on those who denied that the Holy Spirit is a property of Christ,[3] Theodoret remarks upon this, in his refutation of these anathemas: "If it is meant to be said here, that the Holy Spirit is of like essence with the Son of God, and proceeds from the Father, let this be conceded. But if it is meant to be said, that he has his existence from the Son, or through the Son, let it be rejected as blasphemous;" and he refers for proof to John 15 : 26; 1 Corinth. 2 : 12. Theodore and Theodoret both evidently intended here to combat but one and the same doctrine,— that which favored the notion of the creation of the Spirit. The same was the case, on the other hand, in the Western church. When the West-Gothic church of Spain, in the time of king Reccared, went over from the Arian doctrine to the Nicene, that Western theory was first adopted as an addition to the

[1] Sermo 71, § 18. In Spiritu Sancto insinuatur Patris Filiique communitas. Quod ergo commune est Patri et Filio, per hoc nos habere communionem et inter nos et secum. Serm. 212. Spiritus Sanctus, unitas amborum. De Trinitat. l. 15, § 27. Per Spiritum Sanctum insinuatur caritas, qua invicem se diligunt Pater et Filius. — Esse, species rei et ordo. Confessio, l. 13, c. XI. de vera religione, § 13.

[2] Διὰ υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν εἰληφός.

[3] Ἴδιον εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. These words, according to their proper connection, do not belong here, but are taken simply in the connection which Theodoret gave to them, for the purpose of attacking them.

Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed.[1] At the third ecclesiastical assembly of Toledo, A.D. 589, the creed was presented with this addition, and sentence of condemnation pronounced on those who did not believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, where evidently those were intended who still remained attached to the Arian doctrine which hitherto prevailed there.[2]

As we observed, the Oriental church was the proper theatre for the controversies on the doctrine of the Trinity, with regard to which the Western church, in the main, kept itself more tranquil. The Anti-Nicene doctrine had found here but few advocates. The most considerable man among these latter was Auxentius, bishop of Milan, who was rather inclined to Semi-Arianism, and who defended the symbol of faith drawn up at Rimini. The major part of his church being satisfied with him, he was protected by the emperor Valentinian, conformably with that prince's maxim of toleration. After the death of Auxentius, in 374, a violent schism arose at the choice of a new bishop. Ambrose, who, as *consular* over the provinces of Liguria and Æmilia, had his head quarters at Milan, deemed it necessary to go himself into the church, and exhort the people from the chancel to be quiet. A child — perhaps so instructed — shouted the name of *Ambrose;* and this was considered to be a voice from God in favor of Ambrose, who already, in his civil offices, had acquired universal esteem and love. The fact that he was but a catechumen was not allowed to be any impediment. He was first baptized, and somewhat later ordained as bishop. The church of Milan afterwards came into critical situations, in which she was protected by the energy and firmness which Ambrose had acquired and preserved in other offices, and in other relations. The empress Justina, the mother of the young emperor Valentinian II., took advantage of his minority to contrive some method of introducing Arianism, which had zealous friends among the leaders of the allied troops of the Goths. Had Ambrose yielded in a single point, had he given up to them a single church, they would probably have continually gone on increasing their demands. It was said, the emperor had power to determine all matters within his government, that the churches belonged to him. Ambrose, on the other hand, affirmed that they were entrusted to him by God. The plans of Justina were met and defeated by his energy, firmness, and superior influence.

Semi-Arianism and Arianism continued to predominate for some time among the rude populations, especially of German origin, which were during this period converted to Christianity; because they had been first instructed by teachers who were attached to those principles; because they held fast to the form in which they had once received Christianity, and this very form may have constituted a convenient point of

[1] Spiritus Sanctus, qui procedit a Patre Filioque.

[2] A conciliatory mean betwixt the two theories was offered by Augustin's explanation, that inasmuch as the Son has everything from the Father, but everything as shared with the Father, so it might be said, Spiritum Sanctum *principaliter* procedere a Patre. Augustin de Trinitate, l. 15, c. 17, de civitate Dei, l. XI. c. 24; and with this intermediate view the theories of an Athanasius and a Basil might also agree. See above.

transition for these rude nations. This mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Trinity may have been better suited to them than the more completely developed Nicene view. It seems to have been a peculiarity of the Semi-Arian theologians, whereby perhaps they were better adapted to be teachers of the rude tribes of people, that, being less practised logicians, they adhered more tenaciously to the simple Bible doctrine, and were not for teaching anything which they could not prove with the exactness of verbal testimony from the Bible. Hence they frequently offered it as an objection to the defenders of the Nicene council, that they were obliged to have recourse to speculative reasoning, instead of the Bible, to prove the Homoousion.[1]

To the rude populations among whom Arianism found admission, belonged the Vandals. When, in 430, this tribe took possession of North Africa, there arose, under their kings, Geiserich and Hunnerich, several violent persecutions against the adherents of the Nicene doctrine. In part, the Vandal princes wished to retaliate the oppressions which their companions in the faith had to suffer in the Roman empire; in part, those of their subjects who agreed in faith with the Roman Christians were objects of suspicion to them; and in part they were led on by the rude, fanatical, Arian clergy. Victor, bishop of Vita, in Numidia, near the close of the fifth century, wrote a history of this persecution.

But the new Nicene form of the doctrine of the Trinity, which at length obtained the victory over the older system of subordination, had an important influence also on the whole system of Christian theology. The emanation-doctrine in the Triad left still remaining a point of attachment, a foothold, for the emanation-theory; and accordingly speculative questions of cosmogony might here find scope and encouragement, as in the case of Origen. But then inasmuch as, by the consistent Athanasian system, the strong line of demarcation was drawn between that which is grounded in the essence of God, derived from that essence, and one and the same with it, and that which had been produced by a divine act of the will out of nothing,[2] — that is, all which must be comprehended under the notion of a creature, — so the Christian idea of creation was thus preserved against all confusion with the emanation-theory.

b. Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ.

Closely connected with the history of the doctrine of Christ's divine nature, is the history of the doctrine of his human nature, and of the relation of the human element to the divine in his person; for the opposite tendencies in the mode of apprehending the former doctrine would extend their influence also to the different modes of conceiving this *latter*. They who apprehended the notion of Christ's divinity with greater exactness, would thereby be led to apprehend with more

[1] The Arian Maximinus says to Augustin: Si affirmaveris de divinis scripturis, si alicubi scriptam lectionem protuleris, — nos divinarum scripturarum optamus inveniri discipuli. Augustin. c. Maximin. Arian l. I. § 26.

[2] Concerning the meaning of this expression, see vol. III.

distinctness and precision the notion of his human nature, and to draw a clearer line of separation between the predicates of the divine and the human nature, in order that they might secure themselves against the transfer of human finitude to the divine essence of Christ. On the other hand, those who represented to themselves the Logos as being the most perfect among all created beings, but still as not being God in the proper sense, had therefore no occasion for making precise and accurate distinctions between the divine and human nature of Christ, since their conception of Christ's divine nature did not exclude the supposition of a certain finitude; and the not distinguishing here might in truth be advantageous to their system, and supply many proofs for their subordination-system, which would have been taken away from them by the distinction of two complete natures. And on this point Arius did actually adopt into his system the older, still undefined and undeveloped doctrine, in the form which it had previous to the new stage of development to which it was carried by Tertullian, and more especially by Origen. Arius and Eunomius[1] made the incarnation of the Logos to consist simply in his becoming united with a human body. Thus they could now avail themselves of all those passages of the New Testament in which they found anything expressed denoting a finite nature, hinting at a subordinate relation of Christ, as evidence against the doctrine of consubstantiality. But if in such passages the defenders of the Homoousion met them with the distinction of the two natures, by which this was to be explained, then they charged these defenders with denying the true personal unity of the God-man, with making the one Son of God and the one Christ, two Sons of God and two Christs;[2] — the same objection which was made to Origen in the preceding period, when he first gave systematic form to the doctrine of Christ's complete human nature.

Whilst, by Arius and Eunomius, the older church doctrine of Christ's humanity was brought up anew, the older Sabellianism and the older Samosatenianism was repeated over again in the doctrines of Marcellus of Ancyra and of Photinus. As we have already remarked, Marcellus referred everything which seemed to denote a species of dependence, subordination, or limitation, not to the Logos by himself considered, but to his particular active efficiency,[3] by virtue of which he had taken into union with himself also the human nature of Christ. To this particular efficiency, whereby the divine Logos had, as it were, come forth from the hidden essence of God, he referred the entire human appearance of Christ, which had for its object to manifest God in the sensible nature of man, to elevate man to God and to a participation in the divine life, and to procure for him the victory over sin. Until this object should be attained, the separate kingdom of Christ, growing out of this particular activity of the Logos, was to endure.

[1] From Gregor. Nyss. orat. f. 482, it is plain, that the words in the confession of faith of Eunomius must read as follows: Οὐκ ἀναλαβόντα ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἀνθρώπου.

[2] See Eunomius against Basil. Gregor. Nyssen. c. Eunom. orat. IV. f. 578.

[3] The ἐνεργεία δραστικὴ τοῦ λόγου.

But as soon as the object was attained, God would withdraw back into himself this efficiency of the Logos, which had emanated from him; and the separate kingdom of Christ, therewith connected, would again resolve itself into the one, universal, eternal kingdom of God the Father, — all which, as he supposed, could be shown from 1 Cor. 15 : 28. This active energy (*ἐνεργεία δραστική*) of the Logos he made to consist, however, in nothing else than the inspiring with a soul the human body, which the Logos, by so doing, appropriated to himself. In his opinion, which agrees in this respect with that of Beryll of Bostra, and of Sabellius, the entire personal existence and consciousness of Christ was a result of this *ἐνεργεία δραστική*. But here, according to his own theory, he must have been surprised by the question and the difficulty, "What then was to become of the body of Christ, which had thus been animated with a soul, and transfigured to an imperishable existence, when God should once more withdraw into himself the energy of the Logos that had emanated from him and had effected all this?" Marcellus, who was not a logical systematizer, who was actuated by only one single interest, that of holding fast the unity of the Christian consciousness of God, who ever took the stand of opposition to speculative caprice, and to the dogmatism which was for determining too many things, and would hold fast on nothing but what he believed he found expressly determined in scripture, left the difficulty unsolved; at the same time affirming, that it was not safe to determine anything on this point, since holy writ had given no definite solution of the question.[1] But the more logical Photinus, to whom the doctrine of the existence of God in Christ seemed less important, was not to be satisfied with thus admitting the difficulty without resolving it; and as he clearly understood and expressed with precision the Samosatenian theory, to which Marcellus unconsciously inclined in his doctrine of the Logos, so he adopted also its peculiar representation of the human nature of Christ. He made the *ἐνεργεία δραστική* of the Logos here to consist, not in the animating of the body of Christ with a soul, but in the enlightening influence of the Logos on the man Jesus, consisting of body and soul, whereby he stood preëminent over all other prophets and divine messengers, and became the Son of God.[2]

[1] Euseb. c. Marcell. l. II. c. II. IV.

[2] This representation of the doctrine of Photinus seems certainly to be in accordance with the majority of the reports of ancient writers; and it was *this* false doctrine which men designated with the name Photinianism, while at the same time they were accustomed to compare his theory with that of Paul of Samosata. But still the question arises, whether these accounts are perfectly correct. The council of Sirmium in 351 directs against Photinus, among others also, the following anathema: *Εἰ τὶς τὸ ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο ἀκούων, τὸν λόγον εἰς σάρκα μεταβεβλῆσθαι νομίζοι, ἢ τροπὴν ὑπομενηκότα ἀνειληφέναι τὴν σάρκα.* It cannot be conceived how this could be said in opposition to any Samosatenian tenet; but it is altogether apropos, if Photinus, like his teacher Marcellus, and like Sabellius, derived the entire human existence of Christ from a certain irradiation of the Logos into the *σάρξ*. Perhaps, however, he differed from Marcellus precisely in this, that he explained the so-constituted personality of Christ as destined indeed to *endure for ever*, but held that his kingdom was to last only for a certain definite period. The ancients do, indeed, sometimes compare Photinus with Sabellius; but it must be owned, their views of the difference between the doctrine of Paul and that of Sabellius were not clear, and this very circumstance may also have led them to a false representation of Photin's doctrine.

In opposition to these two tendencies in the mode of conceiving this doctrine, the Arian and the Photinian, the two others now proceeded to form themselves in the dogmatico-polemical interest, maintaining, on the one hand, the completeness of the human nature of Christ, and, on the other, the true personal union of the two natures. According as the one or the other of these predominated, differences would now arise in the mode of apprehending this doctrine. Yet it was sought at first to hold fast the theory of personal unity along with the completeness of the human nature taken up into union with the Logos, as the essential thing; in doing which many differences in particular modes of conception might have existed, without encroaching on the unity of faith.[1] The most eminent church-teachers, such as Athanasius, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, labored to preserve the unity of faith on this side, and to suppress those schisms which were now existing in the bud. But the germ of antagonisms was already formed, which could no longer be suppressed, but must go on to develope themselves without stop or hindrance.

Especially important was the influence of the two great church-teachers of Cappadocia, Gregory of Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, on the development of this doctrine. We find in them the further prosecution of the tendency which commenced with Origen. They adopted from Origen the doctrine, that the Logos united himself, by the mediation of a rational human soul, (of a ψυχὴ νοερά,) with the sensuous nature. The essential point of this union, the characteristic mark of the personal unity, they placed in this, namely, that the divine Logos took all the parts of human nature into fellowship with himself, and pervaded them. They affirmed, it is true, that this permeation took place potentially from the first moment of the human existence; but, with Origen, they taught at the same time that its consequences, in respect to all the parts of human nature, did not unfold themselves until after Christ's resurrection; that, after his ascension to glory, his body also became transfigured to a form analogous with the divine essence. See vol. I. p. 639.

In refutation of the charge brought by Eunomius, that, by the supposition of a complete human nature in Christ, along with the divine nature, a duality was ascribed to him, Gregory of Nyssa says: "Be-

[1] As, for example, Hilary of Poictiers expressed his own peculiar mode of apprehending the doctrine as follows: Christum sibi animam assumsisse ex se et corpus per se; i. e. a soul derived in some way from his divine essence, to which it was especially related; and a body miraculously so wrought by the divine informing power, that although in shape it resembled other human bodies, it was yet of a more exalted nature, so that to all sensuous affections which he was not liable to by any necessity of nature, he voluntarily subjected himself to secure a particular object in view, viz. the salvation of man, κατ' οἰκονομίαν. See Hilar. de Trinitate, l. IX. et X. A doctrine similar to that set forth in the preceding period by Clement of Alexandria, according to which, it must be admitted, especially so far as it concerns the view of Hilary, that the ideal of purely human virtue, which Christ must present, in order to be the Redeemer of mankind and the author of a new moral creation in humanity, could not be rightly understood. To this theory of the body, Hilary suffered himself to be misled by the false ascetic theory which derived sin particularly from the sensuous nature. As it respects the other position, however, the correct notion hovered before his mind, that the human nature of Christ cannot be regarded as one that came in the natural course of the development of sinful humanity.

yond question, such a duality would find place, if, along with the divine nature, there existed in Christ another alien one in its own peculiar characteristic marks and properties. But as everything had been transformed after the analogy of the divine nature, into which the human has risen, as wood into the fire, such a distinction no longer holds good."[1] From this theory was derived the argument for a transfer of the divine predicates to the human nature, and vice versa; for a reciprocal interchange of attributes.[2] As, in the case of Gregory of Nyssa, the principles of the Origenistic system of faith appear everywhere more sharply defined than they do in the case of Gregory of Nazianzen; so he maintained that the glorified body of Christ, by that sublimation (*ἀνάκρασις*) into the essence of the divine nature, laid aside gravity, shape, color, limitation, all the properties of the sensuous nature: a proper human nature was to be ascribed to it only during the period of its earthly appearance. Hence also he taught the doctrine of the omnipresence of the glorified body of Christ: "After the same manner as Christ exists in the superterrestrial regions, so also he exists with *us* in all parts of the world."[3]

In opposition to this theory, derived from the Origenistic theology, came forth another system, which once more exerted a special influence on the course of development of the doctrine we are considering; namely, that of the younger Apollinaris, a man thoroughly trained in the study of the ancient Greek literature, and a native of Laodicea in Syria, of which city he finally became bishop. The great effort of this teacher was again to suppress the doctrine of a perfect human nature taken up into indissoluble union with the divine Logos, which had been first brought into systematic form and obtained authority by means of Origen; and, instead of it, to establish on a firm footing, by new logical grounds and trains of argument, the original doctrine of the union of the Logos solely with the human body. In the case of Apollinaris, the interest of Christian faith was combined with the interest of scientific speculation. He was especially intent, like the older Patripassianists, to preserve this point inviolate, and without any curtailment to the faith,— that God revealed himself to him immediately in the appearance of Christ, that nothing intervened to shut him out from the immediate relation to God. This, however, as it seemed to him, was not the case with the theory introduced by Origen and adopted by the church; for in this it seemed to him that the immediate manifestation of God in Christ was not recognized, but only a human spirit was represented as the organ of the divine manifestation. In the next place, it was his opinion, that it belonged to the scientific exposition to bring out into clear consciousness what was contained in the church faith, and to ex-

[1] We see here much that is analogous to the later Monophysitism. See Gregor. Nyss. orat. IV. f. 589, T. III. 265. His ep. ad Theophilum.

[2] The *ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων*, which afterwards became the occasion of so much controversy.

[3] Gregory of Nazianzen expresses himself more temperately. He says we should not attribute to the glorified body of Christ any properly sensuous qualities, but neither again a spiritual essence (*φύσις ἀσώματος*;) that it is impossible to determine anything more than this respecting the nature of his glorified body, (*θεοειδεστέρου σώματος.*) Gregor. Naz. orat. 40, f. 641.

amine, moreover, whether it corresponded to the essence of pure Christianity; whether some Jewish or pagan element had not mixed in with the faith of Christians, as might easily happen, when the faith was proceeding onward in its unconscious development. It was by a credulity which did not stop to examine, that Eve suffered herself to be betrayed.[1] At the basis, then, of this exposition by Apollinaris, lay the principle, that the end to be sought in a scientific examination of the church system of faith was to preserve the purely Christian elements of that faith from the intermixture of foreign Jewish and pagan elements; and, where such an intermixture had already taken place, to purge away the dross. How salutary would have been the effect on the Christian life, how many errors adulterating pure Christianity would have been prevented from being propagated by church tradition to the following centuries, if this principle of Apollinaris had been received, appropriated, and consistently applied!

Apollinaris supposed he was able to demonstrate, with mathematical certainty,[2] how it was necessary for any one to regard the person of Christ, if he would consistently recognize him as the God-man. "Either," said he, speaking against the doctrine of the union of the deity and humanity in Christ conceived after the manner above described, "either the man who was taken into union with the divine Logos, retained his own self-determining free-will; and in this case it was impossible that any true personal union could take place. The man endowed with a free-will is but an organ, through which the Logos acts, in like manner as he made prophets and holy men serve as organs of his activity.[3] Christ differs only in degree from other divinely enlightened messengers of God. He is not the God-man, but only a divine man, just as believers come to be; — only a man serving as an organ of the divine will.[4] Or we must suppose, that the human nature suffered the loss of its free-will in this union with the divine Logos. But, as this belongs to the essence of human nature, the latter, in losing the free-will, ceases to be any longer a human nature; and consequently nothing more is now to be said of a union of divinity and humanity. At the same time, it is not to be conceived that God, the creator of human nature, would so deprive it of that which constitutes its essence, and consequently annihilate it."[5]

Apollinaris, therefore,— who took the same liberty of drawing his own conclusions from the positions of his opponents, and arguing against them, as his opponents took with regard to his, and so of charging

[1] The words of Apollinaris are: Μόναν τὴν εὐσεβῆ πίστιν ἀγαθὸν ἦν νομίζεσθαι, (against those who were constantly appealing only to faith, and repelling all new dogmatic investigations as hostile to faith. Against such he would say, that faith, considered by itself alone, mere believing, was of no value; but everything depended on the examination whether that which was the object of faith, really answered to the essence of Christian piety.) Μηδὲ γὰρ τῇ Εὔᾳ συνενέγκειν τὴν ἀνεξετάστον πίστιν, ὥστε προσήκειν καὶ τὴν τῶν χριστίανων ἐξετασμένην εἶναι, μὴ που λάθῃ, ταῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἢ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συνεμπεσοῦσα δόξαις. Gregor. Nyss. Antirrhetic. adv. Apollinar. § IV. p. 130.

[2] Γεωμετρίκαις ἀποδείξεσι καὶ ἀνάγκαις.

[3] Σοφία φωτιζοῦσα νοῦν ἀνθρώπου, αὐτῇ δὲ καὶ ἐν πάσιν ἀνθρώποις. L. c. 215.

[4] Οὐχ ὁ ἐπουρανίος ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ δοχεῖον. L. c. 255. Ἄνθρωπος ἔνθεος.

[5] Φθόρα τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου ζῶον τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτεξουσίον· οὐ φθείρεται δὲ ἡ φύσις ὑπο τοῦ ποιησάντος αὐτήν. L. c. 245.

them with all the consequences which seemed necessarily to flow from their principles judged from his own point of view, — laid it as a charge against his antagonists, that, like Paul of Samosata and Photinus, they recognized in Christ, not the God-man, but only the divine man;[1] that they made of Christ two persons, two Sons of God, a Son of God in the proper sense, and a Son of God in the improper sense.[2]

The doctrine concerning Christ, as the God-man, Apollinaris held to be the properly characteristic and fundamental doctrine of Christianity. That Christ was a man united with God, and performed miracles in the exercise of a divine power — he supposed — even Jews and Pagans might concede, as the Jews said the same thing in fact of Elijah; but faith in the God-man was that which constituted the Christian.[3]

But how, then, did Apollinaris realize to himself, from his own point of view, the idea of the God-man, which seemed to him so important? Two beings persisting in their completeness, he conceived, could not be united into one whole. Out of the union of the *perfect* human nature with the Deity one person never could proceed;[4] and more particularly, the rational soul of the man could not be assumed into union with the divine Logos so as to form *one* person. This was the negative side of the doctrine of Apollinaris; but, as to its positive side, this was closely connected with his peculiar views of human nature. He supposed, with many others of his time, that human nature consisted of three parts, — the rational soul, which constitutes the essence of man's nature;[5] the animal soul, which is the principle of animal life;[6] and the body, between which and the spirit, that soul is the intermediate principle. The body, by itself considered, has no faculty of desire; but this soul, which is united with it, is the source and fountain of the desires that struggle against reason. This soul Apollinaris believed he found described also by the apostle Paul, in the passage where he speaks of the flesh striving against the spirit.[7] The human, mutable spirit was too weak to subject to itself this resisting soul; hence the domination of the sinful desires. In order therefore to the redemption of mankind from the dominion of sin, it was necessary that an immutable divine Spirit, the Logos himself, should enter into union with these two parts of human nature. It does not pertain to the essence of that lower soul, as it does to the essence of the higher soul, that it should determine itself; but, on the contrary, that it should be determined and ruled by a higher principle: but the human spirit was too weak for this: the end and destination of human nature, therefore, is realized when the

[1] Τὸ ἄνθρωπον ἔνθεον τὸν Χριστὸν ὀνομάζειν, ἐναντίον εἶναι ταῖς ἀποστολικαῖς διδασκαλίαις, ἀλλότριον δὲ τῶν συνόδων, Παῦλον δὲ καὶ Φωτείνον καὶ Μαρκέλλον τῆς τοιαυτῆς διαστρόφης κατάρξαι. 135, l. c. On his own principles he understood the words ἄνθρωπος ἔνθεος and θείος as synonymous; since, according to his theory, a man composed of spirit and body, in whom God dwelt, could be none else than a divine man, specially actuated by the Divine Spirit. It is deserving of notice, also, how wrongly he conceived of the doctrine of his contemporary, Marcellus of Ancyra. See above.

[2] A son φύσει, and a son barely θέσει. See l. c. p. 209, p. 185, 232.

[3] L. c. p. 184.

[4] A maxim of Apollinaris: Εἰ ἀνθρώπῳ τελείῳ συνήφθη θεὸς τέλειος, δύο ἂν ἦσαν υἱός. L. c. 223.

[5] Ψυχὴ λογική, πνεῦμα, νοῦς.

[6] The ψυχὴ ἄλογος.

[7] L. c. p. 138.

Logos, as an immutable divine Spirit, rules over this lower soul, and thus restores the harmony between the lower and the higher principles in man's nature.[1]

In this way, Apollinaris supposed that he avoided all the difficulties which attended the other theory, and that he had demonstrated how the divine and human natures in Christ must be conceived to be united into personal unity. Christ, like every other man, consisted of three parts, of spirit, soul, and body; but with this difference, that, in his case, the place of the weak and mutable human spirit was filled by an immutable divine Spirit: for this reason, therefore, is Christ also the God-man; a name which could not otherwise be ascribed to him. This difference between Christ and other men, Apollinaris believed might also be clearly pointed out in his life. All human development is progressive; it proceeds from conflict and effort, for the very reason that the human spirit is a mutable one, which can only seek to subject the inferior soul to itself by degrees. But we find nothing of this kind in the case of Christ, who from the first ruled the inferior soul by his transcendent, divine Spirit.[2] The union of the divine Logos with a *perfect human nature* takes place only in the case of individual believers, who, by their fellowship with the God-man, are made to partake of his victory over sin, and his dominion over the inferior soul.[3] With this theory, Apollinaris believed he possessed the advantage of being able, without harm to the unaltered properties of all parts of the human nature which the divine Logos assumed into union with himself, to affirm the unity of person, and, as evidence of this, the interchange of attributes.[4] He was fond of certain expressions, entirely at variance with the scriptural phraseology, and which began now for the first time to become current, "God died, God was born."[5] He maintained, that worship was due to the sensuous nature united with the Logos in one person;[6] a thing which, on the other hand, they who attributed to Christ a perfect human nature could not maintain, without adding a fourth essence to the Trinity. He now brought it as a charge against his opponents, that they were obliged to suppose a change in Christ's body, a deification of it contradictory to its own nature, and to represent the true union of the divinity and the humanity as being the result of Christ's resurrection;[7] of which charge the above-described theory of Gregory of Nyssa, and other theologians trained in the school of Origen, especially furnished the occasion. He controverted the theory of the human omnipresence of Christ; teaching that Christ, although

[1] The νοῦς is, by nature, the αὐτοκίνητον, the ψυχὴ ἄλογος, the ἑτεροκίνητον. Οὐκ ἀρα σωζεται τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος δι' ἀναλήψεως νοῦ καὶ ὅλου ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλα διὰ προσλήψεως σαρκὸς, ᾗ φυσικὸν μὲν τό ἡγεμονεύεσθαι, ἐδείτο δὲ ἀτρέπτου νοῦ, μη ὑποπίπτοντος αὐτῇ διὰ ἐπιστημοσύνης ἀσθενείαν, ἀλλὰ συναρμόζοντος αυτὴν ἀβιαστῶς ἑαυτῷ.

[2] The inference of Apollinaris: Οὐδεμία ἀσκήσις ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐκ ἀρὰ νοῦς ἐστιν ἀνθρώπινος. L. c. 221.

[3] Ἐν τῇ ἑτεροκινήτῳ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου νοῦ ἐνεργουμένῃ σάρκι τελείται τὸ ἔργον, ὁ ἐστι λύσις ἁμαρτίας, μεταλάμβανει δὲ τῆς λύσεως ὁ ἐν ἡμὶν αὐτοκίνητος νοῦς, καθ' ὅσον οἰκείοι ἑαυτὸν Χριστῷ. P. 220. In the case of Christ, there was only a πρόσληψις σάρκος, — in that of individual believers, an ἀνάληψις ὅλου ἀνθρώπου.

[4] The ἀντιμεθιστάσις τῶν ὀνομάτων.

[5] See l. c. 264.

[6] L. c. 241.

[7] See l. c. p. 277, 284.

in respect to his body he was in heaven, yet, in respect to his divine essence united with the body, is everywhere with believers.[1]

According to this connection of ideas, it would seem that in the same manner as the older Patripassianists conceived of the whole being of God as constituting the animating soul of the human body in which it dwelt, so also Apollinaris would conceive of the whole being of the divine Logos as constituting the animating soul in the human nature of Jesus. In this case, however, it is difficult to explain how a man of his sagacity could fail to be struck with the great difficulties attending such a supposition. Yet, to judge from a single remark of Apollinaris, it would seem that, in endeavoring to avoid these difficulties and to make the matter clearly conceivable, he touched, without intending it, upon the ideas of Beryll of Bostra and of Sabellius, and fell into that view of the personality of Christ, according to which it was not one commensurate with the whole being of the Logos, but formed from a certain influx or irradiation of the Logos into the human body.[2]

Apollinaris had no intention to separate himself from the catholic church, to set up a particular theory at variance with the old church doctrine, and found a distinct sect; for he was convinced that the essence of the church doctrine was expressed in a consistent manner only in his own theory, and that the scheme which had proceeded from the Origenistic school was self-contradictory. Accordingly he could with honesty subscribe, through his delegates, the articles which were established by the aforesaid synod held at Alexandria, A.D. 362, in opposition to the above-described Arian doctrine concerning Christ's human nature. He directed his name to be subscribed to the articles, by which the hypothesis of a body without soul or spirit (*σῶμα ἄψυχον καὶ ἀνοήτον*) in Christ was condemned; for he also did, in fact, suppose a soul which belonged in connection with the body, and also a spirit

[1] *Ὅτι καὶ ἐν οὐράνῳ ὄντος τοῦ σώματος, μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστι μέχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.* C. 59, p. 286.

[2] It is a remark of Apollinaris, which is to be found in Gregory of Nyssa, c. 29, and which appeared to that father himself somewhat obscure. On the language of Christ, in the gospel of John, "My Father works hitherto, and I work," he observes, that Christ here places his own action on an equality with that of the Father, according to the spirit; but that, according to the flesh, he makes a distinction, (*διαίρων μὲν τὴν ἐνεργείαν κατὰ σάρκα, ἐξίσων δὲ κατὰ πνεύμα.*) Next he goes on to say, that this expression denotes, on the one hand, the equality in respect of power; on the other, the distinction as to the mode of action, in respect of the flesh, by virtue of which, John 5: 21, he did not quicken all, but those whom he willed. (*Ὅπερ ἔχει τὴν ἐν δυνάμει πάλιν ἰσοτήτα καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα τῆς ἐνεργείας διαίρεσιν, καθ' ἣν οὐ πάντας ἐζωοποιήσε, ἄλλα τινὰς, οὓς ἐθελήσεν.*) Yet here Apollinaris plainly fixes a distinction between the unlimited, infinite activity of the Logos, considered by himself, and his limited activity, affected by the existence in the flesh. So far as Christ is conscious of his being one with God, he ascribes to himself the power, like the Father, to impart life to all; so far as his being is conditioned by the *σάρξ*, he is conscious of being able to awaken to life, (which Apollinaris understood without doubt as referring to the resurrection of the body,) only in a limited degree. Thus the Logos does not reveal himself here in a way that corresponds to his divine essence, considered by itself, but in one that corresponds to his form of manifestation conditioned and determined by the *σάρξ*, animated by him with a rational soul. But this point in his system he probably did not make any clearer to himself. Had he made clear to his own consciousness what lay at the bottom of this his theory, he would have been forced to give up a great deal which he felt it to be extremely important to hold fast. The conflicting elements in his system here come into collision.

which directed the soul in Christ. He believed that all this was first presented and established by his own theory in a tenable form, and in a way which corresponded to the idea of the God-man.[1] But when Apollinaris came out more openly with his doctrine, and supposed that he had demonstrated in an irrefragable manner what belonged to the completeness of the conception of the God-man, Athanasius affirmed, in opposition to him, that the true Christ was incapable of being construed by human reason.[2]

The controversy which was carried on against the doctrines of Apollinaris led men to think of the necessary connection between the recognition of a perfect, spiritual, and sensuous human nature, and the doctrine concerning that which constituted a Redeemer and the redemption, in its more exact relations to a systematic body of divinity.

Athanasius, for example, in his work against Apollinaris, alleges, in opposition to his doctrines, substantially the following reasons: "How could Christ represent for us the pattern of the holy life after which we ought to strive, if his nature was not entirely homogeneous with ours? He could not redeem human nature in its completeness, unless he had himself assumed all the parts of which it consists?" He points to those affections and actions of Christ, which could be conceived only as belonging to a human soul; as, for example, his sorrow and mortal agony, his praying, his descent to Hades for the redemption of the spirits in prison.[3] If Apollinaris says that Christ could not assume the human soul free from sin, without subjecting it to a violence destructive of its essential nature, such a theory, Athanasius alleged, whereby sin was supposed to be a necessary thing in human nature, led to Manicheism. According to this, sin would be the nature of man, and freedom from sin stand in contradiction with his nature. But directly the opposite was the case. Freedom from sin was man's *original* nature; it was only by reason of the corruption of that original nature, sin had obtained such dominion over it. Christ elevated it once more to its original freedom. There lay here, at the bottom of the controversy between the two theories, different conceptions with regard to freedom, which somewhat later, amidst the Pelagian disputes, were still more clearly brought out. Apollinaris understood by freedom, the freedom of choice; Athanasius understood by it, freedom to goodness, to moral development undisturbed by anything of a foreign nature. Gregory of Nazianzen

[1] See the explanation of Apollinaris himself, in his letter to the synod at Diocæsarea. Leontius Byzantin. c. fraudes Apollinaristarum, in Canisii lectiones antiquæ, T. f. 608, ed. Basnage.

[2] Ὁ ἀληθινὸς Χριστὸς οὐχ' ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνου λογίσμου διαγραφήσεται. Adv. Apollinaristas, l. I. § 13.

[3] The opinion, however, is assuredly without any foundation, that the opposition to Apollinarianism led to the adoption into the Apostles' Creed of the article respecting the design of Christ's descensus ad inferos; for this must far rather have been made a prominent point long before this, in opposition to the Gnostics, who wholly denied the descensus Christi ad inferos. Apollinaris did not deny this, although his opponents objected to him, that this, as well as many other doctrines belonging to the essence of orthodoxy, could not be reconciled with his theory. We have his own words, in which he holds forth this doctrine; if it be true that it is the same Apollinaris who is cited in the Catena Nicephori, Lips. 1772, T. I. 1475. He considered this descensus as constituting a part of the pain and anguish of Christ's death.

[4] Ep. ad Cledon. and orat. 51.

says, in opposition to Apollinaris: "Christ must, in his character of Redeemer, appear in human nature, not barely because he made use of human nature as a sensible veil, and must bring down the divine element to man's apprehension in this sensible veil; for if so, he might in truth have chosen any other sensible veil as the organ for its manifestation; but he must assume the *human* nature, in order to make make *man* holy; consequently he must assume the whole man, consisting of soul and body."

Moreover, through public synodal articles, the opposition to the doctrine of Apollinaris was expressed by Western councils subsequent to the year 376, and by the second general council of Constantinople. Yet no more new articles of doctrine concerning the divine and human nature in Christ were publicly established in this controversy.

REMARK. — The continuation of the history of the development of this doctrine follows in the next section.

END OF PART FIFTH OF THE ORIGINAL.

CONTINUATION OF THE FOURTH SECTION.

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

From the time of the Apollinarian disputes, the different tendencies already noticed by us as existing at an earlier period, in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ, proceeded to unfold themselves to more decided opposition, according as the doctrine was set forth either in antithesis to the scheme of Apollinaris, or to that of Photinus. This difference of doctrinal tendencies was not grounded merely, however, in a difference of outward and local relations: it had its still deeper ground in an essential difference pervading the whole dogmatic spirit. Those who were predominantly inclined to the side of feeling and religious contemplation, made it their chief concern, in opposition to the Photinian views, — which recognized only a distinction of degree between the Son of God and other enlightened and holy men, — to bring out distinctly the difference of kind between the fact of God's *becoming* man, and a mere influence of God upon a man; and to fix the attention upon the incomprehensible and inexplicable side of the mystery. Those, on the other hand, who were more inclined to seek after clear and well-defined conceptions for the understanding, made it their chief object to distinguish and separate in their conceptions those elements which, in feeling and the mere intuitions of feeling, were apt to be confounded together; and thus, in opposition to Gnostic and Apollinarian modes of apprehension, they were led to insist upon the abiding distinction of the divine and human natures, each retaining its own separate individuality. The first of these tendencies we find more particularly represented in the church and school of Alexandria; the other, in the church and school of Antioch. This difference may in part be accounted for by what we have already said, in the introduction to this section, concerning the general character of these schools.

The Antiochian school could hardly fail to be led, by its prevailing historico-grammatical tendency, to give more importance than others were wont to do, to the human side in the life of Christ. Where an allegorical or otherwise artificial method of interpretation easily contrived means to obscure the plainly manifested human element in the life of Christ, the principles of interpretation adopted by that church naturally produced the contrary effect. While other schools adjusted and interpreted all the appearances brought to view in the gospel narrative, according to a doctrinal conception of Christ already fixed and established, this school, on the other hand, formed its conception of Christ from the gospel history. On determining the sense of those passages where Christ himself speaks of his knowledge as being, in a certain respect, limited, they could not be so easily satisfied with the forced explanations to which others had recourse. The simple con-

templation and exposition of the gospel narrative led men, like Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, to adopt such views of Christ as did not exclude the idea of a process of development in him corresponding to the ordinary course of human nature, and like that, in a certain sense, progressively advancing and making its way through trials and difficulties. This mode of representation, however, either was not, or did not continue to be, in the case of Theodore, a mere isolated notion, taken up for some immediate purpose; but it formed a necessary organic member in the well-concocted whole of his dogmatic system, whose central point was the doctrine concerning Christ. In order to a right understanding of this, it will be necessary here for us to go back and consider certain points pertaining to his doctrine of human nature, which cannot be seen in their proper place and relation without taking into view the latter.

Theodore supposes two portions or states in the entire history of the creation: the rational nature, left, at all stages of its existence, to itself; changeable, and exposed to temptations; — and, on the other hand, the rational nature, raised, by the communication of a divine life pervading and transfiguring it, above the limitation of a finite existence, delivered from all temptations and conflicts, and placed in an unchangeable state of moral purity. The one portion extends to the general resurrection, the other follows after it.[1] Man, who is the representation of God's image for the whole creation, is the medium of transition from the first of these states to the second. This transition could be no otherwise brought about, than by the elevation of the human nature itself to communion with God, and, by means of this, to a life exalted above change and temptation. This was the end of Christ's appearance, by which God's image first became truly realized in human nature; man first raised to that dominion over all nature, for which he was destined at the creation, and made the object of reverence and worship for all created beings.[2] Now, in order to accomplish this, God must take upon him human nature in its peculiar condition of mutability, and, by means of the conflicts and temptations which belong to this state, form it for that higher condition which is the end of all development. Human nature must appear therefore, at first, even in Christ, as a nature subjected to temptations and conflicts; and this presupposes a free-will, in which is implied, though without

[1] Excerpta Marii Mercatoris ed. Garnier. p. 100. Placuit Deo in duos status dividere creaturam; unum quidem, qui præsens est, in quo mutabilia omnia fecit; alterum autem, qui futurus est, cum renovans omnia ad immutabilitatem transferet.

[2] See the fragment of Theodore, in the book written on purpose to refute him, by Johannes Philoponus. It contains his commentary on the history of the creation, in Genesis, l. VI. c. 10. Ὁ θεὸς τὰ τῆς εἰκόνης ἡμῖν διασῶσαι βουλόμενος, ἀνθρωπον ἐξ ἡμῶν ἕνα λάβων, ἀθάνατον τὲ καὶ ἀτρέπτον ποιήσας, εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἑαυτῷ συνάψας, ἵνα μὴ μόνον εἰς ὕψος τυγχάνων, παρὰ πάσης προσκυνῆται τῆς κτίσεως, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ πάντα φοβερός τε καὶ ἀνεπιβουλευτὸς ᾖ τοῖς ἐναντίοις, ἅτε μηδέμιαν παρατροπὴν ἢ ἀλλοίωσιν ὑπομένειν οἱόστε ὤν. According to this theory, he could explain the 8th Psalm, it is true, as relating immediately to human nature in general; but yet maintain that, in its highest meaning, and in the whole extent of its contents, it refers to Christ, as the one in whom all that is said in this Psalm of human nature, became first fully realized. See the fragment of his commentary on the 8th Psalm, in Corderii Catena in Psalmos, f. 166. Comp. Concil. œcum. V. Collat. IV. c. 19.

the presence of sinfulness or of any actual sin, yet the possibility of sinning.[1] Without such a free, self-determining will, a true human nature cannot exist. Conflict by means of free-will appeared, moreover, to Theodore, the necessary condition of all progress in the development of rational creatures. Without this, the bestowment of that higher state of immutability, to which Christ was to attain by the resurrection, and to which through him mankind and the whole world of spirits was also destined to attain, could appear no otherwise than as an act of God's arbitrary will; not, as it is represented in sacred scripture, the merited reward of a victorious conflict.[2] Now in this way Theodore might have been led to the doctrine of a deification of the human nature in Christ, somewhat like the later Socinian view, and consequently excluding the notion of a true being of God in Christ. But he was remote from this, so far at least as he expressed himself with consciousness. He sincerely adopted the doctrine of the church respecting the divine incarnation. He by no means accommodated himself, barely in compliance with prevailing authority, to the expressions of the church, meaning to explain them in a different and alien sense. But he wished to frame to himself, after the analogy of human nature and his contemplation of the life of Christ, a definite conception of that which is to be understood by Christ as God-man in his earthly appearance. The progressive deification of the human nature in Christ up to the time of his ascension to glory, he contemplated as a consequence and effect of the original and hidden union, — the very end for which God had appropriated the human nature even from its birth. But this union, existing from the first and presupposed through the whole life of Christ, by virtue of his constantly victorious conflict, revealed itself in a gradually progressive manner in its effects, as the orderly process of the development of human nature required.[3] By virtue of that union, he developed his human faculties, both moral and intellectual, far more rapidly than other men: hence in his temptations he was not left to himself, but came off victorious by means of this union, although not without the coöperation of his own free-will. In a measure always proportionate to the bent of his own will manifested in the conflict, was revealed through him the divine power of the Logos constantly united with him, thus raising him step by step

[1] Hence Theodore supposed, in the history of the temptation, which he considered as a transaction of the inner sense through the medium of a visionary appearance and communication of the evil spirit, an inward possibility in Christ of being tempted, so that he victoriously withstood the temptation by the power of his will. See the fragment from Theodore's work against the emperor Julian, published by Münter, fragmenta patrum Græcorum, fascic. I. "The end of the temptation, *ἵνα καθαρῶς ἀναμάρτητος δφθῃ, οὐ τῷ μὴ πειρασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ φυλάξασθαι πειρασθεις — ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῶς πειραζόμενος.*

[2] L. c. Concil. V. Collat. IV. Ita et animam Christi utpote humanam et sensus participem (partaking of human feelings and affections) prius accipiens et per resurrectionem in immutabilitatem constituens, sic et nobis eorumdem istorum per resurrectionem præbuit communionem. Post resurrectionem e mortuis et in cœlos ascensum impassibilis factus et immutabilis. Before his resurrection Christ was mutabilis in cogitationibus suis; it was not till after his resurrection he became immutabilis. In this sense he explains 1 Tim.: *ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι*, referring it to the *ἀναμαρτησία* first communicated to him in its strict and proper sense by the Divine Spirit after the resurrection.

[3] Theodore's fundamental principle. Concil. V. Collat. IV. c. 49. Gratia data naturam non immutat.

to continually higher degrees of glory, till he attained to the highest and most perfect degree after his resurrection. Thus Theodore could now apply even to the humanity of Christ, a principle to which he attached the greatest importance; namely, that there is no such thing as unconditional predestination, that this is uniformly conditioned by the foreknowledge of the bent of the human will.[1] God ordained the man Jesus to that supreme dignity which he was to receive in part from the time of his birth, and to enjoy in its *whole extent* after the resurrection, because he foreknew that his will would persevere in its fidelity through every temptation.

Let us illustrate these statements by citing some of the explanations of Theodore himself: "Thus we see him," says he, "before the cross, hungry and athirst; afraid, and of many things ignorant: for out of himself he brought with him the purpose of virtue.[2] Of this, Isaiah testifies, when he says, 'Before the child understands and distinguishes good and evil, he resists the evil to choose the good,' Isaiah 7 : 16.[3] That is, before he came to the age at which other men are usually able to distinguish what ought to be done, he knew how to distinguish good and evil, because he possessed somewhat beyond that which belongs to other men; for if, even among ourselves, we often meet with those who though children in years yet discover great wisdom, in so much as to excite the wonder of those that behold them, much more must the man of whom we speak have surpassed all others at the same period of life."[4] He ascribed, therefore, to our Saviour, at every period of his earthly life, a knowledge transcending the limits of ordinary human knowledge, and, in general, a knowledge far exceeding the capabilities of human nature; but still no participation in the divine omniscience. His theory enabled him to take those passages in which Christ declares himself to be ignorant of the time of the last judgment, in their proper and natural sense; — a view afterwards condemned as heretical under the name of *Agnoëtism*.[5] The words of Luke, that Jesus "grew, and

[1] Even the ancients justly observed the inner connection between the Christology and the anthropology of the Antiochian school, and the affinity grounded on this circumstance between Pelagianism and Nestorianism. Vid. Phot. cod. 54, which is an extract from an ancient writing against Pelagianism and Nestorianism, belonging to the early times of the sixth century, wherein it is said: Οἱ μὲν (the Pelagians) περὶ τῶν μέλων τοῦ Χρίστου ἀποθρασύνονται, (they attribute too much to the man, to the free-will in believers,) οἱ δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ σώματος κεφαλῆς, τοῦ Χρίστου τὴν αὐτὴν διανοίαν καὶ τόλμαν ἔχουσι. On the other side, as, for instance, in the case of Augustin, his opposite views of anthropology stood in connection with his opposite christological notions. Thus he adduced the mode of union between the divinity and humanity in Christ, in proof of the assertion, that the operations of divine grace could not be conditioned on the merit of the human will. Neque enim et ipse ita verbo Dei conjunctus, ut ipsa conjunctione unus Filius Dei et idem ipse unus filius hominis fieret, præcedentibus suæ voluntatis meritis fecit. Augustin. de peccatorum meritis et remissione. L. II. § 27.

[2] He means, on this account Christ had to pass through these conflicts.

[3] Namely, according to the Alexandrian version. Theodore did not hesitate, therefore to recognize this passage as one that relates to the Messiah.

[4] Out of the seventh book of Theodore on the incarnation cited in Leontius of Byzantium. Contra Nestorium et Eutychem, l. III. f. 701, T. IX. bibl. patr. Lugd.

[5] Ante crucem, (i. e. before he came to share, by his exaltation to glory, in the attribute of the divine omniscience,) cum *ignorare* reperimus. Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. 9, f. 701. At the same time, it may seem strange, that, in a fragment of his commentary on the gospel according to John, he

waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him," he explained as meaning that with the progress of time Jesus grew in wisdom, and in corresponding virtue; while both were increased by the favor which he had with God. "In all this, he increased both with God and with men: men saw, indeed, the progress; but God not only saw it, but approved it by his testimony, and coöperated with him in his actions. It is also manifest, that he practised every virtue in a more perfect manner and with greater ease than other men; because, from his very conception, God had united him with himself; ever continued to bestow on him that larger measure of coöperating power which was requisite in order to the great work of salvation; guided all his efforts, exciting him to strive continually after higher perfection, and in many cases relieving and lightening his labors, whether of the body or of the mind."[1]

Regarding the exaltation of Christ, considered as man, to the divine immutability by means of his resurrection and ascension to glory, as a reward of the holy life which he had maintained through every trial, Theodore inferred that it was not in the power of Christ to send the Holy Spirit until after this change had taken place. Hence he explained the symbolical act of our Saviour, and the accompanying words addressed to the disciples after his resurrection, (John 20 : 22,) as being simply a prophetical allusion to the communication of the Holy Spirit, which was not to be actually realized until afterwards.[2] He supposed also, that as the divine majesty of Christ was not revealed until after his exaltation to heaven and the transfiguration of his human nature, so it was not known among men until after the effusion of the Holy Spirit. Here was another point in which he did not allow himself to be fettered by the common doctrinal and exegetical tradition.

Neither Nathaniel, Peter, nor the Marthas, did by their confessions of Christ, in which they called him the Son of the living God, intimate that they believed in his divinity: this would indeed have been very remote from that common notion of the Messiah entertained by the Jews, which was their point of departure.[3] It was enough for them, at the outset, to recognize in his appearance something which vastly transcended what appeared in other men. But, after his resurrection, they were, by the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, guided to a perfect knowledge; so that they recognized what it was that distinguished him above all other men; — what belonged to him, not as in

should say, speaking of the inquiry which Christ made after the grave of Lazarus: — "Our Saviour did not ask this question because he did not know; for how could it be thus when he had already announced the fact that Lazarus was dead?" Vid. Corderii Catena in Joannem, f. 288. Either this fragment did not come from Theodore, (who in the Catena is sometimes confounded with other writers,) or else we must presume it to have been his meaning, that in *this particular case* there was no sufficient reason for supposing Christ to have been really ignorant of the fact respecting which he inquired, inasmuch as the question might be very well explained, as having been proposed simply with a view of leading to the further development of his intentions with regard to Lazarus.

[1] L. c. 701.

[2] Concil. V. Collat. IV. c. 14.

[3] The testimony of Theodore is important here also, as coming from one who was at home in those countries: Judæi et Samaritæ talia sperantes plurimum, quantum Dei verbi a scientia longe erant.

the case of others, by dignity conferred from without; but by a peculiar right, and by virtue of his union with the divine Logos, through which union he came to participate, after his ascension to heaven, in all equal honor with the latter."[1] Accordingly he explained the exclamation of Thomas, "My Lord, and my God!"—as an utterance of surprise; since the resurrection of Christ could be no certain evidence of his divinity.[2]

The controversies with the Apollinarians, against whom this school in Syria had often to contend, led him to unfold this part of his theory still further. Apollinaris, starting with the position that Christ must be regarded as perfectly holy from the beginning, that it would be presumption to ascribe to him a progressive development by means of conflict and trial, inferred that, instead of the changeable human spirit, we must necessarily suppose him to have been possessed of only an unchangeable divine spirit. On the other hand, Theodore disputed the position itself, from which the conclusion of Apollinaris was drawn. He maintained that it was impossible not to recognize in Christ a progressive development by means of conflict and trial, without pronouncing the evangelical record a fable; and that all this was moreover necessarily required, in order to complete the work of redemption. But all this seemed to him perfectly inconceivable without the supposition of a human soul in Christ. "How could Christ," says he, "have experienced fear in the passion, if Deity took the place in him of the sensitive human soul? What need had he, in the approaching anguish, of that fervent prayer which he addressed to God with a loud voice and many tears? How came he to be so overwhelmed with fear, that his sweat was as great drops falling down to the ground?" He referred to the appearance of the angel, whom Christ needed to strengthen and comfort him. The angel, he observes, admonished him to endure with constancy, to overcome the weakness of human nature, and pointed out to him the benefits to be gained by his sufferings, and the glory which was to follow.[3] He affirmed, in opposition to Apollinaris, that Christ, being free from sensual desires, had to maintain the conflict rather with emotions rising up in his soul, than with the desires and pains of the body[4]—which, according to Theodore's views, did by no means necessarily imply the existence of a sinful (peccable) nature in Christ, but only the mutability and capability of being tempted inseparable from the essence of the human soul in its present condition. It was indeed particularly the soul which needed to be healed. From the fact that Christ achieved and maintained the victory over avarice and ambition, the body as such (whose desires, according to Apollinaris, needed to

[1] L. c. 25.

[2] C. 15, and the explanation of Matth. 8, touching the cure of the centurion, which shows his exegetical freedom, where he says of him: Neque enim tanquam Dei Filium, et ante omnem creaturam subsistentem, et omnium, quæ sunt, opificem, adierat centurio. Hæc enim neque discipulorum erat tunc scire ante crucem; sed tanquam hominem per virtutem adeptum majorem quam est hominis potestatem. See Facund. Hermian. l. III. c. IV.

[3] Extracts from his work against the Apollinarists. Concil. V. Collat. IV. c. IV.

[4] Plus inquietabatur dominus et certamen habebat ad animæ passiones, quam corporis. L. c. 27.

be subdued by the power of the Holy Spirit) gained absolutely nothing; since by such desires in fact the body cannot be subdued. But if it were not the soul, but only the Deity, which gained this victory, no advantage could have accrued from all this to us, and the conflict of our Lord would have been a mere empty show.[1] The words of Christ to Peter, Matt. 16 : 23, seemed necessarily to presuppose it as possible, that those words of Peter could have produced some effect on his mind. It is, says he, as if Christ had said to Peter: I shall suffer death with better courage, for the sake of the many benefits to which I and, through me, all shall attain. Pain and disturb not my mind, by exhorting me to shun death as an ignominious thing.[2] "What need," says he, "had the divinity of the only-begotten Son, of the anointing by the Holy Ghost, or the power of the Spirit, in order to work miracles? What need had he of the Spirit, in order to learn, in order to appear without spot or blemish?[3] When it is said, that he was led of the Spirit into the wilderness, this surely presupposes in general, that he was guided, ruled, instructed, strengthened in his thoughts by the Spirit. But if, instead of the soul, the *Deity* only dwelt within him, the strength of that was sufficient for everything, and the aid of the Holy Spirit would have been superfluous."[4]

Apollinaris, again, went on the principle, that it was absolutely inadmissible to compare the essential indwelling of God in Christ with the mode of the relation in which God stood, in other cases, to enlightened and holy men. He called that peculiar mode of the being of God in Christ, a substantial, essential indwelling (*κατ' οὐσίαν, οὐσιῶδες.*) Theodore, on the contrary, endeavored to illustrate the peculiar mode in which Christ was united with God, by comparing it with the manner in which God, in general, was nearer to *certain* reasonable beings than to other creatures; and here he adopted the fundamental points of a theory already unfolded by Diodore of Tarsus.[5] In his work on the incarnation of God, which was directed, as it seems, particularly against the Apollinarian doctrines, he inquired as to what formulas were best suited to designate that which was of the like kind in this relation of God to certain rational beings, and at the same time to exclude in the most certain manner all false, anthropopathic notions. "Are we to speak of an indwelling of God in his essential nature? But, in his essential nature, God can nowhere be either included or excluded: as the omnipresent Being, he stands in the like relation to all. Or shall we suppose the indwelling presence of God to be a presence, not in his essence, but in his energy, (not *κατ' οὐσίαν*, but *κατ' ἐνεργείαν*)? But in case we maintained that God dwells after a special manner in certain beings by his energy, we could not, at the same time, maintain that his providence and government, his preserving and directing agency, extends over all; which, however, we must necessarily affirm if we

[1] L. c. 27. Et videntur domini certamina ostentationis cujusdam gratia fuisse.
[2] L. c. V.
[3] Allusion to Hebrews 9 : 14. So too he explained 1 Timothy 3 : 16.
[4] Collat. IV. c. VI. VII. XIII.
[5] See the fragments of Diodorus in the work of Leontius of Byzantium, l. c. f. 700.

acknowledge God to be the Preserver and Governor of all. We must accordingly find some such formula as is suited, in general, to designate the peculiar relation of moral fellowship and communion in which God stands with those rational beings who are fitted for it by the temper of their minds, in contradistinction from others who by their sins exclude themselves from such communion. And that formula is as follows: — God is peculiarly near to such by virtue of his complacency in them; by virtue of his disposition towards them; by virtue of the direction of his will; by his favor, inasmuch as he has adopted them as his children."[1] Theodore compared also Christ's *baptism* with the baptism of believers, as that which was prefigured by his own; affirming that, from this moment, the effects of that special union with God became manifest in him; but with this difference, that to him was imparted the entire fulness of the Divine Spirit, while believers received *through him* only partial influences of the same Spirit.[2] Here, as in many other places, Theodore seems to assert, that to the Saviour, something new, which had not been in him before, was imparted to him from without; a view, however, which is at variance with the opinion he elsewhere expressed respecting an original union of the divine Logos with the man Jesus; unless perhaps he meant to say, that this communication of the fulness of the divine Spirit, seeming to come to him from without, was but an effect resulting from his hidden union with the divine Logos.

Although Theodore after this manner compared the being of God in Christ with the being of God in sanctified and enlightened men, yet it was by no means his purpose to establish here a *perfect sameness of kind* in all respects, but only to place in a prominent light the sameness of kind in a certain respect; in so far as the relation of God to rational beings standing in spiritual communion with him, must and should be distinguished from the relation of God to the rest of creation. He affirmed, at the same time, that along with this generic identity there still existed, in the same identical relation in this one respect, a great specific diversity. And here regard should be had to the *different modes and ways* in which God stands related to good men generally, to prophets, to apostles, and last of all to the Son.[3] These accessory distinctions served to designate the different ways in which God dwells within whatever is generically like him. "Never," says Theodore, "shall we have the folly to assert, that the mode in which God dwells in Christ is no other than that in which he dwells in prophets or apostles." After these distinctions, the expression Son of God, in the sense of Theodore, would denote "such a not merely partial but complete

[1] Κατ' εὐδοκίαν, in allusion to the divine voice at the baptism of Christ, Luke 3 : 22. Κατὰ διαθέσιν, κατὰ θελήσιν, κατὰ χάριν, καθ' υἱοθεσίαν, l. c. f. 700, which in the Latin is in general translated adoptio. Hence the controversy, at a later period, about adoptionism. He moreover referred to the mode in which elsewhere the names God and the Son of God are used metonymically. Adoptio in baptismo secundum comparationem judaicæ adoptionis, where he referred to Is. I. 2, ψ. 82, 6.

[2] See l. c. fol. 701, col. 1.

[3] Where, namely, this expression, "Son of God," was taken in the highest sense; for Theodore in this respect also did admit that there might be a different application of the term, where nothing more was to be denoted by it than simply the union with God generally. See the preceding note.

union between the being who is by his nature and his essence the Son of God, namely, the Logos, and a man, as that, by virtue of this union, the latter would be made to share in all the honor, glory, and dominion belonging to himself."[1]

Again, whilst Apollinaris affirmed that two beings, both abiding in their own complete and individual natures, could never be so united as to constitute one,— one person ; it was the great purpose of Theodore to show in what way we are to conceive, that deity and humanity, while abiding each in its own peculiar essence in Christ, were still bound together by a certain relation in one personal fellowship and unity. Jesus, as the instrument employed by the deity for the purpose of extending abroad his saving influences to all men who are fitted to receive them, was the temple in which God dwelt, and in so far a divinely human person. If we look at the distinction of the deity and the humanity — said he — there we must distinguish from each other two natures, abiding without disturbance, each in its own purity and completeness, — and accordingly, since both the conceptions are strictly connected, two persons (ὑποστάσεις, προσώπα.) But if we look at their union in the abovementioned relation, we must speak of Christ as a person, in whom, as one, the human nature has been taken up into fellowship with the divine.[2] This he illustrates by comparing it with the case in which man and wife are, in a *certain* relation, called one body, Ephes. 5. Thus, Theodore contradicted what constituted the prevailing doctrine, not only in the Alexandrian church, but also in other churches.[3] It may be said, indeed, that the church phraseology relating to the distinction between the terms ὑπόστασις, προσώπον, and φύσις, was not as yet duly settled ; but the reason why Theodore deemed it necessary to suppose that, in a certain respect, two hypostases were united in Christ, lay still deeper than in this unsettled character of the church phraseology: it was connected with the whole peculiarity of his mode of apprehension.

As we already remarked in describing the doctrine of Apollinaris, the latter employed the interchangeableness of the predicates belonging to the two natures (the ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων) as a character to define the unity of the God-man. But Theodore contended against this unconditional transfer itself, as bringing along with it a perfect entanglement and confusion of conceptions.[4] He was himself also for allowing, indeed, of a certain transfer of predicates, to mark the union of the deity and humanity in Christ ; but this only when the different relation of the same predicate was expressly defined, according as they were employed to denote either the being who, in his essence, is the Son of God, or the man who, through the divine favor, was exalted to Sonship with God by being taken into union with the essential Son of God. Accordingly he said, the virgin Mary might, in different senses, be

[1] L. c. 700, col. 2.

[2] L. c. Concil. V. Collat. IV. 29. Quando naturas discernimus, perfectam naturam Dei verbi dicimus et perfectam personam, nec enim sine persona est subsistantiam dicere perfectam, perfectam autem et hominis naturam et personam similiter.

[3] As the Cappadocian church-teachers had declared in the Apollinarian controversy, that, in respect to the difference of the deity and humanity in Christ, we may say indeed, ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο, but not ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος.

[4] Concil. V. l. c. 8.

called θεότοκος and ἀνθρωπότοκος; — the latter, in accordance with the nature of the fact,—the former, in view of a certain relation, and in so far as God dwelt, after the manner described, in the man who was born of her.[1]

The opposite tendency as to the mode of apprehending and developing this doctrine, we find in the Alexandrian church. Owing to the mystical contemplative bent which predominated in that church, the chief endeavor there was, to set prominently forth the mystery, the incomprehensible, transcendent, and inexplicable fact of the union of the deity and humanity, by the very forms of phraseology chosen to express this doctrine; and to oppose every attempt at explanation. The ἕνωσις τῶν φυσέων ἄφραστος, ἀπερινοήτος, ἀῤῥήτος, and ὑπὲρ λόγον — "the ineffable, incomprehensible, transcendent union of natures,"— such was the *watch-word* of the Alexandrian church doctrine. Since the church-teachers of this tendency, of whom we may regard the bishop Cyrill of Alexandria as the representative, sought by their doctrinal formulas to give particular prominence to the mystery of the appearance and existence of *one Christ* in the united deity and humanity, they were very ready to transfer the human predicates to the divine essence, and the divine to the human. They were fond of such paradoxical expressions as "God has suffered for us; — Mary is the Mother of God, (ἡ θεότοκος;) Mary bore in the body the Word which was made flesh." Because they used such expressions, however, they ought by no means to be charged with holding notions whereby the divine and human natures were confounded, and transformed into each other. They guarded expressly against being so misunderstood, by always holding distinctly apart the divine and the human predicates (τὰ ἀνθρώπινα and τὰ θεοπρέπη;) also by acknowledging the independence of both in their union, and by explaining, that the predicates of both kinds were to be attributed to the one Word who became man, but in different senses; — the one, with reference to his deity; the other, with reference to the humanity which he assumed. Only we ought no longer to distinguish, in the actual case, two natures, to which these different attributes belonged; but ascribe both classes of attributes alike, though not in the same sense, to one and the same Logos who became man. One and the same Son of God miraculously consists of two natures mysteriously united.[2] Since, moreover, the Egyptian theologians, strangers as they were to all intentional Docetism, received all the phenomena which they found presented in the gospel history into their conception of Christ; since, accordingly, they referred to him the expressions of anguish at the approach of death, and also his asseverations of ignorance with respect to many things, regarding these as the marks of humanity, they could agree, on this side, in individual results, with the other party; but the difference between the two dogmatic tendencies manifested itself in their peculiar way of explaining these facts.

The Egyptian scheme of doctrine placed in this the incomprehensible

[1] Leontius, l. c. 703, col. I.

[2] Εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς υἱος ἐκ δυοῖν πραγμάτων εἰς ἓν τὶ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀπορῥήτως ἐκπεφηνώς.

mystery, — that divine omniscience and human ignorance; human suffering, human sensibility, and divine exemption from suffering; and, in general, divine and human attributes coëxisted in one and the same Christ. The suprarational, supernatural side (*ὑπὲρ λόγον, ὑπὲρ φύσιν*) was precisely the one which they were for chiefly insisting upon. The Antiochian theologians, on the other hand, presumed indeed in no wise to derive and explain the existence and appearance of Christ from the ordinary course of the development of human nature. They acknowledged here, in common with the Alexandrians, such a communication of God as could only be an object of faith; but yet they did not confine themselves within the same narrow limits which the latter had set up, in their endeavors to bring these phenomena under distinct and definite conceptions of the understanding. Comparing the life of Christ, as it appeared in its manifestation, with the course of development of human nature generally, and with the great end of Christ's appearance on earth, they sought to point out what was in harmony with nature in the revelation of the supernatural; to trace, in connection with the *ὑπὲρ λόγον*, also the *κατὰ λόγον*. Along with this difference went another; namely, that the Antiochian theologians endeavored to find something analogous to the union of God with man in Christ, in the relation of God to rational beings generally; to find a point of comparison between the being of God in Christ, and the being of God in believers; while, on the other hand, the Alexandrian theologians endeavored to give distinctness and prominence to those points alone in which the union of God and humanity in Christ differed entirely from every other kind of union into which God enters with man, and looked upon all those comparisons and analogies as tantamount to a denial of the divine dignity of the Redeemer; as tending to obscure, or even totally to subvert, the doctrine of the God-man. He who affirmed that God used the man Jesus as an instrument, that He dwelt in him as in a temple, seemed to them to acknowledge no other being of God in Christ, than might be affirmed in the case of all enlightened and sanctified men, — such, for example, as Moses and the prophets; — and so also, he who spoke of a *συναφεία κατὰ χάριν, κατ' εὐδοκίαν*, etc. They did not consider, that these several expressions might be used in a quite different sense from their own; and so they really were used by the theologians of the other party. The Alexandrians, it is true, had in their favor, so far as it concerned the last-mentioned formula, the prevailing doctrinal terminology. The peculiar doctrinal terminology of the Antiochian school was in this case closely connected, however, with the whole of their system, — particularly with its peculiar doctrine of man; but for this very reason they could, in fairness and justice, be judged only by reference to their own connection of ideas, and the relation of their doctrinal language to their doctrinal conceptions. So that theory of a *συναφεία κατὰ χάριν*, or *κατ' εὐδοκίαν, κατ' ἀνθεντίαν, κατ' ἀξίαν* — all which expressions, taken in their own (the Alexandrians') sense, could denote nothing else than a certain spiritual, moral fellowship, at highest a deification of human nature, — to this theory the Alexandrians had nothing to oppose, but the assertion of a *ἕνωσις φυσίκη, κατ' οὐσίαν, οὐσιώδης*,

as they would recognize in the *Christ* who appeared, only the one nature of the incarnate Word, or the one incarnate nature of the Word, (*μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκώμενου*, or *μία φύσις — σεσαρκώμενη*.) But the Antiochians, who likewise proceeded only on the groundwork of *their own* connection of ideas and their own dogmatic terminology, could under these latter definitions conceive of nothing else than a confusion and transformation of the two natures, resulting in a third.

It is manifest, then, from what has been said, how easily the two positions might be held in direct opposition to each other; — how easily those at the one might see dangerous heresies in the assertions which proceeded from those at the other. Had men traced back to its deepest ground the difference at bottom, in the relation of the two dogmatic tendencies to each other, they would have come to perceive and to make themselves conscious, that there existed here a radical difference in the mode of apprehending the relation between the natural and the divine — the relation between reason and revelation; as, in fact, appears evident in the relation of the *ὑπὲρ λόγον* to the *κατὰ λόγον*. But to such clearness of insight, the consciousness of dogmatic oppositions did not, in this period, easily unfold itself. Men were rather disposed to remain fast by the accidental expression or utterance of oppositions in their outward form of manifestation, just where they laid strongest hold on the church interest, without seeking to make themselves clearly conscious of the under-lying root of the antagonism. Besides this, the contest here between the two opposite types of doctrine sprung out of the use of a single term, to which, just then, the church interest attached peculiar importance; and, owing to the manner in which the controversy arose, it so happened that the dogmatic development was from the outset disturbed by the intrusion of profane, personal feelings; and the evolution of the great points of opposition which lay at the root of the disputes on particular questions, was hindered by the confounding of matters belonging to Christian life, with those belonging to the development of dogmatic conceptions, as well as by the interference of outward secular power.

The circumstances which led to the outbreak of the controversy, were as follows: Nestorius, a presbyter of the church at Antioch, esteemed and celebrated on account of the rigid austerity of his life and the impressive fervor of his preaching, had, in the year 428, been made patriarch of Constantinople. Educated in the convent, he had brought with him the virtues and the faults usually connected with Monasticism. With an honest and pious zeal he failed to unite prudence and moderation: his zeal was readily alloyed with passion: he was apt to see dangerous heresies in anything remote from the dogmatic phraseology to which he was accustomed. He did not always know how to unite the spirit of love and forbearance with zeal for the truth of which he was assured. As it was often the case with those who left the discipline of the cloister to act a part on the great stage of public life, that, by the constraint and awkwardness of their movements, they gave frequent occasion of offence; so it happened with Nestorius, when suddenly transferred from a quiet scene of activity into the most per-

plexing relations, near a corrupt court, where every species of intrigue and passion was busily at work, and into the midst of a clergy who were governed, many of them, rather by worldly than spiritual motives. Here he became an object of jealousy to many foreign ecclesiastics who were residing near the court, and who had aspired after the patriarchal dignity, as well as to the patriarch of Alexandria, who would fain be the primate of the Oriental church. Amidst such relations, Nestorius, in order to sustain himself, and to exert a healthful influence, needed to unite to firmness of character, Christian prudence, moderation, and wisdom; but in *these* very virtues, he was lamentably deficient.

He wished to make the first trial of his patriarchal power in suppressing the various descriptions of heretics, who, in spite of all the laws against them, had continued to spread in the capital of the East, and in its subordinate dioceses.[1] Spiritual pride, no less than a blind persecuting zeal, spoke forth in those words of his inaugural discourse addressed to the emperor: "Give me a country purged of all heretics, and, in exchange for it, I will give you heaven. Help me to subdue the heretics, and I will help you to conquer the Persians." There was no lack, indeed, of those who were delighted with this zeal of their new patriarch for the purity of the faith; but neither were there wanting men of more prudent views, to whom a beginning of this sort augured unfavorably. Correspondent to this beginning, was the direction which the active labors of the new patriarch first took, when, without any discrimination of essentials or nonessentials in doctrinal disputes, he proceeded to persecute, with like zeal, Arians, Novatians, and Quartodecimanians. Much violent excitement of feeling, ending in the effusion of blood, was thus occasioned by him. But it was not long before his polemic zeal brought down the charge of heresy upon himself.

Nestorius, if he was not himself a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, yet belonged, as his doctrine concerning the person of Christ evinces, among the disciples of the Antiochian doctrine; and, being devoted to this, he might be very quick to discern important heresies in everything that conflicted with the leading conceptions of his own scheme. On this side, he could not fail to be frequently scandalized under the new circumstances in which he was placed; for here he encountered many phrases in the prevailing language of the church which seemed altogether repugnant to the Antiochian system of doctrine. To this class belonged particularly the title Θεότοκος as applied to the virgin Mary; a title to which the prevailing veneration of Mary attached peculiar importance; and this excessive veneration of Mary itself, which such a title served to encourage, might also contribute, with other causes, to make its use appear dangerous to Nestorius, who had received, in the Antiochian school, a purer direction of the Christian spirit.[2]

[1] The church-historian, Socrates, who must be our principal authority in depicting the character of Nestorius, and who is the least prejudiced of any who have described him, might indeed be led astray in his judgment of him, through partiality for the Novatians, whom Nestorius persecuted; but, on the other hand, he appears free, in his judgments, from the fanaticism of his times; as is evident in those remarks which tend to the disparagement of Nestorius.

[2] Socrates is, in one respect, more just towards Nestorius than the great body of his contemporaries, and the dominant party

As it was not customary in those times to separate what belonged to scholastic divinity from the topics more appropriate to the sermon, it was natural that Nestorius, whose rhetorical manner, modelled after the Antiochian taste, was peculiarly grateful to many of the Constantinopolitans, and whose sermons were received with loud exclamations of applause and clapping of hands,[1] should soon feel impelled to introduce into them a doctrinal theme which appeared to him so important. It may perhaps, however, be ascribed to his prudence, that he did not at once enter the lists against a term which stood in such high veneration; but contented himself to teach in general the doctrine concerning the union of the two natures in Christ, according to the system of Theodore of Mopsuestia.[2] When Nestorius expounded the Antiochian system of doctrine in his discourses, others of less considerate zeal, who were attached to his person, might feel themselves called upon to commence the attack upon the name θεότοκος now commonly applied to the virgin Mary. His presbyter Anastasius, who had come with him from Antioch, and enjoyed his particular confidence, was, on a certain occasion,[3] prompted to exclaim in one of his discourses: "Let no man call Mary the mother of God; for she was human, and God cannot be born of man."[4] This onset, though it sprang out of a well-meant pious zeal,

in the church, during several of the following centuries, in that he defends him against the charge of Photinianism and of Samosatenianism. But in another respect he does him injustice, adopting the false view of these controversies which came to be entertained at a later period, after Nestorius had been factiously stigmatized as a heretic, and charging him with having fostered the controversy about a mere word, from want of accurate knowledge of the language and literature of the ancient church, from obstinacy and from vanity. He was afraid of the word θεότοκος as of a ghost, (ὡς τὰ μορμολυκία.) From the remarks already made respecting the general dogmatic antagonism out of which this controversy arose, it is evident, that although the dispute here was about a word, yet it was by no means a mere verbal dispute; but a far deeper and more general opposition of views was the real source of the controversy. If it had so happened, however, that this particular term had not been drawn into the dispute, the controversy doubtless would not have proved at once so violent and acrimonious.

[1] As appears evident from various allusions in his sermons. See e. g. Sermo II. in the works of Marius Mercator, T. II. near the beginning.

[2] That this preceded the public outbreak of the controversy, is apparent from what Nestorius himself says, in a sermon delivered after the controversy had begun: Μεμνήσθε δέ που πάντος καὶ τὰ πολλακίς μοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰρημένα, τὰς δίπλας πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην Χρίστον διακρίνοντι φύσεις. L. c. p. 9, init. The Quartodecimanians in Asia Minor, who were induced, by his influence, to join themselves to the catholic church, were persuaded by him also to subscribe the creed which he had brought with him from the Antiochian church, which Theodore of Mopsuestia had drawn up for the use of catechumens and converted heretics, and in which his peculiar system of doctrines was clearly unfolded. See Concil. Ephes. act. VI. f. 1515, T. I. Harduin.

[3] Socrat. 7, 32.

[4] It is nothing strange, that the reports differ as to the immediate occasion of the disputes. Various circumstances, following one after the other, may have coöperated to kindle the flame; and then the question comes up, which was the first. The report of Socrates seems on the whole to present the order of events in their most natural connection. According to the account of Theophanes, in his Chronography, Nestorius himself first brought on the dispute, by a sermon composed by himself, (the same which Socrates ascribes to Anastasius,) which he placed in the hands of his *Syncel*, (episcopal secretary,) directing him to read it in the church. This secretary, according to Theophanes, was not Anastasius. Supposing the fact to have been so, we may conclude that this sermon was the first in the series of those which have been preserved by Marius Mercator; for in this discourse something resembling the expressions quoted in the text is unquestionably to be found. But still this amounts to no proof; for, in sermons which continually refer to this subject, many things would

was still extremely ill-timed and unwise. The term which he attacked had on its side the authority of ancient use, not only in the Egyptian church, but also in other respectable churches: many eminent church-teachers had already employed it, without associating with its use the errors aimed at by Anastasius. But by the way in which he attacked it, he would necessarily expose himself, according to the then prevailing method of doctrinal strife, to the reproach of having denied the true deity of Christ, of having taught that Jesus was born of Mary as a mere man, and then, in some after period, visited — like other prophets and divine messengers, whom he differed from only in degree — with the influences of the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, it is said, that a bishop of Marcianopolis in Mœsia,[1] who was just then on a visit to Constantinople, publicly exclaimed in the church, either while addressing an assembly of bishops in the sacrarium, or more probably in a sermon: "Let him be accursed who calls Mary the mother of God." But Cyrill wrongly infers, because Nestorius did not contradict this declaration, and because he afterwards admitted this bishop to the communion, that he approved of what he had said. Nestorius might certainly acknowledge the bishop as an orthodox man, and respect his zeal for pure doctrine, though he may not have approved the way in which he chose to express it.

After this public declaration, the question whether Mary ought to be called the mother of God was much agitated, not only among the clergy at Constantinople, but among the laity, who were so addicted to doctrinal discussions;[2] and the disputes were carried on with heat and violence on both sides. Nestorius thought it his duty to take an active part in these disputes, and to defend the cause of his friend, who was stigmatized as a heretic. He often brought up this subject in his sermons. In the first of these, he began with setting forth the evidences of a providence consulting for the wants of mankind in the kingdom of nature, which evidences he drew from the marks of benevolent adaptation; but with a very superficial conception of the principle, the whole being referred merely to the gratification of sensuous wants. Then, by a quite disproportionate leap, he proceeded next to consider the greatest gift which God has bestowed on mankind, in the appearance of Christ, whose end was to restore the fallen image of God. The restoration of mankind was to be brought about by the instrumentality of a man, in proof of which he adduced 1 Corinth. 15 : 12. On this last proposition he evidently intended to lay great stress, with a view to the immediate application of it against those who were unwilling to call Mary the mother of a man, but who insisted that she was the mother of God.

naturally be repeated. Socrates is here certainly a more important authority than Theophanes, who wrote four centuries later.

[1] Cyrill of Alexandria, the fierce antagonist of Nestorius, and whose testimony therefore cannot be wholly relied on, reports this in several public declarations; e. g. ep. 6. But the truth of this assertion is contradicted on no side; and what Cyrill relates may well be supposed to have taken place through the blind zeal of a bishop of this party.

[2] According to the narrative of Theophanes, it was an advocate (σχολάστικος) of Constantinople, who first came out publicly in the church, against a sermon in which the epithet θεότοκος was attacked.

Unjustly charging such with his own inferences from their doctrine, he put them in the same class with Pagans, who gave mothers to their gods. Him who was born of Mary he, on the other hand, calls the instrument of the Deity, the temple prepared through Mary by the Holy Spirit, in which the divine Logos dwelt. Everywhere in these discourses, he adheres strictly to the formulas of the Antiochian school. He teaches that there were two natures, deity and humanity, united together after the most intimate manner; but from the first, in connection with the duality of natures, there was but one dignity;[1] — the human nature being, in this respect, exalted, by virtue of that intimate union, to a participation in the dignity of the divine. Hence *one* Christ, one Son of God, inasmuch as the humanity had been taken up into union with the one eternal Son of God. He spoke, as we might anticipate from the above remarks, with great heat and injustice against the antagonists of the Antiochian scheme of doctrine, whom he called sophistical dogmatists of the new school.[2] He places the doctrine of a most intimate union between humanity and deity over against the doctrine of a deification of human nature, of which he accuses his opponents.[3]

This controversy excited so much interest even among the laity, that, on a certain occasion, when Nestorius was inveighing against the doctrine which represented Mary as the mother of God, and contrasting the eternal generation of the Logos with the temporal nativity of *the man* whom the Logos assumed as his instrument, an individual of rank, no longer able to restrain himself, cried out "No; the eternal Logos himself condescended also to the second birth." Immediately a violent commotion arose among the assembled multitude, one party taking the side of the patriarch; the other, that of his opponent.[4] Nestorius did not allow himself to be embarrassed by this incident. He once more resumed his discourse, praised the zeal of his friends, and, having refuted the sudden opponent whom he called a poor miserable trifler,[5] proceeded on with the discussion after his usual manner.

Already had Nestorius incurred, in the opinion of many, the charge of Photinianism,[6] when a man who, on account of his personal relations, might well be suspected of being governed by unholy passions and motives, took advantage of the popular feeling now rising against the patriarch, and labored to excite it still more; — coming out publicly, though without naming him, as his opponent, and in a way which was well suited to produce in the minds of many an unfavorable impression against Nestorius. This person was Proclus, who had been offered as a bishop to the church at Cyzicus, but had not been received as such. He had ever since resided in the Eastern capital, and, at an earlier period, sought to obtain the vacant patriarchate at

[1] Ἀξία, αὐθεντία μοναδίκη.

[2] Τοὺς σοφοὺς τῶν δογματίστων τῶν νεωτέρων.

[3] Ἄκρα συναφεία, οὐκ ἀποθέωσις.

[4] Opp. Marii Mercator. T. II. f. 13.

[5] Τῆς τοῦ δειλαίου μιαρίας ὁ ἐλέγχος.

[6] He had heard of this accusation, but considered it unworthy of refutation, because they could not touch his doctrine in that way. Ego autem quibusdam mihi et illud renuntiantibus, cum lætitia sæpius risi, quoniam, inquiunt, episcopus, quæ Photini sunt, sapit.

Constantinople, with some hopes of success. On the Christmas festival of the year 429, or on the festival of the Annunciation (ἡμερα εὐαγγελισμου) on the 25th of March,[1] he preached a discourse, full of rhetorical display and exaggeration, in which, extolling the virgin Mary as the mother of the incarnate Logos, he attacked those who refused to acknowledge her as such, without calling their names, and noticed in particular the objections which had been offered by Nestorius in the first sermon above mentioned. As, by his hints and allusions, he gave it to be understood that his opponents believed only in a deified man, instead of believing in a humanized Logos; as he held them up to view as enemies to the honor of Mary; all this could not fail with many to operate very unfavorably for the party of Nestorius. The tinkling chime of high-wrought phrases, and the cause which he defended, the honor of Mary, procured for the sermon — though, from the peculiar character of the style, it must have been unintelligible to many — immense approbation, as was testified by the loud applause with which, according to the usual practice, it was received. All this having transpired in the presence of Nestorius, and himself understanding full well all the allusions in the discourse, he felt himself called upon to defend his doctrine against these reproaches; and hence on the spot he addressed a short discourse to the church, such as the moment suggested to him, and in which therefore the good temper he showed, in refraining from all personal attack on his opponent, deserves to be more particularly remarked. He began with great prudence, declaring that it was perfectly natural that they should receive with so great approbation what had been said to the honor of Mary; "but," he added, "we must take heed, lest, in doing honor above measure to the virgin Mary, we run the hazard of detracting from the dignity of the divine Logos." With allusion to the swollen language of Proclus, so ill suited to the understanding of the people, he said he would endeavor to speak with plainness, so as to be understood by all. He concluded by exhorting them not to express their approbation at once by clapping, not to suffer themselves to be carried away by the charm of oratory, but to examine with care into the doctrine, and refrain from condemning what was true, merely because it was new to them. Immediately after this, he preached several discourses, in which he expounded the questions still further with special reference to the objections of Proclus. He was aware how much foresight he needed to use, so as to give no offence where there was such an enthusiastic veneration of Mary. He was ready to respect this feeling, yet without yielding anything from the truth. He declared that, in case any of

[1] All that Proclus says, in this homily, is unquestionably suited to the second festival, concerning the celebration of which in this church during the present period, we have, however, no other account besides this. As elsewhere, in the homilies of the Greek fathers, many things connected with the nativity and childhood of Christ are taken together, so this discourse might be understood also as having reference to the *Christmas* festival; and possibly Proclus, for the express purpose of doing honor to Mary, may have converted this festival itself into a παρθενικὴ πανήγυρις. What he says about the great multitude who had come by land and by water, to attend the celebration of this festival, would rather lead us to conclude that it was the great Christian festival of Christmas.

the simpler minded were disposed to call the virgin Mary the mother of God, (*θεότοκος*,) he had no particular aversion to the term, provided they did not convert Mary into a goddess.[2] Adopting the middle course between the two extremes, instead of using the phrases Mary the mother of God, or the mother of the man, (*θεότοκος* or *ἀνθρωπότοκος*,) he employed the term mother of Christ, (*χριστότοκος*,) inasmuch as the name Christ belonged to the whole person, uniting the divine and the human natures. His endeavor to keep close to the holy scriptures appears worthy of all respect. He very justly offers it as an argument against the use of that term, that the holy scriptures nowhere teach that God, but everywhere that *Jesus Christ*, the Son of God, the Lord, was born of Mary. "This we all acknowledge; for unhappy is his case who receives not what the scriptures teach." His pains-taking conscientiousness in refusing to yield anything from the truth may be seen in the following example. He had said, "I do not grudge that epithet to the mother of *Christ*. I know that she is worthy of all honor, whom God assumed into himself, through whom the Lord of the universe passed, through whom the Sun of righteousness shone." These words, which favored the worship of the virgin, and seemed coincident with the prevailing notions, were received with claps of approbation. This made Nestorius fearful lest his language might have been so understood as to conflict with the scheme of doctrine which he had ever taught; and therefore he immediately added: "Your applause makes me suspicious.[2] How have you understood my declaration — through whom the Lord of the universe passed? In that I said not the same as if I had used the words, 'He was born of her.' For I do not so soon forget my own language," &c.[3]

Meanwhile everything at Constantinople was tending towards a schism of the church. One party of the clergy and monks, affecting to regard him as a heretic, a follower of the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, would no longer recognize him as their bishop, and renounced all church fellowship with him.[4] A card was publicly affixed to the walls of the principal church, containing a detailed comparison of the doctrines of Nestorius with those of Paul of Samosata.[5] Several presbyters preached, in one of the churches of Constantinople, against the doctrines of Nestorius. He forbade their preaching. Some of the clergy, who were hostile to him, were deposed from their places, as favorers of Manicheism, by a synod convened under his presidency at Constantinople.[6] On that principle of charging opponents with all imaginable consequences from their doctrines, in which both parties equally indulged, it had probably been inferred from the manner in

[1] *Ἐμοί πρὸς τὴν φώνην φθόνος οὐκ ἔστι, μόνον μη ποιεῖτω τὴν παρθένον θέαν.* S. V. l. c. 30.

[2] Nestorius, to his honor be it said, seems everywhere to have been averse to these loud theatrical demonstrations of applause. He says here: *Πάλιν ὑποπτεύω τὸν κρότον*, — and on another occasion, where doubtless he had been received with loud exclamations of applause, he says, I do not judge the love you bear me by your shouts, *οὐ κραυγαῖς κρίνω τὴν εἰς ἐμε φιλοστοργίαν.* S. II. fol. 8.

[3] S. V. f. 31.

[4] See the petition of the Diaconus Basilius, and the monks associated with him, in Harduin. Concil. T. I. f. 1335.

[5] L. c. f. 1271.

[6] As Nestorius says himself, in a letter to Cyrill of Alexandria, l. c. f. 1380.

which those clergy, in accordance with the Egyptian scheme, had expressed themselves in speaking of the human nature of Christ, that they denied the reality of Christ's humanity, and had therefore fallen into the Manicheian Docetism. In view of the remarks already made respecting the character of Nestorius, we must admit there may have been some ground for the accusations of his opponents, inclined though they were to indulge everywhere in extravagant statements, that in the heat of controversy he sometimes forgot himself so far as to resort to violent measures. But we should remember also how sorely he was provoked by fanatical and arrogant opponents, who showed not the least respect for law or order. Once, when Nestorius was about to enter the church for the purpose of preaching a discourse from the Bema, a monk boldly placed himself in the way to stop him, because heretics should not be allowed to teach in public. His adversaries,[1] who relate this story themselves, call this disorderly behaviour by no severer name, indeed, than the zeal of a pious simplicity; but they really had no reason to complain, when such a disturber of the public peace was harshly dealt with, and banished from Constantinople. On another occasion, Nestorius displayed that spirit of moderation which seeks not to dispute about words, while pure doctrine is seen to be safe. As he had publicly declared in his sermons, that he had no objection to the term θεότοκος, in itself considered; so, in opposition to several of the clergy and the monks who had stigmatized him as a heretic, he declared himself ready to concede, that the person who by his nature is the Son of God was born of the virgin Mary, the mother of God, since there is but one Son of God. The last addition shows in what sense he would concede this; namely, since the true and essential Son of God had appropriated to himself human nature, and taken it up into union with his own dignity, so that there is but one Son of God, the predicates of the human nature might therefore, in this point of view, be attributed to the one Son of God. Had these persons rightly understood the remark of Nestorius, in its connection with his own scheme of doctrine, they would not have accused him of deception.[2] The adversaries of Nestorius at Constantinople, at a time when he still possessed full influence at the imperial court and stood united with the ruling power, would hardly have ventured to come out so boldly against him, unless they had been sure of another powerful support, by virtue of their connection with Cyrill, the patriarch of Alexandria, through whose sympathy and participation it was that consequences of a still more extensive and general nature flowed from this controversy.

To form a correct judgment of the several steps from the beginning, which Cyrill took in this matter, it will be necessary first to glance at

[1] L. c. Harduin. 1338.

[2] The language of Nestorius, as quoted by his accusers, (Harduin. I. f. 1338,) was: Περὶ τοῦ φύσει υἱου τοῦ θέου, ὅτι ἐτέχθη ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας τῆς θεότοκου, ἐπεὶ (οὐκ) ἦν ἄλλος υἱος. It is plain that, with Tillemont, we must here supply the οὐκ inserted within the brackets; since for the very reason that Nestorius acknowledged but one Son of God in the united deity and humanity, he was willing also in this regard to admit the term θεότοκος, rightly understood.

the disposition and character of the man, and at the course of conduct he had exhibited since his entrance on the episcopal office. A violent persecuting spirit against Pagans, Jews, and heretics, an unbounded ambition, which did not scruple to resort to force and to political means for the sake of securing its ends,[1] were the traits of character which Cyrill had thus far unfolded.[2] A man of his stamp must have been attracted by an opportunity so inviting, of extending the dominion which he exercised in the Egyptian church, over a still wider field. In contemplating by themselves the first steps taken by Cyrill in this contest, we might be led to conclude that he was actuated by a zeal for pure doctrine, which, though it grew out of an exclusive, dogmatical spirit, and was exceedingly narrow, was yet untainted by personal passions; — that in the outset he did really seek, by gently pointing out where Nestorius was wrong, to convince and change the mind of his fellow-bishop, who, in his opinion, had given just cause of offence to many; — and, in so concluding, we should not attach overmuch importance to his abusive interpretation of his opponent's principles, — a practice which we find to have been no less common with the other party. But when we compare these steps of Cyrill with his character as previously exhibited; when we follow them in their measured and gradual progress to the final results; — it becomes quite probable that he commenced so gently, only because the reigning influence of the patriarch of Constantinople was at first too strong for him; and that he meant to prepare with cunning policy the more decided steps which were to follow in due time.

Soon after the breaking-out of the disputes at Constantinople, Cyrill took part in them by publishing two works of his own, in which, however, he refrained wholly from alluding to the name or the person of Nestorius. One of these was a program referring to the approaching Easter festival,[3] which, conformably to the usage of the Alexandrian bishops, he issued just before the commencement of the fasts. It being customary on such occasions to treat such topics of faith or morals as were adapted to the season, Cyrill chose for his topic on this occasion the peculiar character of Christ, the God-man, as compared with all other divine messengers and prophets, — the doctrine of the union of the deity and humanity in Christ.[4] Next, he took up the same doctrinal subject in a long admonitory letter, addressed, after the Easter festival, to the Egyptian monks. In both these writings, he carried out the distinction between an essential and natural union, and a barely relative, moral communion of God with humanity. He represented the transfer of predicates, and hence also the designation of Mary with the title θεότοκος, to be a necessary consequence of the former: he labored to show that, unless the former were adopted with all the consequences

[1] Vid. Socrat. VII. 7.

[2] It was also rumored of Cyrill, that bishoprics could be obtained of him for money, by persons wholly unworthy of the office. See Isidor. Pelusiot. l. II. ep. 127.

[3] Libellus paschalis, γράμματα πάσχαλα. Among the works of Cyrill, these letters appear under the name of homilies, (ὁμιλίαι,) perhaps because they answered the twofold purpose of being read before the Alexandrian church, and of being sent to other Egyptian churches.

[4] The 17th among his homiliæ paschales.

which flowed from it, Christ would be represented as a mere man, whom God employed, like other men, as an instrument; and that accordingly Christ could not be the Redeemer of mankind. In his second work, Cyrill expressly states the reason why he deemed it necessary to address this letter to the monks. Evil reports — he said — had got among them;[1] and people were abroad, who sought to disturb their simple faith, by starting such questions as whether Mary ought to be called θεότοκος or not. He observed, in the first place, very justly, that it were better, if these persons (who had no call whatever to teach, and who for the most part were wholly destitute of any regular education) would abstain altogether from such questions, and not agitate anew those matters which even the best cultivated minds could scarcely contemplate as seen through a glass darkly. This reason surely ought to have prevented Cyrill himself from writing his letter; but he supposed that, inasmuch as such questions had already begun to be agitated among them, it was necessary to furnish them with the means of refuting the sophisms of their opponents, and of securing their own faith against these assaults. But among the Egyptian monks, who were wholly dependent on the authority of the Alexandrian patriarchs, and by their peculiar mode of training were least of all prepared or inclined to receive the Antiochian scheme of doctrine, the danger of being infected by errors which emanated from Constantinople was hardly so great as to call for any extraordinary precautions. Hence it would seem to be evident that Cyrill was not altogether in earnest in what he here said: it may rather have been his express design, instead of suppressing, to foment the dispute, and add to its importance. The Egyptian monks were, in truth, the willing and ready tools of the Alexandrian bishops in their controversies; and Cyrill must undoubtedly have been aware how easily the passions of these people could be excited on matters of this sort.

It would seem, moreover, that, from various quarters, Cyrill was reproached[2] for having made such an attack on Nestorius, on the ground of mere reports, as he himself had avowed; an attack which, owing to the position maintained by the patriarch of Alexandria in the church, must necessarily create a great sensation. Cyrill now declared that he felt himself called upon to open and expound the pure doctrine, in order to set at rest the minds of those who had taken offence at the reported explanations of Nestorius.[3] He defended himself against the charge of uncharitableness and love of dispute, by alleging what, in such cases, hypocrisy, abusing the sacred name of love, may easily wear on the lips, that he was ready to sacrifice everything to charity, but could yield nothing in matters of faith; that he could not remain silent,

[1] Θρύλλοι τινές χαλεποί.

[2] See ep. VI. and VII. among his letters. The venerable abbot Isidore of Pelusium, who might properly address Cyrill in a certain tone of authority, wrote to him thus: "Put an end to the dispute, lest you bring down upon yourself the judgment of God. Let not the punishment which you deem it necessary to inflict on mortal men on account of personal grievances, fall upon the living church. Prepare not the way for perpetual divisions in the church under the pretence of piety." L. I. ep. 370.

[3] Ep. 6. Σκανδαλισθείσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξηγησέων αὐτοῦ, in the II. ep. to Nestor. Χαρτίων ἤγουν ἐξηγήσεων περιφερομένων.

when scandal had been given to all the churches of the Roman empire; that, by remaining silent under such circumstances, he would incur the charge of a serious dereliction from duty in the sight of God. He also hints at the reasons which induced him, in that address to the monks, to abstain as yet from all personal attacks, and to use language which was still so far from being vehement. He says[1] that he might justly have pronounced the anathema on every person who refused to call Mary the mother of God; but he had as yet forbore from so doing,[2] for the sake of Nestorius; — lest many might say that the *bishop of Alexandria* or the *Egyptian synod* had condemned him. It is easy to see, that Cyrill was anxious to avoid the reproach of hunting up heresies under the influence of passion, — a reproach to which events still fresh in the memories of all[3] easily exposed him.

Nestorius must, of course, have been greatly excited by this letter, soon dispersed abroad, in which the doctrine taught by him was represented as conflicting with the very essence of Christianity; — a letter, the design and purport of which, no one who was acquainted with the incidents at Constantinople could be at any loss to understand, and which put a new weapon into the hands of his antagonists at Constantinople; and the more so, since, from Cyrill's own declaration afterwards, that his address was aimed against the reported scriptural expositions of Nestorius, it was apparent that the above-mentioned discourse first held by Nestorius was the real object of his attack.

When Cyrill learned how much Nestorius had been annoyed by his letter to the monks, he wrote to him personally in justification of himself. It was not *his* letter assuredly, he thought, which had given rise to disturbances on account of the faith; but it was what Nestorius was supposed to have said, whether he had said it or not. There were many, he affirmed, who were ready to deny that they could any longer call Christ God, or anything more than an instrument of the Deity. How could he (Cyrill) remain silent, when injury was done to the faith, and so many were disturbed?[4] Would he not have made himself answerable for his untimely silence before the judgment-seat of Christ? Indeed, what was he to do now? Cyrill hypocritically represented the matter, as if he were desirous of consulting with Nestorius himself as to how he should act, since he had been inquired of by the Roman bishop Cœlestin and by a Roman synod, whether the writing dispersed abroad under the name of Nestorius, which had created everywhere great offence, should be considered as his or not. Cyrill says he did not himself know how that writing had been conveyed to Rome; although doubtless he knew all about it. He affected to doubt whether that discourse had really proceeded from Nestorius, although his animadversions on Nestorius in this letter showed clearly enough that he had no doubts on the subject; and although, in case he entertained any, his

[1] Ep. VI.

[2] Οὐ πεποιήκα τούτο δι' αὐτὸν τέως.

[3] In the case of Chrysostom, of which we shall speak hereafter.

[4] It is hardly to be conceived, however, that a sermon of Nestorius should have produced such important effects among Egyptian monks, who were so little capable of being affected by a tendency of this sort.

conduct would only have been the more censurable. Thus then Cyrill concludes, that Nestorius was bound rather to find fault with himself, than with him. It would be his better course to correct what he had said, so as to put an end to the scandal which the whole world had taken. If anything had escaped him, even in oral discourse, which he had occasion to regret, he ought, after mature reflection, to rectify the mistake, and no longer hesitate to call Mary the mother of God.

This letter of Cyrill was, of course, not calculated to mend or to mitigate the injury he had done to Nestorius; for this very letter, notwithstanding all its assurances of love, contained, in fact, the severest charges which could be alleged against a preacher of the gospel as such. Although Nestorius signified as much in his reply to Cyrill, yet he answered him in a calm and dignified tone. Into the specific matter of Cyrill's letter he forbore to enter at large, but sought only to refute the charges brought against his doctrine in Cyrill's address to the monks, and to retort the same accusations, under another form, upon Cyrill himself. In so doing, he indulged himself, it must be allowed, though in a different way, in the same unwarrantable license, which his opponent had taken, of misrepresentation and false charges. Instead of entering into Cyrill's train of thought, in holding fast to the expressions, "God was born," "God suffered," and the like, which might flow out of the theory of the transfer of predicates, he accused him of falling into Pagan, Apollinarian, and Arian errors, and still worse, — of representing God as capable of passion. But he was surely right, when he said that the sacred scriptures uniformly give such predicates, not to the Godhead, but to Christ, which name designates the union of the two natures. Hence, moreover, it was his opinion, that Mary should be called rather the mother of Christ, (*χριστότοκος*,) than the mother of God. After having called upon Cyrill to examine more closely into the doctrine of scripture, so as to perceive this, he ironically thanked him for sympathizing so deeply with those whose peace had been disturbed, and for extending his anxieties even to the affairs in Constantinople. He might rest assured, however, that he had been wrongly informed, perhaps by clergymen of Constantinople like minded with himself; for everything there was in the most favorable condition; — the Christian knowledge of his flock daily improving, and the emperor rejoicing in the prosperity of the church. Nestorius could not therefore, at this time, have been aware of any threatening danger. Cyrill did not leave this letter unanswered: he complained, in his reply, of the calumnies of worthless men, who dared to criminate him, especially in the councils of the higher officers of state.[1] He next repeats the admonitions of his first letter, unfolds anew his doctrine concerning the union of natures, and defends it against the consequences which Nestorius had drawn from it in his letter.[2]

[1] Τὰς τῶν ἐν τέλει σύνοδους καιρωφυλακοῦντες μαλίστα. These persons would naturally be averse to a bishop who was so fond of intermeddling with political affairs. This passage serves to show, moreover, that in the outset Nestorius seemed to have those who were in authority rather in his favor than opposed to him.

[2] Ep. IV.

For a moment it seemed as if the way was opened for a reconciliation between the two patriarchs, which, could it possibly have been brought about, would have facilitated the suppression, at least for a time, of the controversies now in the bud. A presbyter of the Alexandrian church, by the name of Lampon, came to Constantinople, as a mediator of peace; an office which he had probably undertaken of his own accord. Although Nestorius had already determined to break off the correspondence entirely, yet the spirit of Christian love by which Lampon seemed to be actuated, exerted an influence over him, which nothing else could have done. Nestorius was persuaded to write one more short letter to Cyrill;[1] a letter which everywhere breathes sincerity, and in its few words presents a fair image of the writer's heart. "Nothing is of more power," he writes, "than Christian gentleness. By this man's might I have been conquered; for I confess that I am seized with great fear, when I perceive in any man the spirit of Christian gentleness;—it is as if God dwelt in him."[2] It may perhaps have been a consequence of this peaceful disposition, then cherished by Nestorius, that the presbyter Anastasius himself, who was the original author of the dispute, made an attempt towards reconciling those members of the clergy at Constantinople who had broken off from fellowship with their patriarch.[3] But the opposition of the two parties to each other had already gone too far to allow this disposition of Nestorius to be of any long continuance, or such a negotiation to come to any favorable issue.

Cyrill constantly kept up the connection with the party opposed to Nestorius amongst the clergy, monks, and laity at Constantinople. He covertly directed their steps, which could easily be done, since doubtless the Alexandrian patriarchs were always accustomed to maintain their agents (*ἀποκρισιάριοι*) near the imperial residence. But, at the same time, so ambitious and violent a man as Cyrill would necessarily have many enemies among his own clergy; and these now sought protection and support from Nestorius. They placed in his hands many charges against their bishop; charges for which the latter, by his arbitrary and violent proceedings, had doubtless given just occasion; and it would seem that these complaints were at first received and entertained at the imperial court. In a person of Cyrill's character, this circumstance would probably create an impression, that disappointed vanity and revenge had now led Nestorius to aim at ruining him; but fears for the disposition of the court at Constantinople, which still seemed favorably inclined to Nestorius, would counsel him to prudence. Deserving of notice in this regard, is particularly Cyrill's answer to a memorial of the events which had there transpired, sent to him by the clergy who espoused his cause in Constantinople.[4] Laying it to the

[1] Ep. III.

[2] *Φόβον ὁμολογῶ κεκτῆσθαι πολὺν περὶ πάσαν πάντος ἀνδρὸς χριστιανίκην ἐπιεικείαν, ὡς ἐγκαθήμενον αὐτῇ τὸν θέον κεκτημένην.*

[3] See Cyrill. ep. 8.

[4] Ep. 5. This remarkable document has come down to us in two different forms,—in the Greek, and in a Latin translation by Marius Mercator,—which last contains a good deal more than the Greek, and sometimes helps to correct the latter, though it must itself also sometimes be corrected by the Greek. According to the superscription as given by Marius Mercator, this

charge of Nestorius that he had instigated worthless men to appear as Cyrill's accusers, he says, "Let him know that I have no fear of the journey (to Constantinople,) nor of my being able to answer those persons, when it *is the proper time*. For in due course the providence of our Saviour makes use of slight and unimportant things as occasions for assembling a synod, and through its means his church is purified, so that it preserves the noble faith untarnished. But let not the *wretched man* suppose, that, even though the persons who by his instigation would accuse us were more in number and more important than they are, he *is to be judge over us;* for when I come to Constantinople, I shall protest against this, and he himself will have to answer for the bad reports which are abroad concerning him." We see from this, that the *thought* of Nestorius presiding over a synod, as his judge, was a thing peculiarly intolerable to Cyrill's vanity. Nestorius had been the first to propose a synod, to assemble at Constantinople for the purpose of considering these and other matters; but although this proposition had come from his adversaries, yet Cyrill was satisfied with it;—for, as it here appears evident, he conceived the hope that, by adroit management, he should succeed in converting this synod into an instrument for the overthrow of Nestorius and his system. He wrote, therefore, to the above-mentioned ecclesiastics, that everything from the sermons of Nestorius which could be used to his disadvantage, must be carefully preserved, *until the proper time*,[1] unless a change took place in him. Those ecclesiastics had transmitted to him a complaint drawn up in very severe language against Nestorius, and designed for the emperor, in making use of which they wished to follow the judgment of Cyrill. The latter, however, chose to withhold the document, *because he feared an unfavorable impression would be created by its severity*.[2] He substituted in place of this another memorial, craftily prepared by himself, in which he preferred they should act first, not on the offensive, but on the defensive against Nestorius. In this instrument, they protested against his judicial authority; and, to justify the step, they endeavored to point out the cause from which the hostility of Nestorius proceeded, which gave them a convenient opportunity for bringing out on this occasion the complaint against his orthodoxy. In case their adversaries persisted in their accusations, they were to appeal to another tribunal. This memorial, Cyrill wrote to them, was to be delivered only when it should be found necessary. He would himself take the first opportunity to choose certain bishops and monks, wise and pious men, and send them on to Constantinople; for he should not rest easy, until, as he cantingly

letter of Cyrill was directed to his agents (Apocrisiarii) at Constantinople. On the other hand, according to the Greek document, it was directed to the schismatic clergy at Constantinople. At all events, the advice with regard to the petition to the emperor, which had been submitted to Cyrill's inspection, is closely connected with this letter; and this advice assuredly seems much more like that which would be addressed to the clergy of another diocese, who had entered into combination with Cyrill, than to agents taken from his own clerus. It is probable, therefore, that the Greek title is the right one.

[1] Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἐπισύρονται ἐγκλήματα ἐκ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων αὐτοῦ, φυλακθήσονται ἕως καίρου.

[2] Ἵνα μὴ. ἐπερχοίτο ἡμῖν λέγων: κατηγορήσατέ μου ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ὡς αἱρετικοῦ.

expressed it, he had fought out the battle for the salvation of all to the end. Moreover, he was already preparing to write such letters and *to such persons as the case demanded.*[1]

To create an influence against Nestorius at the court, Cyrill, in the year 429, had written two works, in which he expounded his own views, as above described, and controverted the opinions attributed to Nestorius; but without engaging in any personal attack on Nestorius, or even mentioning his name. One of these works he addressed to the emperor Theodosius II. himself, and to the empress Eudocia; the other to that all-powerful woman, the Augusta Pulcheria, and to the rest of the emperor's sisters. A passage in the letter hereafter to be noticed, which the emperor sent to Cyrill, might lead us to conjecture, that Cyrill had very good and *special* reasons for addressing himself to Pulcheria; that he had been informed, by means of his secret spies at Constantinople, of a misunderstanding, of which perhaps Nestorius himself had been the occasion, between the emperor and his sister, who otherwise possessed so much influence with him; and that he hoped to turn this connection with Pulcheria to the purpose of weakening the court party which favored Nestorius: for he is afterwards accused by the emperor of having taken this step, either because he had contrived, in a way unbefitting his station, to get knowledge of the breach between the emperor and his sister, or because he had sought to sow discord between them. And this accusation brought against Cyrill harmonizes with an ancient story, which intimates that Nestorius had incurred the displeasure of Pulcheria, by leading her brother to suspect her of having entered into some illicit connection with one of the nobles of the court.[2] This supposition is rendered probable likewise by similar examples in the history of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs.[3]

It had often been the case before, that the bishops of the contending church parties in the East endeavored to secure the victory on their side, by forming a connection with the bishops of Rome. To this

[1] Undoubtedly Cyrill understood very well what persons at Constantinople he should address, and how he could best work upon them so as to accomplish his designs at the court. The most instructive explanation of all these points is contained in a letter of his archdeacon and syncell, which we shall have occasion to quote when we come to speak of somewhat later events.

[2] The obscure passage in Suidas, under the word *Pulcheria*. Ἡ Πουλχερία τοσοῦτον ἐμισεῖ τὸν Νεστορίον, ὡς τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἐκείνον διαβρύλλειν, ὅτι πορνείαν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτῆς Θεοδοσίον τὸν βασιλέα διέβαλε Πουλχερίας ὁ Νεστορίος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἐμισεῖτο, ἐλοιδορεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν τότε μαγίστρον Παυλίνον λεγόμενον. The sense of this passage might perhaps also be construed thus, that Nestorius had accused her before the Paulinus there mentioned, of forbidden intercourse with her brother; but this rendering is not so well suited to the collocation of the words as that followed in the text. And had this been the accusation, Theodosius would have been as much excited against Nestorius as Pulcheria was.

[3] Afterwards, too, it is always to Pulcheria that the merit is ascribed of having especially contributed, by her zeal for the orthodox faith, to bring about the suppression of the Nestorian heresy. The language of the syncell already mentioned, to a bishop of Constantinople, during the later transactions, may serve as an example: Festina supplicari dominæ ancillæ Dei Pulcheriæ Augustæ, ut *iterum ponat animam suam* pro Domino Christo; that is, in behalf of the cause of Cyrill. When Pulcheria reigned with Marcian, the Egyptian bishops, during the first session of the council of Chalcedon, shouted: Ἡ Αὐγύστα Νεστορίον ἐξέβαλε. See Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 74, B.

means Cyrill now resorted. He sent to Cœlestin, bishop of Rome, a report of the erroneous doctrines taught by Nestorius. It is plain that, in so doing, he took the liberty of making many untrue statements, so as to make it appear to the Orientals, that the step had been taken, not of his own free will, but as a matter of necessity. Earlier than this he had complained to Nestorius, that his sermons had given great offence at Rome; (see above;) and he had pretended to ask him what was to be done. But it is evident from the letter of Cyrill, of which we are now speaking, that *he* was the *first* to write on this occasion, without being asked, to the Roman bishop; for his letter is not a reply to one which he had received. Moreover, it seems to have been Cyrill himself who caused the sermons of Nestorius to be translated, and immediately sent to Rome, where he was the first to make them known. Next, in his letter to John, patriarch of Antioch, he represents the matter as though he had been led first by the report of Nestorius to the Roman bishop, to write to the latter in his own defence; but this statement is utterly at variance with the contents and tone of the letter to the bishop Cœlestin; for Cyrill surely would not have omitted to mention in his own letter that of Nestorius, if his own had been occasioned by it. This epistle was composed in a style well fitted to win the favorable verdict of a Roman bishop, anxious to establish his authority as judge over the whole church; for he wrote to him, that he left it to his decision whether he (Cyrill) ought or ought not to announce to Nestorius the withdrawal from him of the fellowship of the church. He requested him to make known his decision by letters to all the bishops of the East; for this would have for its effect to unite them all together in the defence of the pure doctrine. To the bearer of this letter, a certain deacon Posidonius, Cyrill at the same time entrusted, for the use of the Roman bishop, a brief statement of the main points in which the erroneous doctrines of Nestorius consisted, and a skilful exposition of all that was peculiar and characteristic in the Antiochian system of doctrine; represented, however, only in that particular light in which it must appear to him from his own point of view, and with some unfair conclusions.

As to Nestorius, he too had occasion to write to the Roman bishop, but on another subject, and one, indeed, which was not exactly suited to procure for him a favorable hearing. Four bishops from Italy, deposed in the Pelagian controversies, had some time before taken up their residence in Constantinople. They had complained of the injustice done them, and sought help from the patriarch of Constantinople, as well as from the emperor. Nestorius was too much a friend to justice, and of too independent a spirit, to condemn these men at once, without inquiring into the matter. He wished to hear both sides, and therefore reported the affair to the Roman bishop, requesting from him a more exact statement of the facts. He wrote several letters to Rome on this subject, but received no answer; partly perhaps because the Roman bishop, being ignorant of the Greek language, was obliged to wait till the letters could be translated, and partly because the style of the letters may not have been altogether flattering to the Roman

pride. In two other letters, which he despatched after these, Nestorius drew up a report of the controversy which had now begun. He spoke here with the same vehemence and injustice of the positions of his opponent, as the latter had done with respect to his own doctrines. Yet here too he declared himself ready, though preferring himself to give Mary the title of *χριστότοκος*, to allow that she might be called *θεότοκος*, provided this title was understood to refer, not to the deity, but to the humanity united with the deity. Very striking, however, is the difference of tone between the letters of Nestorius and those of Cyrill to the Roman bishop. Cyrill addresses him in language which was at least capable of being so understood as if he did concede to him a certain supreme judicial authority over the church. Nestorius speaks to him as one colleague to another, and as a person standing on the same level with himself. This of itself would be sufficient to interest Cœlestin, the Roman bishop, in favor of Cyrill rather than of Nestorius, and to enlist his prejudices against the latter. In addition to this, he had first become acquainted with the doctrines of Nestorius from the representations of Cyrill, the latter having more craftily accompanied his letters with a Latin translation; and it is easy to see that the scheme which had *thus* been explained to him would, from the first, appear to him to detract from the dignity of the God-man.[1]

Cœlestin decided at a Roman synod, that the clergy excommunicated by Nestorius should be received back to the fellowship of the church; and in case Nestorius himself did not present, within ten days after the reception of the sentence pronounced at Rome, a *written recantation*, and testify his agreement with the Roman and Alexandrian church doctrine respecting the birth of Christ, who is our God, he should be excommunicated, and no longer recognized as patriarch. In a letter to Cyrill, full of extravagant praises, he gave to that bishop, by the sovereign authority of the apostolic see, the power of carrying this sentence into execution; and, in case Nestorius refused to furnish the required recantation, of providing at once for the appointment of a new patriarch. This sentence he communicated also to the clergy at Constantinople who had seceded from Nestorius, and to the latter himself with the most vehement reproaches. The Roman bishop here claimed for himself a supreme judicatory authority, which, according to the then constitution of the church, in nowise belonged to him; and which Cyrill, unless he had seen that it might be turned to his own advantage, and could not possibly prove injurious to it, would assuredly never have conceded. But, under the present circumstances, this declaration of the Roman bishop was extremely agreeable to Cyrill, as an important means for the attainment of his objects; for he could make use of this declaration to intimidate the Oriental bishops by the fear of a rupture with the whole Western church; with which church, peace had, but a short time

[1] The doctrine of Nestorius appeared to him to be such, that its author could sometimes consider Christ to be a mere man, and sometimes, whenever he thought fit, ascribe to him unity with God. See the letter of Cœlestin to the clergy at Constantinople. The Roman narrowness betrays itself in his letter to Cyrill, where he charges it upon Nestorius as a crime: *Ὅτι Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἐπάγεται ζήτησις περὶ τῆς ἰδίας γεννήσεως.*

before, been once more restored. This is made manifest in his letter to John, patriarch of Antioch.[1]

The most eminent and influential bishops of the Eastern provinces of Roman Asia,[2] who were attached partly to the unaltered system of Theodore, and in part to a very temperate and mild interpretation of the same, looked with alarm at the outbreak of a new schism, which threatened once more to sever from one another the Christian East and West, after the peace of the church had, but a very short time before, by the unwearied pains of the centenarian bishop Acacius of Berœa in Syria, been again restored. Among the bishops of Syria, several men were at that time to be found, who were distinguished for profound knowledge, genuine and ardent piety, and freedom from that worldly spirit by which so many of their colleagues were governed. By the relations of former friendship, they were, for the most part, well disposed to Nestorius, as they were, by their moderate way of thinking, inclined to take the part of mediators of peace between the two parties. In this feeling, the person who in rank stood first among these bishops, John, patriarch of Antioch, wrote to Nestorius with the common understanding of six other bishops of this district, who happened just then to be assembled with him. He transmitted to him the letters which he had received from Alexandria and Rome, accompanied by remarks of his own, distinguished for Christian wisdom and moderation. He begged of him so to read the letters which he sent, as not to allow himself to be hurried away by those impulses of passion, out of which the hurtful spirit of dispute and self-will were wont to spring; nor yet to despise this matter, which might lead to an irremediable evil;—but with friends of the same mind with himself, to whom he must allow the liberty of impartially telling him the truth, to inquire with calmness what ought to be done. He presented before him the danger of the new rupture which threatened to take place. What insolence would not opponents who had already arrogated so much to themselves, assume after reading these letters![3] He regretted that the whole dispute had arisen about a bare word, which in fact, even according to the opinion of Nestorius himself, might be used in a right sense, and had already been used in this sense by many church-teachers. The Roman bishop had, indeed, allowed him but a short respite of only ten days; but he needed not even so short a space as this for reflection. He could in a few hours decide as to the explanation which should be given; for he needed not hesitate to approve a term whose fundamental sense, according to the right understanding of it, he certainly did not reject. He called upon him to offer this sacrifice for the sake of preserving the

[1] In this letter he says, for example, with regard to the determinations of the Roman synod: Οἷς ἀνάγκη πείθεσθαι τοὺς ἀντεχομένους τῆς πρὸς ἅπασαν τὴν δύσιν κοινωνίας.

[2] The so-called ἀνατολικοί.

[3] A remarkable expression in the letter of the patriarch: Ἐννόησον γὰρ, ὡς εἰ πρὸ τῶν νῦν ἀποσταλέντων γραμμάτων οἱ πολλοὶ δοχεῖοι ἦσαν καθ' ἡμῶν, νῦν ὁράξαμενοι, τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων τούτων παῤῥησίας τινες οὐκ ἐσόνται, καὶ ποιᾷ οὐ χρήσονται καθ' ἡμῶν παῤῥησίᾳ. Unless we suppose, that the patriarch is speaking here simply *per anakoinosin*, — which, however, is not probable, — we find here a hint of the many attacks which the bishops of Eastern Asia had already had to endure.

peace of the church. What the patriarch John here advised his friend, agreed, in fact, with the sentiments which he himself had already expressed, of his own accord, on a previous occasion; and accordingly Nestorius in his reply, after having explained the origin of the whole dispute, said that he had nothing to object to the term θεότοκος, provided only it was guarded against misrepresentation, and understood in a right sense, as designating the union[1] of the two natures. But with regard to the habitual arrogance of the Egyptian — he wrote to the patriarch John — there was no reason why he, in particular, should be surprised at it; for he had before him many old examples of the same thing.[2] Nestorius was then hoping for a general ecclesiastical assembly, at which this controversy could easily be disposed of by a general agreement. He had no presentiment at that time of the preponderance of the opposite party at court.

Had this plan of Nestorius been adopted, the dispute might still have been for the present suppressed, although indeed only for the moment; since the opposition of the two doctrinal tendencies lying at the root of this controversy about the term θεότοκος would most assuredly, sooner or later, openly manifest itself.

But, by the arrogant conduct of Cyrill, the dispute about a word with which the Syrian church also was satisfied, was converted into a contest between the doctrinal systems of the two churches. Cyrill determined to act as the executor of the sentence passed by the Roman synod. In this year, 430, he sent a letter, in the name of a synod held at Alexandria, to Nestorius, in which, conformably to the sentence pronounced at Rome, he was for summoning him, the third and last time, to recant. He laid before him the system of doctrines which he must confess as the true system, and unfolded in twelve formulas of condemnation (ἀναθεματίσμοι) what he had to recant. These explanations, however, contained nothing else than the Egyptian creed carried out in opposition to the rigidly Antiochian system, as it had been expressed by Theodore of Mopsuestia — a ἕνωσις φυσική (natural union) as opposed to the ἕνωσις κατ' ἀξίαν, εὐδοκίαν (union by worth, favor) — a ἕνωσις, and not a συναφεία (union, and not conjunction) — which last formula expressed too little. One Son of God, one Christ out of two natures; or, as he preferred to say, formed of two different things into an indissoluble unity.[3] In the one Logos who had become man, the different divine and human predicates were, indeed, still to be distinguished; but not so the two natures. Both kinds of predicates were to be referred to one and the same Logos, who became man. One Logos, with his own proper body.[4] Hence the unconditional transfer of predicates; — as, for example, that Mary had corporeally borne the Logos from God who became flesh;[5]

[1] Propter unitionis rationem.

[2] De consueta vero Ægyptii præsumtione maxime tua religiositas non debet admirari, dum habes antiqua hujus exempla perplurima. Here too, we have a noticeable indication of the contests which had before existed between the Egyptian and Syrian churches.

[3] Ἐκ δύο καὶ διαφόρων πραγμάτων εἰς ἑνοτήτα τὴν ἀμέριστον συνηνεγμένος.

[4] Εἷς λόγος μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σάρκος.

[5] Γεγεννῆκε σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον.

that the Logos from God had suffered and been crucified according to the flesh,[1] etc.

This step of the bishop Cyrill gave the whole matter a different turn; for it was thereby necessarily converted from a personal attack on Nestorius into an attack on the form of doctrine taught in the Syrico-Asiatic church. So it was considered by the most authoritative teachers of that church. John, patriarch of Antioch, who stood at their head, deemed it necessary to enter into a public refutation of these anathemas, and selected Theodoret, bishop of Cyros, a town on the Euphrates, for this purpose.[2] This man, otherwise distinguished for his Christian moderation and gentleness, allowed himself, however, in this instance, to be misled by his dogmatic zeal, though springing no doubt out of a purely Christian interest, into an unfair judgment. With right he might complain that Cyrill's formulas of condemnation failed in accuracy of doctrinal expression, and that from this defect a dangerous reäction was to be apprehended on Christian knowledge. With good right he supposed, that the extravagancies of expression, which might perhaps be tolerated in the composition of Christian hymns, and in the more rhetorical language of the homilies, would be followed with dangerous consequences in doctrinal language, and could not be so mildly judged.[3] Very justly he felt himself bound to enter the strongest protest against this thing in particular, that Cyrill was bent on making a form of doctrinal expression which was so inexact, and so liable to misconstruction, the prevailing formula in the Oriental church; — and for stigmatizing as heresy, everything that did not accord with it. But still he ought to have distinguished the doctrine lying at bottom from the form of the expression, and not to have attributed to Cyrill, doctrines which he could derive from his assertions only by inferences, against which Cyrill had expressly enough guarded; as he did, in fact, contrive to find, in the condemnatory sentences of Cyrill, Apollinarian, Gnostic, and Manichean errors. Now as Cyrill, in defending his anathemas, proceeded in the same way against Theodoret's system of faith, it was a matter of course that although the more temperate form of the Syrian creed approximated very nearly to that of Cyrill, yet the opposition between the two systems became more and more apparent; and the difficulty of coming to a calm, mutual understanding with regard to differences,

[1] Τὸν θεοῦ λόγον πάθοντα σάρκι καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σάρκι.

[2] Ep. 150, among the letters of Theodoret.

[3] In his circulatory letter addressed to the Syrian monks, in opposition to the anathemas of Cyrill, ep. 151, where he speaks of the expression used concerning Mary, εἰ καὶ πανηγυρικῶς τὶς λέγειν ἐθέλει καὶ ὑμνους ὑφαίνειν καὶ ἐπαίνους διεξιέναι καὶ βούλεται τοῖς σεμνοτέροις ὀνόμασιν ἀναγκαιῶς κεχρῆσθαι, οὐ δογματίζων, ἀλλὰ πανεγυρίζων καὶ θαυμάζων ὡς οἱόντε τοῦ μυστηρίου τὸ μεγεθος, ἀπολανέτω τοῦ πόθου καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις ὀνόμασι κεχρήσθω. This more closely drawn distinction betwixt liturgical, ascetic, and properly dogmatic language, was, as a general thing, characteristic of the Syrian church. Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, traces the whole corruption of dogmatic terminology to the confounding of the two distinct forms of language. Et quidem ut in festivitatibus sive in præconiis atque doctrinis incircumspecte *Dei genitrix* sive *Deum enixa* ab orthodoxis tantummodo sine adjectione diceretur, vel Deicidæi Judæi (θεόκτονοι) vel quia *verbum incarnatum* est cæt., sane nulla accusatione sunt digna, eo quod nec dogmatice sunt posita ista. Epistola Alexandri Hierapolitani ad Theodoretum in Tragœdia Irenæi ed. Lupus. Opp. Tom. VII. c. 94, f. 247; also in opp. Theodoreti, ed. Halens. T. V. ep. 78.

every day increased. A difference between the two systems existed, it is true, all along; and this had its ground in the fact, that Theodoret was seeking to unfold the truth under the forms of the understanding; while Cyrill, avoiding everything of that sort, was for holding fast only to the transcendent fact, so that those nicer distinctions of the understanding appeared to him a belittleing or a denial of the mystery. But, notwithstanding all this, the dispute on many of the formulas was made of so much weight, because the parties did not mutually understand each other as to their meaning. Theodoret vehemently controverted the doctrine of a ἕνωσις φυσική, of a ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν, because he maintained that God was thereby subjected to a natural necessity, and the distinction of the conceptions of deity and humanity which had become united in Christ, was impossible; but Cyrill understood those expressions in another sense, and guarded himself sufficiently against all those interpretations. He opposed that ἕνωσις φυσική and καθ' ὑπόστασιν to a barely moral union, consisting in the will or in the mode of conduct. He accused his opponents of holding to the latter only; but Theodoret in fact taught expressly, that deity and humanity were united in one person.[1]

Out of these different doctrinal tendencies, however, arose also a different mode of apprehending several particulars in the life of Christ. Theodoret did not hesitate, in following the gospel history, to ascribe to our Saviour, during his life on earth, in reference to his humanity, a limited knowledge, and to say, "that this humanity, in that point of time, knew only so much as the indwelling deity revealed to it."[2] But to Cyrill this assertion appeared scandalous: he affirmed, on the other hand, that whoever said a revelation, and that a graduated one, was made by the indwelling God to the servant-form, made of Christ a mere prophet. As he was not disposed, however, directly to deny the ignorance predicated of the human nature of Christ, since he recognized the attributes of the latter in their individuality, he expressed himself, with a view to mark strongly the incomprehensibleness of the mystery, after a form to which he could hardly attach any definite meaning: "When Christ subjected himself to the general *mass* of human nature, which is limited in its knowledge, he appropriated *this part of it* also by a special economy,[3] although still he had no bounds to his knowledge, but was, with the Father, omniscient."[4]

Thus, then, this arbitrary, illegal conduct of Cyrill tended at first to injure rather than to benefit his course. In the consciousness of his right, and of his independent dignity, Nestorius received the episcopal deputies who brought to him the requisitions of Cyrill and Cœlestin, with merited contempt: he did not allow himself to be interrupted thereby in the preaching of his doctrine, and he opposed to the anathemas of Cyrill, twelve others.

[1] Ἓν πρόσωπον. He would not say μία ὑπόστασις, because he took this term in another sense.

[2] Τῆς τοσαύτα κατ' ἐκείνου τοῦ καίρου γινωσκούσης, ὅσα ἡ ἐνοικοῦσα θεότης ἀπεκάλυψε.

[3] Οἰκονομικῶς οἰκειοῦται καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων.

[4] He says also: Αὐτοῦ παντῶς ἴσται καὶ τὸ εἰδέναι καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι δόκειν.

In the emperor's court at Constantinople also, the conduct of Cyrill created an impression very unfavorable to the latter. The complaints of his arrogance and love of power, which had been already received there before, seemed thereby to be confirmed. All the previous steps of Cyrill in this affair, being placed along with the last, seemed to indicate a deeply laid scheme for the arbitrary supplanting of Nestorius; but men were determined not to tolerate this despotism which individual bishops wished to exercise over the whole church, and not to sacrafice Nestorius to any such arbitrary caprice of an individual. According to that system of church constitution which alone was recognized at Constantinople, Cyrill's arbitrary will could gain no legal authority from the dictatorial conduct of a Roman bishop. Since, then, it had already been determined upon before, to assemble a general council to attend to other ecclesiastical matters, according to the wish of Nestorius himself, and according to the proposal of his opponents, — so, by these new events, the prosecution of this purpose was hastened to a completion; for the investigation of the matters in dispute by a general council would be set over against the arbitrary decision of individual bishops and synods. The emperor was resolved to approve nothing but the decisions of such a council. But as Constantinople had before (see above) been fixed upon as the place for the meeting of the council, so now the city of Ephesus was appointed instead of it. This change of the place was occasioned, beyond all doubt, by some special cause. Probably fears were entertained of the combination of Cyrill with a certain party of the Byzantine court, and with influential monks. So, on the 19th of November, 430, the emperor Theodosius II. issued a proclamation to all the metropolitans of his empire, summoning them to meet in a council to be holden at Ephesus, about Pentecost, in the following year. But along with the general proclamation addressed to Cyrill, as it was to all the metropolitan bishops, the emperor sent to the former a special one, in which he severely reprimanded him for his conduct thus far, and declared to him that he would suffer it no longer. This letter is drawn up with more good sense than we should expect from a Theodosius, and we can scarcely be mistaken in supposing that it was dictated by a wiser head.

It called upon Cyrill to recollect, that pure doctrine was found by investigation, rather than by the assumption of authority; for from the first[1] it had been established, not by the threat of any potentate whatever, but by the deliberations of the fathers. Let Cyrill declare then — it proceeded — why, neglecting the emperor, of whom he knew that the cause of piety lay near his heart, and neglecting all the priests in all the churches, who ought rather to have been assembled for the purpose of settling the matters in dispute, he has chosen, as much as in him lay, to excite disorders and divisions in the church? And no wonder he had here overstepped the bounds of propriety, as he had not even spared the imperial family itself; for why had he written twice; — once to the emperor and to the empress, and a second time to his sister Pul-

[1] At all events, it should have been so.

cheria? Doubtless for no other reason than because he either believed that they were at difference with each other, or else hoped to set them at difference by his letter. But were the first the case, it betrayed a censurable curiosity (a prying interference in the concerns of the court) for a bishop who lived so remote from the court, to know anything about such matters; and, if it was not the case, the wish to excite such discord was nowhere less befitting than in a bishop. But it betrayed the same disposition to be stirring up discord in the imperial family, and to be exciting it among the churches; as if one had no other means of making one's self famous.

The emperor, at the appointed time, sent to Ephesus the Comes Candidianus, as his plenipotentiary before the synod, with the express command that he should not interfere with the doctrinal proceedings of the council, but only use his authority for the preservation of order.[1] Doubtless there were reasons for the anxiety which led to such a precautionary measure; and many other things, indeed, contained in the letter which the emperor addressed to the synod, confirm this conjecture. For he directed, at the same time, that all persons belonging to the secular order, and all monks who had assembled at Ephesus, or who should afterwards assemble there, should without exception leave the place; in order that the peaceful and calm investigation of doctrine might not be disturbed by them, and that no passionate feelings or discord might be excited. There may, then, have already existed reasons for apprehending — an apprehension which indeed afterwards proved to be but too well founded — that the Cyrillian party would have at their service many instruments quite alien from the spiritual investigation. Furthermore, the bishops were forbidden, during the proceedings, to leave the synod, and especially to visit the court at Constantinople;— an order which indicates again that there were many grounds for fearing the intrigues of the Cyrillian party with the court. It is clear moreover, from all the facts, how far the emperor then was from tolerating the forcible supplantation of Nestorius. His favorable disposition towards the patriarch was shown by his allowing him alone to take with him, as his companion to Ephesus, a friend of noble rank, the Comes Irenæus.

Cyrill and Nestorius arrived at Ephesus at the appointed time. Cyrill brought with him a great number of Egyptian bishops, whose interests were identical with his own, and who were his devoted tools. The bishop Memnon of Ephesus was his friend, and perhaps, as the opponent of the Constantinopolitan patriarch, whose ecclesiastical supremacy these consequential metropolitans reluctantly acknowledged, bound to Cyrill by a common interest. This alliance secured to him a dominant influence over the bishops of Asia Minor; and as Memnon, being of like disposition with Cyrill, doubtless exercised a like authority at Ephesus, to that which the latter exercised at Alexandria, it moreover gave him a great power in the city where the council was assembled. It was probably on account of his fear of this power, that Nestorius requested and obtained of the imperial commissioner a guard,

[1] In the imperial *sacra* directed to the synods, Harduin. Concil. T. I. 1346. Ὥστε τῇ συνόδῳ πανταχόθεν περιφυλαχθῆναι τὸ ἀτάραχον.

who surrounded his dwelling, and allowed no one to enter without being announced. This, it is true, may be reckoned along with the many other adventitious circumstances of state which surrounded the great bishops of the Roman empire, as indeed his opponents taunted him on this military attendance; but a bishop of the party hostilely disposed to him, Acacius of Melitene, hints perhaps at the true motive, when he says[1] that Nestorius was induced to this step *by fear*. It is true, he explains the fact according to his own views, attributing this fear to the bad conscience with which the heretic must have been troubled. But when we consider what a fanatical spirit had been breathed into the Cyrillian party, what an influence this spirit might exert on the rude popular masses which were devoted to this party, especially if the charges laid against Cyrill in several public declarations — and which appear by no means so improbable, to judge from the dominion which he exercised at Alexandria, — if these charges are true, namely, that he had engaged the peasants of Asia Minor and the Egyptian sailors to execute his tyrannical behests,[2] we may easily find another cause for the apprehensions of Nestorius. The party of Cyrill affirmed, it is true, in their report to the emperor, that no disturbances had taken place at Ephesus, which could have given Nestorius any occasion for such precaution;[3] but the proverb might here be applied, that he who excuses himself is his own accuser.

After the bishops, assembled at Ephesus, had already waited several weeks beyond the term fixed upon by the emperor, there were many who should have assisted at the synod, that were still detained by various circumstances from being present. The absence of the deputies from the Roman bishop, who had been detained by unfavorable winds, would give Cyrill neither concern nor satisfaction; for he could reckon upon their approbation of whatever he and his party might carry through at the council, whether they were present at the proceedings or not. But he must have rejoiced to find it in his power to open the council without the assistance of the patriarch John of Antioch, and the other Syrian bishops; for it was from these alone, who were for the most part friendly to Nestorius, or, at least, all of them thoroughly opposed to the Egyptian doctrines, and altogether independent of the Egyptian influence, that he had to expect the most decided opposition. The patriarch John had, in the first place, been obliged to put off his journey on account of a famine which was then prevailing at Antioch, beyond what was usual in that populous capital of Roman Asia in the East, and on account of the popular tumults which had thence arisen.[4] Besides, the violent rains in many of the districts through which the long land-rout from Antioch to Ephesus led, had occasioned inunda-

[1] Concil. Ephes. act. I. T. I. f. 1390.

[2] In the letter of the patriarch John of Antioch, and the bishops connected with him: Harduin. l. c. 1459. *Ναυταῖς τε Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ ἀγροίκοις Ἀσιάνοις ὑπούργοις τῆς τυράννιδος χρησαμένοι*, l. c. 1454. *Πλήθος τὸ ἀγροίκικον συναγάγων διεταράξε τὴν πόλιν.* Nestorius says, in his report to the emperor, that Cyrill placed soldiers, probably procured through the influence of Memnon of Ephesus, around the marketplace, and set the whole city in an uproar. L. c. 1438.

[3] L. c. 1442.

[4] The letter of John to the emperor. Harduin. I. 1459.

tions, by which the journey was rendered more difficult and slow. Sixteen days had already elapsed beyond the term appointed by the emperor for the opening of the synod. The Syrian bishops, after having been thirty days on the road, were still from five to six days' journey from Ephesus. The patriarch John informed Cyrill of this in a respectful letter, which he sent to excuse their delay.[1] After having delayed for *so long* a time the opening of the council, the deputies certainly might have waited for these few days longer. But though forty-one bishops insisted that the arrival of their colleagues, who were now distant but a few days' journey, ought to be waited for; and though they declared that they were resolved not to take part in any earlier assembling of the council; though Nestorius would receive no message from a party assembly; though the imperial commissioner issued several protests against the regularity of such an assembly, which was counter to the emperor's summons; yet Cyrill, having secured the support of Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, and Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, and relying upon the vast number of Egyptian bishops and bishops of Asia Minor, was not to be deterred by any of these things; and on the 22d of June, A.D. 431, he opened the synod with about two hundred bishops. He endeavored afterwards, it is true, to justify this proceeding, on the pretence that the patriarch John had purposely delayed; that he was unwilling to take any part in the sentence of deposition to be pronounced on Nestorius, which he doubtless foresaw would be the result of the synod, and of which affair he was heartily ashamed; while many of the bishops coming from Eastern Asia had mentioned, in the commission of their patriarch, that the council might do what they pleased, without waiting for their arrival.[2] But the above-mentioned letter of the patriarch John seems more deserving of credit than this assertion of Cyrill, as the latter would naturally seek after every thing in the shape of an excuse for a mode of procedure so manifestly illegal; and it is moreover difficult to conceive, that the patriarch John, who then assuredly entertained the purpose of sustaining his friend Nestorius, would have designedly sacrificed him to the Cyrillian party, whom he then had no occasion whatever to fear.

This assembly was partly a blind instrument in the hands of Cyrill, who by various artifices had contrived to gain the entire influence over it,[3] and partly it was governed by the wildest fanaticism. Of course, a regular and orderly investigation was not to be thought of; the result to be arrived at, had already been settled and determined; and hence all the proceedings which were to lead to it, could easily be despatched in a single day. Cyrill, as the champion of the pure doctrine, was

[1] Concil. Ephes. Pars. I. c. 21. Harduin I. 1348.

[2] Cyrill in his letter to the clergy of Constantinople. I. Harduin. f. 1435.

[3] Cyrill is said to have made use, in this case also, of bribery; a favorite means of his for accomplishing his ends. This is intimated by the bishop Ibas of Edessa, in his letter to the Persian church-teacher, Mares: Προλάβων ὁ Κυρίλλος τὰς ἀκοὰς τῷ φαρμάκῳ, τῷ περοῦντι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν σόφων προκατέσχεν. S. Concil. Chalc. act. 10, Harduin. II. f. 530. Ibas was one of the Orientals who came to Ephesus in company with the patriarch John. In the above letter, he shows, indeed, that he belonged to a party, but still manifests no excitement.

loaded with flattering encomiums; his letters to Nestorius, which were read, and his anathemas, were applauded as expressing the pure doctrine. Nestorius having declined two invitations of the council to be present at their deliberations, and having declared that he should appear only when all the bishops were assembled; a third summons, in the customary form, which was usually observed even when men were acting in the very face of the laws, was now sent to him by four bishops, accompanied by a notary and a church prelector.[1] Nestorius, who, according to the original purpose of the assembly, was to appear as an assistant in the investigations, not as a defendant on trial, was called upon by the most holy synod, as they styled themselves, to vindicate himself; and was threatened, in case he did not appear and answer to the written and oral charges laid against him, that the synod would find it necessary to proceed against him according to the ecclesiastical rules. The guard, who were stationed in the front court of the house, refused, according to their orders, to admit the bishops to Nestorius, and moreover informed them that, if they waited till night, they would receive no other answer from Nestorius than the one already given.[2]

Although Nestorius had every lawful reason to protest against this tribunal, yet the council proceeded to consider itself as the regular body to judge and decide upon his case; and his refusal to appear before them was construed as an admission on his own part of his guilt. His letters to Cyrill were read, and received with marks of disapprobation as universal as the applauses bestowed on the letters of Cyrill. One proof of the unchristian, fanatical passion which animated this synod was given in the following sally of the bishop Euoptios of Ptolemais[3] at the reading of these letters: "As those," said he, "who counterfeit the imperial coin deserve the extremest punishment, so Nestorius, who has presumed to falsify the doctrines of orthodoxy, deserves every punishment both from God and man."[4] Even familiar remarks of Nestorius and his friends, dropped in their conversations with other bishops during their residence at Ephesus, were brought up against him and perverted. In the vehemence into which a man of his temperament might easily be hurried in dispute, he had remarked, when reprobating the crass-sounding expressions of the other party, that it surely could not be affirmed, God had been two or three months old. This was so construed as if he meant to deny the deity of Christ. One of Nestorius' friends had said, that the Jews could bring suffering on the man indeed, but not on the deity itself. This was regarded as an unheard-of blasphemy, as an attempt to justify the Jews, and to extenuate their sin.[5] The synod accordingly, as they declared with pharisaical hypocrisy, *after many tears*, constrained by the laws of the church, and by the letter of the Roman bishop Cœlestin, pronounced the sentence, which they dared to express in the following form: "Our Lord Jesus Christ,

[1] For the purpose of reading before Nestorius the letter of the synod, and taking a note of his answer.

[2] S. Harduin. Concil. T. 1. f. 1362.

[3] Who must have been a very different man from his brother and predecessor, the gentle and free-minded Synesius.

[4] L. c. 1391.

[5] Harduin. f. 1398 and 1399.

by Nestorius blasphemed, has ordained, by this most holy synod, that the Nestorius above named should be excluded from the episcopal dignity and from the whole college of priests."[1] After the synod had passed this sentence, the bishop Rheginus of Constantia, on the island of Cyprus, preached a discourse, which, short as it is, presents a most singular exhibition of extravagant dogmatic formulas, repugnant to all human and Christian feelings, and even savoring of idolatry, by which it was imagined to do honor to the living Christ; a picture of fanaticism sacrificing as well the spirit of Christ, as that of reason. On the ground of this dispute about pitiable forms of conception, pitiable in the comparison with Christianity, which is *spirit and life*, and the essence of which is *love*, the victim now branded as a heretic was pronounced worse than Cain and the Sodomites. The earth ought, of good rights, to open and swallow him up; fire ought to rain down on him from heaven, that the simple might see his transgression punished! The God Logos, whom he had ventured to sever, who had come forth in the flesh from Mary the mother of God, would appoint for him the punishment of eternal torments in the day of judgment. The bishop concluded his discourse with an invitation opposed to the Antiochian creed, and consonant with the whole tenor of his remarks, as follows: "But let us worship and adore the God Logos, who has condescended to walk among us in the flesh, without separating himself from the essence of the Father!"[2]— As if this worship of the incarnate God did not exist among the party of Nestorius, because they expressed themselves, respecting the appearance of the same incarnate God, in other dogmatic forms! Thus a new slavery to forms of expression in religion was again to be substituted in the place of the worship of God in spirit and in truth!

Cyrill caused the above sentence of deposition pronounced upon Nestorius to be publicly affixed at Ephesus, and indeed to be proclaimed by heralds through the whole city.[3] The bishops who had constituted that assembly, or who formed the Cyrillian party, moreover, despatched a letter worthy of the spirit of this party to the emperor, in which they informed him of the sentence passed by the synod, which they affirmed themselves to be. They offered various excuses, the emptiness of which could easily be exposed, for opening the proceedings before the arrival of the patriarch John and his associates. They resorted to the most abominable perversions of those familiar remarks of Nestorius already mentioned, in order to present him in the light of a blasphemer of the holiest things. They affirmed he had not ceased to maintain that He who had for our sakes become man, ought not to be called God; that he made the human nature which the deity had assumed from love to man, an objection to that deity; that he ridiculed the mystery of the divine incarnation. They prayed the emperor to command, that the entire doctrine of Nestorius should be expunged from the churches, and that his books, by which he sought to deny the grace of God, should be committed to the flames wherever they might be found.

[1] L. c. f. 1422. [2] L. c. 1444. [3] According to the declaration of the Comes Candidianus. Harduin. l. c. 1451. [4] Harduin. l. c. 1442.

Nestorius, and ten bishops united with him, thereupon sent another letter to the emperor, in which they described, according to the truth, the arbitrary and illegal proceedings of Cyrill and Memnon. They submitted to the emperor the just petition, that he would either secure for them a residence at Ephesus safe from injury, and order the constitution of a regular assembly; so that none of the clergy or monks, whether belonging to themselves or to the Egyptians, and none of the bishops who had not been called, might be present to disturb the synod (only two bishops from each metropolitan diocese, men competent to enter into such investigations, were to attend the assembly with their metropolitans;)[1] or that the emperor would enable them to return back free from peril to their churches. This demand clearly places the party of Nestorius in an advantageous light. It is evident that they wished to obtain the victory, not by superiority of numbers, not by violence and clamor, but by calm and rational investigation; whereas, on the other hand, a suspicion of the opposite kind is thereby cast on the party of Cyrill.

The imperial commissioner was of the same mind with Nestorius; as indeed he had at the very outset declared the assembly of Cyrill's party to be illegal, and contrary to the emperor's letters warrant. He therefore insisted that their decrees could have no legal validity; and in conformity with these views, he drew up also on his part a report to the emperor, and advised those bishops who had not been present at the Cyrillian assemblies, not to allow themselves to be forced to subscribe the decrees of that body, but to wait till the arrival of the Syrian patriarch. Candidian, on account of his intimate connection with the Syrian church party, might be accused of a partiality unbefitting his position: but it appears evident that he did not espouse the party of any doctrinal system; but, conformably to his office, took part, of course, with those who most rigidly observed the forms of law. Where the matter related to a conflict between arbitrary will and legal order, it was the duty of his office not to remain neutral.

But his neutrality alone would appear a crime in the eyes of the ambitious or fanatical bishops of the Cyrillian party. Still less could they pardon it in him, that he should adopt in earnest the cause of right, and send to Constantinople a report of their tyranny which was according to the truth. Since, then, these people looked upon everything with the eye of passion, and indulged themselves in the most abominable perversions of words and actions, in every sort of exaggeration, and even falsehood; we can give no confidence to what they report concerning the violent conduct of the man whom credible testimony represents to us as acting uniformly on the side of order and within the bounds of his commission.[1]

The bishop John of Antioch arrived at Ephesus with his companions, as he had promised, a few days after the organization of the assembly which had been formed by Cyrill. Although it may have been true,

[1] L. c. 1439.

[1] As is evident particularly from what the bishop Memnon of Ephesus reports in his manifestly lying letter to the clergy at Constantinople. Harduin. Concil. l. c. f. 1595.

as was reported by Memnon bishop of Ephesus, that the Cyrillian council had sent deputies to meet him to bid him welcome, and to inform him of what had been done, yet these assuredly did not conduct themselves in any way suited to make a favorable impression on him; and an arbitrary act like that which had just been consummated, admitted, in truth, of no palliation. John could not be otherwise than highly offended at it; and he was compelled, by the laws of the church and by the doctrinal principles which he advocated, to consider the proceedings of that council as without force, and to declare them so. It is true that he himself did not conduct, in this case, in the true spirit of prudence and moderation. He, with his bishops, — of whom there were but thirty, — and a few more, proceeded to form a new council, which considered itself to be the only regular one. The Cyrillian party found something particularly exceptionable and contrary to order in the fact, that so inconsiderable a minority should set themselves up as judges over so overwhelming a majority; but the patriarch John maintained that that majority could have no weight, since it was composed, for the most part, of bishops from Egypt and from Asia Minor, wholly dependent on Cyrill and Memnon. Candidian considered it his duty to present himself also before this party convention, as he had done before the previous one. He here made report of the conduct he had there observed: he read before them the imperial ordinance, which was addressed to the whole council, and then immediately withdrew. The council now passed sentence of deposition upon Cyrill and Memnon, and excommunicated the other members who took any part in the proceedings of that party assembly, until they should manifest penitence and condemn the anathemas of Cyrill. This sentence pronounced upon the two bishops they made known by posting it up publicly; and they drew up a report of it, which was sent to the emperor. In accordance therewith, they called upon the other bishops to separate themselves from Cyrill and Memnon, and to unite with them in forming a general council according to the imperial letters patent.

But Cyrill governed the collective body of the bishops with whom he had held the first council. Meantime the deputies of the Roman bishop arrived, who had received instructions to proceed in all respects according to the advice and will of Cyrill, yet at the same time to insist on the supreme judicial authority of the Roman church. If the synod fell into disputes, they should be mindful that it did not become them to take any share as a party in the controversy, but to pass judgment on the opinions expressed by the others.[1] These deputies, therefore, stuck closely throughout to the council of Cyrill: they requested the earlier proceedings to be read to them at one of its sessions, and signified their approbation of the whole. So this council

[1] The words of the *commonitorium*, which Cœlestin gave to his legates, were as follows: Ad fratrem et coëpiscopum nostrum Cyrillum consilium vestrum omne convertite, et quicquid in ejus videritis arbitrio, facietis. Et auctoritatem sedis apostolicæ custodiri debere mandamus. Ad disceptationem si fuerit ventum, vos de eorum sententiis judicare debetis, non subire certamen. Harduin. l. c. f. 1347.

now considered itself warranted to claim for itself the authority of the Roman bishop. On the presentation of a complaint to this party-council by Cyrill and Memnon, the patriarch John was in the customary form thrice summoned to appear before it, and defend his conduct; the penalties of the church being threatened in case of disobedience. But as John declined entering into any negociations with this council, — which he did not recognize as a regular one, but declared that, after he had made out his report in full to Constantinople, he should merely wait until he could receive from there leave to return home, — the council passed sentence on him and his associates, that they should in the first place be suspended from their episcopal and priestly functions, reserving the whole severity of the ecclesiastical laws to be employed against them, in case they did not alter their conduct.

Meanwhile the report of Candidian was producing the effect at Constantinople, which, if the fanaticism and intrigue of a court party had not stood in the way, must necessarily have resulted from it. On the 29th of June, the emperor sent a letter to the synod drawn up with impartiality and moderation, of which an imperial officer, the magistrianus Palladius, was made the bearer. The emperor censured in it the illegal conduct of the bishops, which had manifestly proceeded from passion, yet without designating any persons by name against whom this censure was particularly directed. He declared that he would approve only of the result of a deliberation on the disputed doctrine, instituted by the whole council in common. Another imperial commissioner of rank was to observe the course of proceedings in company with Candidian, and prevent any further steps contrary to law. Until then, no one of the bishops could be permitted to return home to his diocese, or to *visit the court*.[1] The emperor avowed that it was not so much the person of Nestorius or of any other individual, as the cause of truth, which lay near his heart.[2] The imperial messenger above mentioned must doubtless have been charged by the emperor — so important seemed to him this occasion — to hasten in every way his journey to Ephesus and his return to Constantinople; for the answer of the Cyrillian synod which he brought back, was dated the first of July. These bishops defended themselves therein against the reproach of passionate conduct; they persisted in maintaining, that Nestorius had been rightfully deposed on account of his erroneous doctrines; and they accused the count Candidian of having, out of partiality to Nestorius, given a false representation of the whole matter. A letter of this sort, however, would produce but little effect. Candidian's report to the emperor, which bore on its very face the impress of truth, furnished a ready key to explain the whole state of the case. Besides, the count Irenæus, who accompanied Nestorius to Ephesus, and had shown himself there to be a true friend, and many other persons of consideration at Constantinople, who were also his friends, warmly supported his cause. Cyrill was therefore obliged to resort to other means, to turn

[1] It is easy to see, that there were reasons for apprehending the last, particularly from the members of the Cyrillian party.

[2] L. c. Harduin, f. 1539.

the balance in his favor. He could reckon upon the ignorant, fanatical zealots among the monks of that city. Among these was an Archimandrite by the name of Dalmatius, who stood in the highest consideration. For eight and forty years he had never left the cell in which he had immured himself! The emperor himself had occasionally visited him there, to ask for his intercessions. But he had sometimes besought him in vain — on the occurrence of earthquakes, which frequently filled Constantinople with alarm — to leave his solitude, and take part in the public penitential processions.[1] We may presume that the new patriarch from the Antiochian school had already from the first been represented to this monk, by Alexandrian influence, as a dangerous teacher of error; for, after the arrival of Nestorius, he was wont to say to those who visited him in his cell: "Take heed to yourselves, my brethren; for an evil beast has come into this city, and he may injure many by his doctrines.[2]" This person, then, Cyrill contrived to rouse to action in favor of his own party and aims, by giving him an account of the sentence of deposition passed upon Nestorius, and of the sufferings of the defenders of the true faith on that account. This story Dalmatius received through a letter addressed to the bishops and monks residing at Constantinople, which a beggar brought to that city, concealed in a hollow reed; — whether the truth was that Cyrill, as he pretended, was obliged to resort to this shift, in order to have the letter safely reach its destination, because the men who sought to frustrate Cyrill's plots took pains to intercept his communications to the clergy and monks at Constantinople; — or whether it was that the necessity of employing such means was a mere pretence, contrived for the purpose of heating the minds of his partisans by such evidence of the oppression to which he was subjected. Might we suppose that the bearer of the letter was no beggar, but a bishop in the disguise of one, we should then see another motive for resorting to this species of secret communication; — the bearer who was to visit Constantinople unperceived, under this disguise, would doubtless be entrusted with the execution of other oral commissions.

This message, then, set the whole party of zealous monks in commotion. Dalmatius imagined himself summoned by a voice from heaven to come forth from his solitude of eight and forty years, in order to save the churches from the great threatening danger. All the monks and abbots forsook their cloisters, and, chanting psalms with alternate choirs, marched in procession with burning torches, Dalmatius at their head, to the palace of the emperor. A procession of this sort could not

[1] Harduin. l. c. f. 1587.

[2] L. c. 1447. This Dalmatius was a writer at one of the imperial bureaus, σχολάριος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ σχολῇ, and had a wife and children, — when, through the influence of a venerated monk, Isacios, he was induced to become a monk. He obtained great influence, was frequently called upon to settle quarrels among citizens, as is told in the Greek history of his life, published by Banduri, in the second volume of his imperium orientale. When the new patriarchs entered upon their office, it was the custom for them first to visit and pay their respects to Dalmatius, in his cell. But Nestorius, according to this account, had not been admitted to him. It is easy to see what advantage Cyrill might gain by securing such an instrument.

fail to set the people all in a ferment, and to spread the alarm far and wide, that the true faith was in imminent jeopardy; and hence vast multitudes of the people joined the procession. The abbots were summoned to an audience in the palace, while the crowds of monks and of the people remained standing before it, chanting in their choirs. Dalmatius addressed the emperor before a crowded court, in the same bold and confident tone in which he was wont to converse with him. He handed over to him the letter of the synod; and the weak emperor said, if the case stood thus, the bishops might have leave to come from Ephesus. But Dalmatius complained, that of the other party, as many as pleased were permitted to come to Constantinople: on the other hand, whoever of the Cyrillian synod wished to come were detained in custody. He asked the emperor, in his usual style, to whom he would give ear, — the six thousand bishops, or *one* godless man; and got him to promise that the Cyrillian party should be permitted to send deputies to Constantinople. When Dalmatius announced to the assembled crowd that a favorable answer had been received from the emperor, the whole procession, singing songs of praise from the 150th Psalm, moved forward to a church, where Dalmatius was to read the letter of the synod, and give an account of his audience. After the letter had been read, the assembled people shouted with one voice, "Anathema to Nestorius." Also the address of Dalmatius to them was followed by an equally loud anathema.[2]

Upon this, the Cyrillian party sent three bishops to Constantinople; and it soon became evident what an ascendant influence the artifices of these men had succeeded in acquiring. Some who had been till now the favorers of Nestorius, among the rest the imperial chamberlain Scholasticus, were so wrought upon as to join the party against him; it being represented, by the wilful perversion of some of his familiar remarks in conversation, that he was no longer willing to tolerate the application of the term θεότοκος to Mary. Nestorius deemed it necessary, therefore, to clear himself from these aspersions. He assured Scholasticus, that his views on that point continued to be precisely the same as those he had constantly professed at Constantinople; that he considered the union of the two designations of Mary, θεότοκος and ἀνθρωπότοκος, in their different references, to be the mark and badge of perfect orthodoxy. He commended in him his solicitude for the maintenance of the true faith. Were this — he added — but secured, he would joyfully resign the episcopal dignity. In any such case, his friend might regard the present letter as one in which he took leave of him; for glad would he be to return back to his old cloister-life, since he knew of nothing higher or more blessed than such tranquillity. And well might it be that Nestorius, after so much sorrowful experience of a turbulent, distracted, and care-worn life, sincerely longed after his former silent and tranquil retirement.

[1] The question arises, how much truth lay at the bottom of this story; — whether it was only a contrivance to inflame the zeal of Dalmatius, or whether it was the fact that several bishops, who had come to Constantinople for the purpose of exciting disturbances, had been justly arrested.

[2] L. c. f. 1587.

The Asiatic bishops who were still assembled at Ephesus had meanwhile, with a view to counteract the influence of the Cyrillian party, prevailed on the comes Irenæus, the old friend of Nestorius, to repair to Constantinople with a letter with which they furnished him. He arrived there three days after the arrival of the Cyrillian bishops; and must soon perceive, that the latter had been well received by the nobles and higher officers of state, and had been successful in their efforts to weaken the effect of Candidian's report. He labored earnestly to counteract their influence at court; he prevailed upon the emperor, with his chief ministers of state, to grant a common audience to him and the Egyptian deputies, and listen to the representations of both parties. He succeeded in convincing the emperor, as he writes in the journal of his commission, that the party of Cyrill had proceeded in a way directly contrary to law, so that the emperor was already on the very point of confirming the judgment of the second assembly held under the auspices of the patriarch John, and of threatening additional punishments to the bishops deposed by that body. But the feeble sovereign was the mere tool of court-parties, who were themselves in turn exposed to manifold influences from without. Soon after, the physician John, secretary [1] of the patriarch Cyrill, came on a visit to Constantinople; and this person soon found means of giving the whole business an entirely different turn. Now, the different opinions prevailing at court became manifest. Some, whose hearts were solely bent on the restoration of quiet, desired, in order that this might be obtained in the simplest way, that no inquiry should be made as to the right or wrong of either party; but that, to satisfy all parties, all three of the bishops should be deposed. Others proposed that the sentences of both sides should be annulled, and that deputies should be sent for from Ephesus for the purpose of discovering through them the real course which matters had taken, and of learning to which side the charge of illegal conduct ought to be laid. Many who favored Cyrill's party endeavored to procure, that they themselves might be sent to Ephesus, with full powers to inquire into the whole matter on the spot.[2]

The party of Cyrill, however, could not as yet obtain the victory: the influence of the moderate class at court was still, as it would seem, too powerful for them. For the present, the plan first mentioned was adopted; and an individual who would have been by no means the choice of the Cyrillian party, since he had no disposition to serve as the tool of a church or theological sect, John, the ministerial secretary of state, (comes sacrarum,) was sent to Ephesus. He arrived in that city with an imperial letter of commission, (sacra,) in which it was commanded, that all the three bishops deposed by the synods should remain deposed; and in which the members of the council were exhorted to lay by their mutual strifes, that they might be prepared to return in peace and concord to their several dioceses.

The count John faithfully maintained the position which he was bound to maintain as a minister of the state, acting on the same princi-

[1] Συγκελλός. Without doubt an ecclesiastic, as in this period physicians are not rarely to be met with among the clergy. [2] The letter of Irenæus. L. c. 1548.

ples as Candidian had done, — without whose concurrence, moreover, he took no step whatever. He first invited all the bishops to a meeting in his own apartments, where he wished to read over to them the imperial commission. But here he became witness of a most vehement contest between the two parties.[1] When the greatest part of the day had already been spent in these disputes, he unceremoniously interfered with the authority of force. Nestorius and Cyrill he removed at once. To the rest he read the imperial letter; and, for the purpose of carrying it into effect, and preventing disturbances, he committed the three deposed bishops to a respectable and safe custody. After this, he labored in every way to restore peace between the two parties. John of Antioch and his associates manifested at once a ready and willing disposition for this. They were prepared to submit to the emperor's decision, which approved the decrees of both the synods; and they were inclined to come to an agreement with the other party, provided the latter would but agree to condemn the anathemas of Cyrill. But the party of Cyrill was by no means so compliant. The person of their leader was to them of much more importance than the person of Nestorius to their opponents. They would listen to no terms of agreement, unless the other party retracted every thing, manifested their repentance to the synod, which they considered themselves alone to be, and condemned, in writing, Nestorius and his doctrines. These things the other party of course could not consent to do. As the count was extremely anxious to convey the news to Constantinople, that he had succeeded in getting the victory over the passions of the bishops, and of uniting them on terms of peace, he sought now to enter at least into negotiations for the drawing up of a common confession of faith. But neither would the Egyptian party be persuaded to engage in anything of this kind.[2] The Orientals had been accused, in the rumors industriously circulated against them by their opponents at Constantinople, of wishing to deprive Mary of the honor of being called θεότοκος. The emperor had expressly charged the count John to get them to declare themselves on this point. Thus they were led to draw up a confession of faith, in which, after distinguishing with precision the two natures in Christ, they declared that, as confession was made of one Son of God, one Lord, and one Christ, in the sense of a union without confusion of the two natures; so too, in the same sense,[3] Mary was called the mother of God, because Christ, from the time of the conception, united with himself the temple he had assumed.[4] This confession of faith was

[1] He says himself, in his letter to the emperor: Magna facta est seditio, immo prœlium et pugna.

[2] See their own declaration, l. c. 1594.

[3] Secundum hunc inconfusæ unionis intellectum. See epistola Johannis, in the Synodicon published by Lupus, (see above,) c. 17; Lupus opera, T. VII. f. 56.

[4] There may, indeed, have been some grounds for the assertion of the Cyrillian synod, in their report to their partisans at Constantinople, that, in drawing up this confession of faith, there was schism among the Orientals themselves, as all were not satisfied with this retention of the word θεότοκος. That this was a correct assertion, is evident from a letter addressed to Theodoret by Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, who was present at Ephesus during these proceedings, in Lupus, l. c. 94. Also to be found in operib. Theodoreti ed. Halens. IV. p. 745. This zealous advocate of the Syrian church doctrines sees, in the compliant disposition which was then so

laid before the emperor in a letter which the patriarch John wrote him in the name of the synod.

But as the count John now saw that all his pains to effect the restoration of peace were defeated by the pride and passion of the Cyrillian party; as he was accused by them of party proceedings, and of dispatching false reports to Constantinople, he finally called upon the emperor himself to send for deputies from both parties, and enter personally into an investigation of the whole matter.

This proposal was adopted, and eight bishops from each of the two parties were summoned as deputies to Constantinople. Soon after their departure from Ephesus, Nestorius received there a letter from the pretorian prefect, by which he was informed, in answer to his own previous letter, (see above,) that the emperor had given all the orders necessary for his returning back, in the most convenient and desirable manner, to his cloister. In this letter there appears no trace of an unfriendly feeling towards Nestorius. The prefect concluded by saying, that with his wisdom, and treasure of inward goods, he stood in no need of condolence. But it is plainly to be seen, that it was believed impossible to retain him any longer in the patriarchate in opposition to the hatred and the power of that party, which, by Cyrill's intrigues at court, had been formed against Nestorius among the nobles and among the monks at Constantinople.[1] Nestorius, weary of these harassing cares, gladly availed himself of the conceded permission, and, in his answer to the prefect, only commended to him the care of maintaining pure doctrine. But the contest, which was no longer connected barely with the person of Nestorius, could not be hushed by his removal. On the contrary, the rupture became now more decidedly expressed, when, on the removal of Nestorius, Memnon and Cyrill were again restored to their offices.

It soon became manifest, that the feeble emperor meant to act impartially, but was ever hurried along from one step to another by the Cyrillian party, which exerted its influence through the monks, the clergy, and the courtiers. When the deputies of the two parties arrived at Chalcedon, they were directed to remain there, and not come to Constantinople, because apprehensions were entertained of a movement among the monks. At a later period, however, the deputies of the other party obtained leave to visit Constantinople; while, on the other hand, this liberty was withheld from the Oriental delegates. The bishop of Chalcedon stood in alliance with the Cyrillian party; and to its deputies he gave up all the churches which they desired for the purpose of holding worship in them. But the Orientals were excluded

generally manifested, the incipient intrigues of a party who were ready to give up the truth; and he reminds his friend Theodoret, how strenuously he then resisted these measures. Memor est sanctitas tua, quod nec ullo pertulerim eis communicare consilio, de epistola, quæ apud Ephesum facta est . . . . vox hæc (theotocos) ad proditionem et calumniam illius, qui rectam fidem docebat (*Nestorii*) inserta est.

[1] The well-informed bishop, Ibas of Edessa, writes on this subject in his letter to Maris: Νεστόριος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἐμισεῖτο παρὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν μεγάλων τῶν ὄντων ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐκεῖ ὑποστρέψαι οὐκ ἠθυνήθη. It is certain, however, that Nestorius still had a large party in his favor in the church, as appears from the later events.

from the churches; yet they managed to procure a suitable room, where Theodoret preached before a large audience.[1] The favorable reception they met with from the people excited to a still higher degree the jealousy of the ferocious monks, by whom the Orientals and their attendants were attacked with stones, several of them not escaping without wounds.[2] The emperor, at an audience which he gave them at the villa of Rufianus, reproached them with having excited these disturbances by their church assemblies. They now petitioned the emperor to allow them the same justice which the count John had shown at Ephesus, and to forbid the bishops of both parties from holding divine worship, until they could come to some mutual agreement. To this the weak emperor replied: "I cannot command *the bishops*." "Well, then," rejoined the bishops, "pray do not command us."

They found, as they declared in their letter written from Chalcedon, the higher magistrates all committed in favor of the creed of Cyrill, having been corrupted either by his gold or by his flatteries. Pulcheria also may have succeeded by this time in rendering her brother thoroughly hostile to the man towards whom he had before been so favorably disposed; so that, when the subject of his restoration was pressed at the emperor's privy council, the very suggestion of such a measure appeared like high treason.[3] The emperor himself said: "Let no one speak to me *of him*: I have had enough of him already."[4] But the Oriental synod at Ephesus had the courage to write to the emperor, that, although Nestorius might a thousand times flee from the turmoils of strife, and prefer the life of a private man; yet, in order that the faith might receive no detriment, it was no whit the less necessary that the illegal sentence of deposition passed upon him by the party who would introduce Cyrill's heretical anathemas, should be annulled. As the Oriental deputies, after five pretended audiences, saw doubtless that their longer residence near the court would be to no purpose, they petitioned the emperor, that at least, if an impartial investigation was not to be had, they might themselves be suffered to depart from Chalcedon, and the other bishops from Ephesus. This the emperor granted, but by a decision which, to the Orientals, could not appear otherwise than as an act of unjust and arbitrary will. The sentence of deposition pronounced on Nestorius was suffered to remain valid; but Cyrill — who in the mean time had been allowed to visit Constantinople, where his influence was unbounded — and Memnon, were permitted to return to their dioceses. "Thus the Egyptian," said the Orientals, writing from Chalcedon, "will have it in his power to corrupt every one with his gifts, so as to return, after having done numberless wrongs, to his episcopal seat, while that innocent man can scarcely make good his escape to his cloister." Yet the hatred to Nestorius, and the power of Cyrill's party, to which the emperor himself succumbed, seems

[1] See the letter of Theodoret to Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis. Theodoret. l. c. IV. 1568.

[2] In the second report to the emperor, they name as their assailants, servos monachorum habitu indutos; i. e. perhaps, not slaves disguised as monks, but such as had once been slaves, but had become monks.

[3] Defectionis notabamur.

[4] De hoc mihi nullus loquatur, specimen enim semel dedit. L. c. 1568.

to have had far more influence upon him than any preference for the Egyptian system of doctrines. It continued still to be his wish that the two parties might be brought to an agreement on the disputed points of doctrine, and that in this way peace might once more be restored to the church. In announcing to the Cyrillian party at Ephesus that they were discharged from the council, he gave them to understand that if peace had not been restored, it was no fault of his; but God would know who were to blame. He would never be induced to condemn the Orientals, for they had been convicted in his hearing of no guilt; as none had been willing to enter with them into any theological investigation, — a reproach which must have been meant for the Cyrillian party, who had avoided all discussion with the others.

The negotiations set on foot by the tribune and notary Aristolaos, one of the great officers of state, seemed at first to be beset with many difficulties, as the demands of the two parties were so directly opposed to each other. The Orientals required from Cyrill a condemnation of his anathemas; but Cyrill refused to give them up. On the other hand, he persisted in requiring that the Orientals should approve the condemnatory sentence pronounced on the person and on the doctrines of Nestorius, and should consent to the ordination of the new patriarch at Constantinople.

But much as Nestorius was disliked at the imperial court, and firmly as all were resolved that he should not again be allowed to be patriarch, yet there was little disposition to support Cyrill in his quarrel with the Syrian doctrines. On the contrary, the dogmatic stiffness of Cyrill was regarded as the cause of the continued divisions in the church, and men were well inclined to demand that he should sacrifice his anathemas in order to preserve the peace of the church. Cyrill was obliged to resort to many of his wonted arts, to summon to his aid all the influence of Pulcheria, of the chamberlains, and court ladies in his alliance, as well as of the abbots at Constantinople; he was obliged to cause large sums of money to be distributed at court, funds which he found it impossible to collect without burdening his churches with debt, in order to gain over the hostilely disposed nobles, and to reänimate the zeal of others for his party;[1] and yet, with all these intrigues, he could not

[1] Cyrill's method of proceeding in such cases is, for the most part, disclosed by the letter of his archdeacon and syncell, Epiphanius, of which letter we have spoken before, and for the preservation of which we are indebted to the Synodicon, so often mentioned, c. 203. Theodoret. T. V. ep. 173. This letter is addressed to the patriarch Maximianus, of Constantinople. It is here said, Cyrill had written to Pulcheria, to several cubicularios and cubicularias. Et directæ sunt benedictiones (*εὐλογία*, presents) such as were worthy of them. An attempt was made to gain over one of the chief chamberlains, Chrysoretes, who was hostilely disposed, by sending him magnificent presents, ut tandem desisteret ab oppugnatione ecclesiæ. The patriarch of Constantinople was requested to entreat Pulcheria, ut iterum ponat animam suam pro Domino Christo, puto enim, quod nunc non satis curet pro Cyrillo, ut et omnes, qui sunt in palatio regis. The patriarch was to give them whatever their avarice demanded, (so I would restore the sense according to a probably necessary emendation of the Latin text,) although they had already received presents enough, (et quicquid avaritiæ eorum deest, præsta iis, quanquam non desint et ipsis diversæ benedictiones,) that Pulcheria might be induced to write emphatically to the patriarch John, that no further mention must be made of that godless man (Nestorius.) Various influential court ladies were to be called upon to coöperate towards the same end. The abbot

succeed in inducing an individual to lend him any hand in pressing his anathemas upon the other party. On the contrary, he felt himself obliged to adopt towards them a milder language, which could not be honorably meant on his part.[1]

On the other hand, the patriarch John of Antioch was not disposed to defend any longer the cause of Nestorius against the hatred which ever continued to be more strongly expressed against him at the court at Constantinople. To maintain the more moderate Antiochian system of faith, i.e. the doctrine of the real distinction of the two natures in opposition to the Egyptian Monophysitism, was the point of greatest interest with him. Cyrill now doubtless understood that it would be necessary for him to purchase the acquiescence of the Orientals in the condemnation of Nestorius, and their consent to the ordination of the new patriarch Maximianus at Constantinople, by yielding something on his own side in articles of doctrine. If the Orientals could once be brought practically to recognize as valid the judgment pronounced by the council of Cyrill, the approbation of the doctrinal principles on which this judgment was based would easily follow, and by degrees everything at variance with the Egyptian system of doctrine might be declared to be a Nestorian heresy. The negotiations of a certain bishop Paul of Emesa, who came to Alexandria as a deputy of the Orientals, contributed in a special manner to bring about an agreement which had been prepared in this way; for he himself took particular pains to further the matter, as he was very solicitous for the honor of being the author of peace, and for this reason promised more than he was warranted to do by his instructors. Thus Cyrill was exempted from the necessity of expressly recalling his anathemas; and, on the other hand, he was induced to subscribe a confession of faith laid before him by the bishop Paulus, which was in no respect different from that which had been set forth by the patriarch John at the council of Ephesus in the name of the Orientals, to vindicate their orthodoxy, (see above,[2]) by which the title "mother of God" was applied to Mary in

Dalmatius (see above) must protest earnestly before the emperor and the chamberlains, in the name of religion, so as to alarm their consciences. Sanctissimum Dalmatium abbatem roga, ut et imperatori mandet, terribili eum conjuratione constringens, et ut cubicularios omnes constringat, ne illius memoria ulterius fiat. It is worthy of notice, that even the abbot Eutyches, whose name afterwards became so famous, and who, it would appear therefore, was one of the tools of the Cyrillian party, was here called upon to act. Appended to the letter there was a list of persons to whom presents had been sent from Alexandria, that the patriarch of Constantinople might see how much the Alexandrian church had interested itself in his cause, (for it was only in case the sentence of deposition against Nestorius continued valid, that he could retain his office,) in so much that the clergy at Alexandria mourned over the poverty brought by these troubles upon the Alexandrian church. Neither should he, on his own part, be sparing of the property of his church, to satisfy the avarice of those who troubled the church at Alexandria. The patriarch should without delay beseech Pulcheria, that Lausius might be made lord chamberlain, so that the power of Chrysoretes might be destroyed, et sic dogma nostrum roboretur. Such were the artifices of episcopal intrigue.

[1] L. c. Quicquid videtur reprehensibile esse, zelo et calore circa Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui abnegatus sit a Nestorio, dictum esse. Or that the anathemas contained a doctrine which could not be comprehended by every one, but only by the more practised. See ep. 98, T. V. Theodoret.

[2] Theodoret has been named, without any sufficient reasons, as the author of this confession.

the sense that two natures were united in Christ, while each still remained pure and unmixed in its individuality. On the other hand, the patriarch John acquiesced in the condemnation of Nestorius, and recognized the ordination which had been consummated by the Cyrillian party as good and valid.

This compact, struck in the year 432, which was a mere work of policy, and not the result of any reconciliation of doctrinal antagonisms in a natural and harmonious manner, experienced the usual fate of such outward and artificial combinations. *In concealing the schism which still continued to exist within, it merely served to call forth new divisions.* The men of both parties who regarded the dogmatic interest as of greater importance than the political, were dissatisfied with it. Cyrill was accused by the zealots of his own party of betraying those doctrines which he had, till now, opposed to Nestorianism. And not without reason; for Nestorius himself would doubtless have been induced to recognize the predicate θεότοκος applied to Mary, in the sense of such a union of the two natures as was denoted in the confession which lay at the basis of the agreement. Cyrill was able to defend himself against this accusation, only by alleging, first, that by severing, as he had already done before, the single positions of Nestorius from their connection with his whole system, he made an entirely different thing of Nestorianism from what it actually was; next, that he had artfully contrived to introduce into the distinction-theory of the creed which he had subscribed, a sense remote from that which was intended by its authors. What was said, for example, concerning the distinction of the two natures, he explained as follows: that it held good only of the distinction of the divine and human predicates; both of which, however, were to be referred to the one incarnate nature of the Logos; so that, in abstracto, two natures would be, indeed, distinguished from each other; but, in concreto, only one nature was to be recognized.[1] He attributed to the Antiochians, that he might be able to explain himself in agreement with them, a doctrine directly at variance with their entire system, that the *one* Christ consisted of two natures distinguishable *in conception*, but not of two natures distinguishable *in reality*.[2] Cyrill again, in order to defend himself with those who missed here the exactness of doctrinal expression, alluded to the great difficulty in general of finding suitable expressions for such matters in human language.[3] But this observation must have prevented him, if other motives and interests had not been at work at that time, from passing so severe a judgment on the expressions of Nestorius.

[1] Cyrill, ep. ad Acacium. Ὡς ἐν ἐννοίαις δεχόμενοι, δύο μὲν φύσεις ἡνῶσθαι φάμεν, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἕνωσιν, ὡς ἀνῃρημένης ἡδὴ τῆς εἰς δύο διατομῆς, μίαν πιστεύομεν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ φύσιν.

[2] Οἱ δὲ γε κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν ἀδελφοὶ τὰ μὲν ἐξ ὧν νοεῖται ὁ Χρίστος, ὡς ἐν ψιλαῖς καὶ μόναις ἐννοίαις δεχόμενοι, φύσεων μὲν εἰρήκασι διάφοραν.

[3] Εἰ γὰρ τισὶ δόκει τῶν λέξεων ἡ συνθήκη καὶ τῶν νοημάτων ἡ πρόφορα τῆς ἴσχνης ἄγαν ἀκριβείας ἀπολιμπανέσθαι, θαυμάστον οὐδὲν δυσεκφωνήτα γὰρ τὰ τοιάδε λίαν. When he adduces, in proof of this, the words of the prayer, Ephes. 6: 19, he shows again his habit of confounding what properly belongs to the simple preaching of the gospel, with what belongs to the development of doctrinal conceptions

The same Cyrill had, at an earlier period, during the negotiations with Aristolaus for a settlement of the differences, offered in excuse of his anathemas which were to be censured as heretical, that he had written what appeared so censurable, only from a glowing zeal for the Christ denied by Nestorius (see above.) If this were honestly said, if it was not a mere subterfuge of theological chicanery, yet the same could also have been alleged in this reference as an excuse for Nestorius. What to Cyrill appeared a denial of Christ, proceeded on the part of Nestorius, and on the principles which he maintained, only from a well-meant zeal for the honor of Christ, believing as he did that the Cyrillian mode of expression involved a denial of the divine immutability.

A still greater dissatisfaction than this which existed among the advocates of the Egyptian system of faith, was excited by the above-mentioned agreement, among the zealous adherents of the Antiochian scheme of doctrine. A doctrinal interest which overvalued the importance of precise dogmatic conceptions, was not less predominant among the latter than among the Alexandrians ; and the interest in behalf of the dogmatic notions had vastly more influence with many of them, than any sympathy which they felt in the case of their friend Nestorius suffering under the oppression of despotic will. As the Alexandrians saw everywhere the spectre of Photinianism, so, on the other hand, the Antiochian dogmatists saw everywhere the spectre of Apollinarianism, which seemed to them to rise up again in the system of Cyrill. To receive back Cyrill to the fellowship of the church appeared to them as frightful an enormity, as if they should receive into the same fellowship Apollinaris himself.[1] Alexander of Hierapolis thought it intolerable, that a monk, whose life he himself must confess was in accordance with the gospel, should be named in the prayer at the altar as one remaining in the communion of the church ; and he gave himself no rest, as he informs us, until this practice was abolished.[2]

Among those who in the Syrian church disapproved of this coalition, there was still manifested, however, a difference of judgment, according as they were disposed generally by natural temperament either to moderation or to extravagant zeal ; and according as they had seized the

[1] We have a graphic illustration of this in a dream, which the bishop Andreas of Samosata, who also was, in the outset, a zealous opponent of the Cyrillian treaty of agreement, relates concerning himself. He dreamed that, in an assembly of other bishops, his friend, the bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, told him that the heretic Apollinaris was still living. Andreas, in astonishment, asked him several times whether this was really so, and Alexander assured him that it was. All at once they entered a house, where Apollinaris, now extremely aged, lay upon a bed. And as they were about taking their seats by the bedside, he arose and distributed the elements of the supper. The patriarch John lay in the bed, and received the elements from his hand, and then next Alexander himself. But Andreas of Samosata said indignantly to himself: "What accommodation to circumstances is this? It is a sin against the Holy Ghost. It is trifling with the incarnation of our Lord." With these words he awoke, and gave earnest expression to the wish that this dream might not after all prove true — in other words, that Apollinaris of Alexandria, who had reäppeared, so to speak, in Cyrill, might not bring over all to his own views. Ep. 48, l. c. 706.

[2] L. c. ep. 145, p. 823.

system of doctrine taught by Theodore of Mopsuestia in a more stern and exclusive, or in a more mild and tolerant manner. The former, such as Theodoret and Andreas of Samosata, were, it is true, satisfied, on the whole, with the doctrinal explanations of Cyrill. They doubtless rejoiced, too, and saw in it the governing hand of divine grace, that Cyrill had been constrained to distinguish two natures in Christ, and to acknowledge that his sufferings belonged to the flesh, and that the deity was exalted above suffering.[1] Although it may unquestionably be gathered from the whole process of the matter, as we have described it, that in this case, where everything proceeded solely on grounds of impure worldly policy, there was no occasion for such joy, and for such praise of the divine providence; since the supposition last named, that the deity was capable of suffering, had indeed never once entered Cyrill's thoughts, and the former distinction was, in fact, merely an outward accommodation in terms, which Cyrill employed in a different sense from that which was intended by his opponents.

But neither in the sentence of deposition passed on Nestorius, nor in the condemnation of his doctrines, did they believe they could acquiesce with a good conscience. "So vaguely to condemn the doctrine of Nestorius," said Theodoret, "was nothing more nor less than to condemn the doctrine of piety."[2] The patriarch John had, it is true, in his letter to the emperor, in which he declared his consent to the agreement, no doubt purposely expressed himself in such a way as that he could refer the condemnation, not to the *whole doctrine* of Nestorius, but only to that which he had taught *foreign from the apostolic doctrine;*[3] — in which sense, one might, indeed, unhesitatingly subscribe the condemnation of every human doctrine. But this very indefiniteness in a dogmatic explanation appeared to the more rigid among the Orientals as a dishonorable subterfuge;[4] and they could the less be satisfied with it, because they were well aware in what sense Cyrill interpreted what had been left undetermined. On the other hand, Theodoret offered to subscribe any form of condemnation, by which men might be distinctly placed on their guard against the charges commonly brought against the Antiochian system of doctrine — a sentence of condemnation against those who divided the one Lord Jesus Christ into two Sons, and those who denied his divinity.[5]

But the acquiescence in the sentence of deposition on Nestorius appeared to them to be an unjustifiable wrong. It seemed to them a contradiction to pardon the man who had been constantly sowing dis-

[2] Theodoret. ep. 73, l. c. Naturarum differentiam clara prædicant vocc, et passiones carni coaptantes, impassibilem divinam confirmant esse naturam.

[2] Ep. 50. Quod indeterminate anathematizare Nestorii doctrinam, idem sit, quod anathematizare pietatem.

[3] Quæcunque ab eo aliene ac peregrine dicta sunt contra apostolicam doctrinam. His words in the letter to the emperor, and the commentary of Theodoret, ep. 128. Anathematismus non indefinite, sed cum quadam determinatione positus, modicam quandam præbet consolationem.

[4] See the letter of the Orientals to the Roman bishop Sixtus, in the Synodicon, published by Lupus, c. 117. They say of the patriarch John: Sic et accusatione ac demonstratione defecit, ut nec diceret, illam sive illam anathematizo sententiam, sed ait: quidquid ab eo impie dictum est. Dum certe aperte dicere debuisset, ut ab eo sensu quisque cautior redderetur.

[5] Ep. 50, p. 708.

cord, and who had at last with difficulty been brought to assent to the orthodox confession, but to sacrifice him who from his youth up had taught the same right doctrine. They declared that they could consent to the unjust and wicked sentence of the holy bishop, neither with hand, tongue, nor heart.[1] These declarations of Theodoret had, however, been so construed, as if he had proved unfaithful to the conviction earlier expressed by him; as though he had yielded through the fear of man, and to preserve his bishopric, and for this reason had acknowledged the formula subscribed by Cyrill to be satisfactory. This suspicion against Theodoret having been excited by some persons in the mind of Nestorius himself, the former wrote him a letter in defence of his conduct.[2] "Very gladly," he said, "would he lay down an office which he found burdened with so many cares, and make his retreat to the cloister. Nestorius, therefore, ought not to allow himself to be persuaded, that, from love to his bishopric, he had received with his eye shut the letter of Cyrill as in correspondence with the true faith. He could not say otherwise, consistently with the truth, than that he had not found anything in it which was heretical; although he, no less than others, detested, in the author of that letter, the disturber of the general peace. And he hoped and trusted, that on this score no punishment awaited him at the day of judgment, since the just Judge looked upon the heart. "But to the measures," he added, "which unrighteously and wickedly have been set on foot against you, I will not be induced to give my consent, even though they should cut off both my hands; for I hope that the divine grace will aid me, and strengthen the weakness of my soul."

But the zealots of this party, such as Alexander of Hierapolis, and Meletius of Mopsuestia, were not satisfied that even so much should be yielded as had already been done. They still persisted in demanding of Cyrill an express revocation of his anathemas. They could see nothing in Cyrill's letter but his old erroneous doctrine artfully concealed. And when the above-cited letter, in which he had vindicated himself to his friends against the reproach of denying his previous convictions, came to their knowledge, sufficient proof was unquestionably furnished them, to turn to shame the triumph of the patriarch John over the conversion of Cyrill.[3] As they had already, at the council of Ephesus, declared against the unconditional application of the predicate θεότοκος to Mary, so, too, they were dissatisfied with the new application of the term according to the articles of agreement there drawn up. The bishop Alexander, in declaring his dissent, proceeded on the ground of a distinction between the *homoletic* and the strictly dogmatical use of language, which we have already noticed as constituting a distinguishing characteristic of the Syrian church-teachers. "We cannot complain," he writes, "of those preachers who in their festival discourses may have imprudently called Mary the mother of God, or the Jews, God's murderers, and the like; which may have been said by orthodox men in an unsuspicious manner; for the very reason that it

[1] Ep. 59. [2] Ep. 102. [3] See the letters of Meletius, ep. 76 and ep. 121. [4] Ep. 78.

was in nowise their intention thereby to define doctrines. But it was quite otherwise with a strict form of dogmatic expression, and especially after Cyrill, in his anathemas, had expressed the erroneous doctrine which served to give currency to this predicate, and by the same document had spread it far and wide." These bishops, for the reasons just stated, not only rejected the agreement concluded upon, and not only continued therefore to consider Cyrill as excluded from the communion of the church, but they also excommunicated those who had received that agreement. A whole synod, in Cilicia Secunda, passed a decree of this sort; the members declaring they were ready to suffer anything, rather than enter into fellowship with error or with the teachers of error. The patriarch John might doubtless have been able, by moderate conduct, to gain over the more mildly disposed among the Orientals, if he had refrained from urging upon them an acquiescence in the sentence which deposed Nestorius, — the course actually pursued afterwards; but, by the vehemence with which he conducted towards all opponents, he alienated from him even this more moderate class.

The patriarch John took occasion, from these disputes, to indulge himself in many encroachments on the administration of affairs in foreign dioceses; he furthered the promotion of unworthy men, disposed to serve him as his instruments, to episcopal stations which he had no authority to fill. Thus he made himself hated, and thus it was his own fault that the party of his opponents augmented, and the worthiest bishops of Syria withdrew from all fellowship with him. A schism followed not only in the Antiochian church diocese, but also in other parts of the Eastern church, which were subject to the patriarch of Constantinople. The discontented from all quarters attached themselves to the opposition party of Eastern Asia; and thus was formed an association of bishops who stood opposed to the three patriarchs of the East. To the same circle belonged the bishops of that portion of Syria which touches on the Euphrates, of the two provinces of Cilicia, of Cappadocia Secunda, of Bithynia, Thessaly, and Mœsia.[1]

Meanwhile, notwithstanding all the pains of the Cyrillian party, the memory of Nestorius had not been wholly effaced from the minds of his devoted community at Constantinople. This became evident after the death of the patriarch Maximianus in 433. In many parts of the city, vast multitudes assembled, and with loud shouts demanded Nestorius again for their bishop; threatening, unless he were restored to them, to set fire to the patriarchal church.[2] Yet such movements in favor of a man once hated by the dominant court party could do him no service, but, on the contrary, only tend to excite still more the rage of his enemies, who grudged him such love of the people. In the manner in which the vacant patriarchate was once more filled, appeared the influence of the party opposed to Nestorius; for that very Proclus who had first stood forth as his opponent (see above) was

[1] See the letter written in the name of these schismatic bishops to the Roman bishop, Sixtus II., in Lupus, l. c. c. 117.

[2] Procli Synodica, l. c. 805.

named patriarch; and this man leagued himself with Cyrill and John of Antioch, to enforce everywhere the recognition of the agreement struck between the church of Eastern Asia and that of Egypt, which had been made the basis of the peace of the church. The patriarch John, who by this alliance obtained great power, resorted at first to means of benevolence, to presents and pecuniary aid, for the purpose of gaining over the poor churches of Syria, which were burdened with debts;[1] and next, where he could not accomplish his ends in *this* way, he tried to intimidate by threats. All being to no purpose, he exerted himself to procure an imperial edict against the obstinate bishops. Already he had contrived, by bribing the quæstor Domitian, to obtain such a decree; but those bishops whom it was wished to expel, stood so high in the esteem of their communities, that the execution of such measures against them might draw after it very disastrous consequences. The pretorian prefect Taurus represented to the emperor, that the cities would be ruined, and that the empire, otherwise (by the bad management of its resources) growing impoverished every day, would here also lose one source of its revenues;[2] and the execution of the imperial ordinance was therefore put off for the present. The quæstor who had obtained this ordinance for the patriarchs, in the mean time resorted to a trick, in order to induce the Syrian bishops to yield. He informed them that this ordinance was signed by the emperor, and was to be published, but that he had for awhile withheld its publication, in order to see whether they might not be induced to compliance by arguments, before it should be necessary to resort to extreme measures.[3] At length the imperial decree against the disturbers of the peace and the corrupters of the doctrines of faith, who employed religion as a pretext, — by whom, however, could be meant no others than those Syrian bishops who were opposed to the articles of agreement, — was actually published; and men who for a long series of years, without mingling like others in the impure worldly business of those times, had consecrated all their labors, without earthly splendor and enjoyment, solely to their spiritual office, were now to be forcibly separated from the communities in which they were cordially loved and respected, because the arbitrary will of a few individuals found it possible through the court to rule over the church.[4]

When these threatening commands were made known to the bishop Theodoret, he was at first resolved to forsake all, and retire to the

[1] As may be gathered from the words of the bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, ep. 143: Non habemus pecunias et munera et naves plenas oneribus, quæ mittamus. . . Illis armatur multitudo contra veritatem.

[2] Futuras ex hoc eversiones urbium, — quod qualis est Thracia, talis et Cilicia erit, quæ pæne sola remansit ad tributa solvenda, ep. 105, l. c.

[3] See his letter to the bishop Helladius of Tarsus, ep. 106.

[4] In the letter which the magister militum orientis sent to all the bishops concerned, in order to the carrying into execution of the emperor's command, it was said: Necesse est, ut aut communices Joanni episcopo catholicæ ecclesiæ, ut ablatis contentionibus sancta ecclesia quiete fruatur ac pace, quam peperit, (which John introduced by means of his articles of agreement) aut contendens, formam divinitus datam (the penalty defined in the imperial *sacra*) subire cogaris. Privaberis enim urbe, privaberis et ecclesia, si meliori sorte obedire et assentiri nolueris.

cloister in which he had received his spiritual education; but the pious monks of his community urged him to enter into new negotiations with the patriarch John, so as to preserve his church without detriment to his conscience. Theodoret foresaw that, if he declined to obey the emperor's decree, he would be forced away from the community, where his labors were blessed, and some unworthy person would be substituted in his place. He considered it therefore to be his duty, so far as he could so do without denying his own convictions and without detriment to his conscience, to yield, in order to subserve a higher interest of the church; and as the patriarch John released him from giving in his acquiescence in the judgment pronounced on Nestorius, and as he himself had already testified his satisfaction with the doctrinal part of the articles of agreement, he could at present with a good conscience comply with the prescribed conditions.[1] The patriarch John now endeavored, through Theodoret's mediation,[2] to gain over also the other Syrian bishops; and Theodoret himself was moved, by his zeal for the best good of the church, and his friendship for his old colleagues involved in this controversy, to exert himself to the utmost to bring about a general reconciliation and union. He urged his old friends with the most pressing arguments, and among others wrote thus to the bishop Helladius of Tarsus:[3] "He assuredly ought not without good cause to expose the flock entrusted to him to destruction: the purity of doctrine had certainly been secured: to participate in wrong-doing was a thing to which they were forced by no one. The righteous Judge would not punish them for the injustice of others. It was high time to put an end to disputes, and to unite the churches once more together." But in vain were all these representations and entreaties to the three men, distinguished for their firmness of character, Meletius of Mopsuestia, Alexander of Hierapolis, and Helladius of Tarsus — men whose souls, strong in faith, and superior to all human fear in resisting the despotic caprice which would subject everything to itself, deserve respect, notwithstanding their narrow dogmatic zeal. They were firmly resolved not to grant Cyrill the fellowship of the church, under any other condition than that he should revoke the system of doctrine expressed in his anathemas, and acknowledge Nestorius as a catholic bishop. All other yielding was the same in their eyes as to purchase the peace of the church with the denial of the truth and the approbation of injustice. They held it to be their duty to remain faithful, under all trials, to the pastoral calling which had been entrusted to them; but they believed themselves justified also to give up their authority to govern, in order to remain true to their convictions. They were men who had for a long series of years administered their office in so disinterested a spirit, that, when obliged to relinquish their posts, and to leave their flocks, they could take nothing with them for their journey and for the means of subsistence, but had to depend entirely on the charity of their friends.[4] The bishop Alexander answered his

[1] See ep. 126. Theodoret. l. c., together with other letters of his in that collection.

[2] See ep. 103.

[3] Ep. 138.

[4] As the bishop Alexander writes, ep. 147: Ex his quæ mihi direxerunt amici habeo ad animalium conductionem.

friend Theodoret after his repeated remonstrances: "I solemnly adjure you by the most Holy Trinity to press me no longer; for my hope is in the Crucified. I am already waiting for those who are to drive me from my place, with so great joy, that, had I any other gold besides the utensils of the church, I would give them for that a larger present than for any joyful tidings they could bring me. Give yourself no further trouble therefore, but only pray for me."

As Theodoret could effect nothing in this way, he at length betook himself to a man, in defence of whose innocence those common friends were in truth particularly zealous, the injured Nestorius; and besought him, that he would himself represent to the bishop Alexander how sorely he failed against the law of love, in having respect solely to what concerned himself, not to what was for the advantage of many others; that he ought not to hesitate, if it were necessary, even to commit a trifling sin, in order to save many from sin, and lead them to salvation.[1] On the one side, we see here, in the man of moderation, the subjective caprice of his system of morals, justifying the means by the end, — a thing which we frequently remark among the Orientals; on the other, we see in the zealot the ethical severity which would not acknowledge the principle that the end sanctifies the means. When Theodoret failed in this way to accomplish his purpose, he begged the patriarch John, in the most touching appeal, that he would not allow force to be employed against the venerable man. "Time," he said, "would soon make him more pliant; and even if this should not be the case, yet it could do no harm; for his doctrine accorded with the faith of the church, and he would move on quietly in his own field of labor, without seeking to make any disturbance. The patriarch John would make himself extremely unpopular, if he undertook to do anything against the venerable old man, of whom he himself had once said, that all must bear him; while, on the contrary, by pardoning him, he would secure the esteem and love of all."[2] But these representations made no impression whatever on the patriarch, who was determined at all hazards to enforce ecclesiastical obedience, and to restore unity to the church. The pious old man was torn from his devoted flock. This occasioned a universal lamentation throughout the city; the churches were closed, and it was necessary to open them by force. Loud complaints and reproaches were heard from all quarters against those who had determined to deprive his flock of their old spiritual father. Young and old, women and men, united in petitioning the imperial governor of the province of Eastern Asia, the Comes Orientis, and the patriarch John, to allow their old bishop to end his few remaining days quietly in the midst of them: without him they could not live.[3] The patriarch John, however, was not to be softened by such representations. He answered the church at Hierapolis in a cold and haughty official tone, assuring them that their bishop must attribute all that he suffered only to his own stubborn self-will; and he represented

[1] Ep. 148. Pusillum delinquat, ut a multo delicto cæteros liberet.
[2] Ep. 150.
[3] See the report of the judge of the secunda Euphratesia, ep. 166.

it as a great crime in him, that he refused to enter into any negotiations with those men (the bishops) by whose prayers the world is saved.[1] Yet he added, that, if Alexander would desist from his wonted pride, and reform, he would joyfully send him back to them again.

A similar fate befell the bishop Meletius of Mopsuestia. The Comes Titus had urged him likewise voluntarily to submit to the imperial ordinance; he opposed to him the common argument of the entire Christian world, — the usual argument of the party in power. As it was God's will that all men should be saved, it was not to be thought of that the judgment of an individual should stand against the common consent of all. To this Meletius gave him a becoming reply: "He was right," he wrote to him, "in what he said concerning the divine will; but it was evident that human will did not always accord with the divine: for God had allowed men, endowed with a rational soul, to be masters of their own will. And hence it had often happened, as the history of the Old and New Testament showed, that a few men, inspired with the right disposition towards God, had defended the truth against the multitude. So now, too, God would not reject the few, who clove to him with all their love, and on this account had to endure from a multitude sworn against them, disgrace, persecution, and exile. And pardon me," he continued, "I entreat you, if I do not find it in my power to deceive my own conscience. As soon as I see the command signed by the emperor's own hand, I shall leave the church at once, just as I am, still praising God as before. I am ready, through God's grace, not only to give up the church, but even to die a thousand deaths, rather than to sin against my conscience, in respect of our Lord Christ." When now the emperor's command was put in execution, and another bishop, whom the patriarch John had resolved to thrust on the church, was installed in the place of Meletius, the whole community testified their grief and sympathy. All were for having Meletius alone for their bishop, and would recognize no other. These commotions gave the patriarch John occasion to accuse Meletius at Constantinople as a violater of the imperial laws and a disturber of the peace, and to propose that he should be expelled from the whole province of Cilicia. He was banished to Melitene in Armenia, and quietly resigned himself to his lot, which he accepted as one ordained by a higher wisdom, and inflicted by the hand of God, for whose cause he believed he was contending.

We will now for a moment turn aside from contemplating the further development of these events, in order to cast a glance at the final lot of that pious man, Nestorius himself, who undeservedly became an object of abhorrence to many of his contemporaries and to posterity. As may be gathered from what has already been narrated, even the old friends of Nestorius, though they belonged to the same doctrinal school with him, had gone over to the side of those who pronounced upon him the sentence of condemnation; and in the end they must persuade themselves, in order to justify this step to their conscience, that Nes-

[1] Quorum precibus mundus ipse salvatur.

torius had preached dangerous errors. But the zeal in behalf of such a conviction, which had proceeded merely out of self-persuasion, is for the most part wont to incline but so much the more strongly to heat and violence. No voice of commanding influence spoke openly and loudly in behalf of that Nestorius who became every day more hated at the imperial court, — the man whom the emperor Theodosius, in his edicts, had compared with an Arius, a Porphyry, a Simon Magus. Theodoret, and those of like mind with him, must be contented, indeed, that they had merely been spared the necessity of signing the condemning sentence pronounced against Nestorius. But his enemies did not cease persecuting him; for they grudged the honorable ease which he enjoyed in the cloister, and the sympathy which, from time to time, he still met with; and they dreaded the influence which he might exert in his narrow circle, and from thence extend over a still wider compass. The Roman bishop Cœlestinus had already, by a letter to the emperor Theodosius, A.D. 432, called upon him to remove the man who had been condemned by the judicial sentence of all the priests, and who still persisted in his blasphemous errors,[1] from all intercourse with society, that it might be put out of his power to lead others astray.[2] This demand, however, did not as yet produce the intended effect. Nestorius continued, for four years, to enjoy undisturbed repose and esteem in the cloister of Euprepius, which lay before the gates of Antioch, only two stadia from the city. But when John and Cyrill of Alexandria had now made it their aim to cause the sentence pronounced against him to be universally recognized, it could not but be extremely vexatious to them to be aware of his residence on such a spot, which was so convenient for maintaining a correspondence with the whole Syrian church. By their influence, therefore, Nestorius, in the year 435, was torn from the repose of his cloister, and condemned to exile. By the first edict, the town of Petra in Arabia was fixed upon as the place of his banishment.[3] But this edict was not so executed. Perhaps it was a mitigation of the punishment, that he was, instead of this, exiled to one of the Oases, probably the great Oasis of Egypt.[4] Hordes of Libyan barbarians, known under the name of Blemmyans, falling upon this district and laying everything waste with fire and sword, made Nestorius a prisoner. They had compassion on him, set him at liberty with several others, and warned him themselves to leave that place of residence, because other hordes would soon follow in their train. Nestorius now betook himself to the town of Panapolis in Egypt, and from thence he wrote to the prefect of Thebais. He informed him that it was not his intention to escape, that he might furnish no occasion for calumny: he awaited what might be determined concerning him according to the laws. But he begged him, at the same time, not to leave him a prey to the machinations of wicked men, lest it might be

[1] In prædicatione sacrilega perdurantem.
[2] Ut facultatem aliquos perdendi non habeat.
[3] The imperial edict in Harduin. Concil. l. c. 1669.
[4] When Socrates wrote the seventh book of his church history, he was still in that place. Vid. Socrat. hist. eccles. VII. 34.

lamented in all future times, that it was better to be a prisoner to barbarians than to take refuge at the throne of the Roman emperor.[1] But these representations availed him nothing. Perhaps the prefect was the mere tool of Egyptian fanaticism and blind heresy-hatred. The old man, whose physical powers were already enfeebled by age and by his many misfortunes, was, at the command of the governor, without the least show of compassion, dragged about from one place to another, by a guard of soldiers composed of barbarian allies, to the borders of Egypt. He therefore wrote to the governor a second letter, which, to judge from a fragment preserved to us by the church-historian Evagrius, was composed, like the first, with dignity and composure, although the heart of an Evagrius was so steeled by the power of dogmatic fanaticism, that he had no sense to perceive this, but saw in the expressions of a dignified spirit, which had not been bowed to servility by all its misfortunes, nothing but expressions of pride and obstinacy.[2] Having demanded of the governor, that after being so dragged about he might at length be allowed some repose, and that his case might be reported to the emperor, he concluded in the following words: "Thus I counsel you, as a father would his son. But if you receive *these* words, as you did my first, with displeasure; then act according to your own good pleasure, if so be that your good pleasure has more weight with you than arguments of reason." Amidst the sufferings of his exile, Nestorius enjoyed sufficient composure of mind to write a history of his controversy, and of his fortunes resulting therefrom, especially designed to vindicate himself against the reproaches made against him by friends and enemies; which work he seems to have entitled, the representation of his *Tragedy*.[3] In this work, it would appear, he exposed, with a vehemence of indignation which might easily be excused, the intrigues of Cyrill; while he expressed himself with more mildness concerning others, who, according to his own opinion, had only been deceived by Cyrill.[4]

[1] The words of Nestorius in the fragment of his letter preserved by Evagrius in his church history, I. 7, are: Ἵνα μὴ πάσαις ἐκ τουτοῦ γενέαις τραγῳδῆται κρεῖττον εἶναι βαρβάρων αἰχμαλώτων ἢ πρόσφυγα βασιλείας ῥωμαίκης.

[2] Ὁ μήδε ἐξ ὧν πεπόνθε σωφρονήσας.

[3] See the citations from it in Evagrius, l. I. c. 7, and in the Synodicon published by Lupus, c. VI. Lupi opera, T. VII. f. 26. That the work bore the title of "Tragedy" is reported by Ebedjesu, a Nestorian metropolitan of the fourteenth century, in his list of Syrian ecclesiastical writers in Assemani bibliotheca orientalis, T. III. P. I. f. 36. This work of Nestorius has unfortunately not come down to us, unless perhaps it may be somewhere found in a Syrian translation. But Irenæus, the friend of Nestorius already mentioned, who accompanied him as a count of the empire to Ephesus, on account of his friendship for Nestorius, fell into disgrace with the emperor, lived for some time in exile, and then, after having been ordained by his friends bishop of Tyre, was deposed again by command of the emperor. This Irenæus composed a work, full of zeal for the cause of Nestorius, treating of the persecutions which he suffered, and of the history of the church in his times, which likewise bore the title of "Tragedy." In this work he made use of the history compiled by his friend Nestorius, from which he often quoted. But we have to regret, that this tragedy of Irenæus has also failed to come down to us. But an unknown author, probably a North African, in the times of the emperor Justinian, or soon after, in writing on the controversies respecting the three articles, of which we shall speak hereafter, has brought together copious extracts from this work, with other important records which he hunted up at Constantinople, all relating to these disputes. These are contained in the Synodicon, first published by Lupus, from a manuscript in the abbey of Monte Cassino. There is another printed copy of the manuscript in Mansi Concil. T. V.

[4] Cœlestin, being an unlearned Roman

As to the manner, however, in which Nestorius ended his life, no certain and definite accounts have come down to us. The church historians of this period, who represent all the misfortunes which befell the persecuted man as being a divine judgment on the blasphemer, here give us rhetorical fustian in place of simple and credible history.[1]

We now return from the personal history of Nestorius, to trace the consequences which resulted from the Nestorian disputes.

Theodoret and his friends had, it is true, as we have already remarked, adopted the Alexandrian articles of agreement, only with such restrictions as to secure themselves against any violation of conscience: but it was easy to foresee, that they would not be suffered long to enjoy that immunity; that it would soon be declared to be a mere subterfuge, which they had left open to themselves, so as not to be under the necessity of renouncing Nestorianism. The new severer measures against all the adherents of Nestorius and all so-called Nestorians might easily pave the way for this.

In the year 435, appeared new laws, by which it was ordained that the Nestorians should for the future be called Simonians; that all the writings of Nestorius should be burnt; that those who should copy, preserve, or read them, should be punished in the severest manner; and that all bishops who ventured to defend the doctrines of Nestorius should be deposed. All meetings of Nestorians for divine worship were strictly forbidden. The tribune Aristolaus was a second time sent to the Antiochian church diocese, for the purpose of seeing these laws carried into execution, and of enforcing everywhere the condemnation of Nestorius and of his doctrines.[2] Many bishops, who until now had acceded to the articles of agreement only under the abovementioned limitation, submitted to these new ordinances. Others, as Theodoret, remained firm by their former declarations; and Cyrill therefore accused them before the patriarch John and the tribune Aristolaus, as men who had adopted the articles of peace only in a deceitful manner, and as being secret Nestorians.[3] In general, Cyrill was already making preparations, by degrees, to condemn, under the name of Nestorianism, everything which was opposed to his own system of doctrine; although he did not as yet come out openly with this

bishop, he excused on the grounds that he could not possess any exact insight into doctrines, (simpliciorem, quam qui posset vim dogmatum subtilius penetrare,) and that he had suffered himself to be deceived by the garbled quotations of Cyrill. Nestorius moreover acknowledged here, that it was himself who first proposed the assembling of a synod at Ephesus; a step, however, for which he was reproached by his friends. In answer to the charge that he made Christ a mere man, he appeals to the fact, that, immediately after his ordination, he got a new law to be passed against those who maintained this, as well as against other heretics. Nestorius, then, here avows himself as the author of the severe law against the heretics, which appeared in the very year in which he entered upon the patriarchal dignity, in the year 428, and is to be found in the Codex. Theodosian. l. 16, Tit. V. l. 65.

[1] Evagrius cites words of a church-historian, who says that Nestorius, after his tongue — no doubt in punishment for his blasphemies — had been gnawed away by worms, went to the greater eternal punishment of another world.

[2] Cyrill. ep. 166 to Aristolaus, decretum, per quod præcipitur, ut universi episcopi orientis anathematizarent impium *Nestorium* et omnes ejus contra Christum blasphemias dicere Simonianam seu Nestorianam hæresin; and ep. 179 to the same.

[3] Cyrill. ep. 180.

project. Already he denounced those who condemned the doctrines of Nestorius only in appearance, without actually renouncing them. Nestorianism, he asserted, did not consist alone, as some pretended, in refusing to call Mary the mother of God.[1]

In the next place, what men called Nestorianism was, in fact, substantially nothing else than the doctrines of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The defenders of Nestorius and of his doctrines boasted, not without good reason, of being disciples of the great Theodore.[2] When therefore the Cyrillian party aimed at the total supplanting of Nestorianism, they believed their object would be completely accomplished only when the doctrines of Diodorus and Theodore should be condemned at the same time, as the proper fountain of Nestorianism. To Cyrill it very rightly appeared like a contradiction to condemn the doctrines of Nestorius, and to defend those of Theodore, who set forth the same, often in far harsher terms. In the veneration paid to those two Syrian fathers, he saw only a pretext under which Nestorianism, while it was nominally condemned, might still continue to be defended.[3] But it was a most difficult undertaking to induce the Syrian clergy, who had been accustomed, from their youth, to name those men with the greatest reverence as the fathers and teachers of the church, to appove a decree by which they were publicly condemned. True, the partisans of Cyrill among the Syrian monks and clergy, and a certain bishop, Rabulas of Edessa, who had joined them, made trial of carrying through such a sentence of condemnation: but the general and determined resistance which they experienced, proved how impracticable any project of this kind still was in the Syrian church at large; and the opposition called forth thereby contributed to the formation, from the Syrian church, of an independent Nestorian church-party in Persia, concerning the rise of which we shall speak more particularly in a separate section.

A certain abbot, Maximus, who was one of the most violent opponents of Nestorianism, excited in the Syrian church, by a project of this sort, the greatest indignation even among the laity, among whom the character of those men stood in the highest veneration. In the midst of the assembled communities, the cry was heard, "Long live the faith of Theodore! We believe as Theodore believed," — and in the Antiochian church, stones were thrown at that abbot.[4] The Cyrillian party made one more attempt to enforce, by means of the emperor and the patriarch Proclus, the condemnation of those Syrian church-teachers; as indeed Cyrill himself, when he sent to the emperor his explanation of the Nicene creed in opposition to Nestorianism, had invited him to attempt this, at least in an indirect manner, having in his accompanying letter described Diodorus and Theodore, in the harshest expressions,

[1] See ep. 179 to Aristolaus, and ep. 167 to John.

[2] See, for example, the language of the bishop Meletius, ep. 152, opp. Theodoret. T. V. p. 832. Fidem apostolicam et a patribus traditam, quam a magno Theodoro accepimus.

[3] See the letter of Cyrill to the bishop Acacius of Melitene, opp. T. V. P. II. f. 197, where he says of the Orientals: Ὑπὸπλατόμενοι γὰρ τὰ Νεστορίου μίσειν, ἑτέρῳ πάλιν αὐτὰ συγκροτοῦσι τρόπῳ, τὰ Θεοδώρου θαυμαζόντες, καίτοι τὴν ἴσην, μᾶλλον δὲ χείρονα νοσοῦντα δυσσεβείαν.

[4] See Cyrill's letter to Acacius, bishop of Melitene, p. 197.

as being the fathers of those blasphemies, and declared that under their name Nestorianism was revived.[1] But the patriarch Proclus was nevertheless too prudent, and too decidedly the friend of peace,[2] to be willing, for the sake of gratifying the passions of zealots and the ambition of Cyrill, to cast the church into new turmoils, the consequences of which could not be estimated, and which could be more easily excited than quelled. He endeavored, while it was yet time, to check the violent commotions which were already on the point of breaking out.

The Armenian church having requested him, on occasion of these disputes, to give his own judgment, he addressed to them a dogmatic exposition, which acquired great authority in the Greek church.[3] With this, he united certain anathemas on several propositions akin to Nestorianism, which were supposed to have been drawn from the writings of Theodore, but in which he had wisely omitted to mention the author by name. Yet the deputies who were the bearers of this letter of the patriarch to the Syrian church, one of whom was the above-mentioned zealot Maximus, did not exercise the same prudence. On the contrary, the opportunity was welcome to them by which they were enabled, under the authority of the patriarch of the imperial residence, to demand the condemnation of the propositions of Theodore; and they took the liberty, therefore, of affixing his name to them. As the propositions now appeared under the name of Theodore, the proposal to subscribe these articles of condemnation was received, in the Syrian church diocese, with the most violent indignation. The patriarch John of Antioch wrote to Cyrill, that the bishops of this district would prefer to be burned, rather than to approve the condemnation of Theodore.[4] The bishops of the Antiochian patriarchate, assembled at Antioch, sent the most emphatic letters as well to the emperor as to the patriarchs Proclus and Cyrill. They declared that they could not possibly consent, for the sake of such isolated propositions, torn out of their proper connection, — just as, by a like proceeding, propositions which seemed not a whit less revolting might be extracted from the writings of the most venerated fathers, — to condemn after his death so great a church-teacher, who had so manfully contended for the defence of pure doctrine against so many errors. But even were it possible for them to be induced to such a step, yet they would meet the most determined resistance from their communities, who even now were ready to revolt at these proposals.[5] In their letter to the emperor, they express themselves with just indignation against the idea of condemning, after their death, men who to the close of their lives had served the church in the best possible manner. By such a course, no church-teacher could be safe; for, as all were men, it was impossible that they should

[1] See this letter of Cyrill, opp. Theodoret. T. V. p. 854.

[2] See Socrat. hist. eccles. VII. c. 41.

[3] Procli Tomus ad Armenos.

[4] See the letter of Cyrill to the patriarch Proclus, opp. l. c. f. 200.

[5] See the fragment of this document addressed to the patriarch Proclus, in Facund. Hermianens. defensio trium capitulorum, l. VIII. at the beginning, opp. Sirmond. T. II. ed. Venet. f. 460, and all that remains to us of the transactions of this Antiochian council, in Mansi. concil. T. V. f. 1182.

escape the censure of those who took pains to hunt up whatever was bad in them: indeed the declarations of the holy scriptures themselves were in various ways perverted by teachers of error.[1] Proclus wrote hereupon to the patriarch John, that it had never entered his thoughts to condemn any man who had died in the communion of the church. He severely upbraided his deputies for overstepping the powers which had been entrusted to them; and he commanded them to take no step without the knowledge and approbation of the patriarch John, and to do all in their power to appease those commotions. The emperor himself issued an ordinance, (sacra,) addressed to the synod assembled at Antioch, in which he forbade everything which had been undertaken to disturb the peace of the church in those districts.[2] Even Cyrill thought it best at length to yield to the storm. In a letter to the patriarch Proclus, he declared that, to avoid disturbances, it was perhaps best to proceed no further, as the object to be accomplished was, after all, not so important; for, by condemning the blasphemies of Nestorius, the kindred blasphemies of Theodore were in like manner also condemned. If Theodore were now living, and should persist in defending the blasphemies of Nestorius, or the things which he himself had written, the condemnation would reach also to himself personally. But as he had already gone to God,[3] it was sufficient, if nothing further was done than to condemn the false doctrines which were to be found in his writings, without mentioning his name.[4]

Yet although he must have been sensible, that a public condemnation of the writings and doctrines of Theodore could, under these circumstances, in no wise be enforced, yet his polemical zeal was not suffered to grow cool. He composed a work under the title, "There is but one Christ," against the doctrine of Theodore, in which work he accused him of having written a great deal which savored of the most extreme impiety, — of having denied the true deity of Christ, and of having made Christians the worshippers of a man.[5] After such attacks upon the venerated teacher of the Syrian church, the Syrian church-teachers could not, of course, remain silent. Theodoret felt himself constrained to defend the memory of his instructor against these attacks; and, as we may gather from the fragments of this work,[6] he indulged himself in the same violence, and the same unwarrantable imputation of consequences, as his opponent had done.

Thus this new contention served but to excite afresh the rupture between the Alexandrian and the Syrian church. If we may trust to an ancient account, Cyrill was already laying the foundation of new plots against the Syrian church-party, which he so much hated, and was laboring to carry through his designs at the court,[7] when by his death, in the year 444, the church was delivered from this threatening danger.

[1] Fac. Herm. l. c. l. VIII. c. 3.

[2] The sacra in Facundus, l. c. l. VIII. c. 3.

[3] Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπεδημήσε πρὸς Θέον. A remarkable expression in the mouth of Cyrill, who made no scruple of condemning Nestorius to hell.

[4] See opp. Cyrill. f. 200.

[5] See the extracts from that work in the 5th act of the second œcumenical council of Constantinople. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 107.

[6] Which are preserved to us in the Latin translation, in the Collat. V. of the II. œcum. Concil. Constantinop. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 107.

[7] This may be gathered from the words

The death of Cyrill, however, served, only for the first moments, to promote the restoration of tranquillity in the Oriental church. What had been done during the episcopal administration of Cyrill, the man-

of Theodoret, in his well-known letter to the patriarch of Antioch, on Cyrill's death; ep. 180, in opp. Theodoret. Somniavit enim, sicut dicunt, et regiam urbem perturbare, et piis iterum dogmatibus repugnare et tuam sanctitatem accusare, utpote ea colentem. Yet this letter is by many, since the time of Tillemont, (note 80 to his life of Cyrill, Memoires T. 14,) considered spurious, but for reasons which to us do not carry the force of conviction, and of which many derive their weight merely from the Catholic point of view at which Tillemont stands. That Theodoret should speak after this manner of Cyrill's character and of his death, cannot appear so surprising to those who without prejudice contemplate Cyrill and his relations to Theodoret. The sportive description of Cyrill's voyage to the world below is not to be reckoned a very strange thing, even in Theodoret; when, for instance, in allusion to Lucian's dialogues of the dead, he says: Lætificavit quidem superstites illius discessio, contristavit vero forsitan mortuos, et timor est, ne prægravati ejus conversatione, iterum ad nos remittant, vel illos effugiat, qui eum abducunt. For this reason, he says, it might be, that the patriarch had ordered a huge stone to be placed on his grave. In the world below, there was no further occasion to fear danger from Cyrill's doctrines: not only those who were well informed in such matters, but even Nimrod and Pharaoh, would be disgusted with them, and stone him.

Any person who attempted to fabricate a letter under the name of Theodoret, would hardly have represented him as discoursing in so sportive and heathenish a style. He would rather have put into his mouth earnest denunciations in the language of the Old Testament. An allusion of this kind to Lucian's dialogues of the dead is much rather in the character of Theodoret, who was doubtless well versed in the study of the ancients. But as in this sportive style there is to be detected no mark of bitterness or of revenge, so in the conclusion of the letter we find expressed the spirit of Christian charity, by which Theodoret was actuated, and which any person who, from motives of doctrinal interest, had interpolated a letter of this sort, would have found it difficult to imitate. For instance, after remarking how troubled his friends were with the thought that Cyrill was still to the last plotting evil, he adds: "May it be so ordered, by your prayers, that he may obtain mercy and forgiveness, and that the unmeasured grace of God may prevail over his wickedness." Tillemont supposes that the objections which Theodoret makes in this letter to Cyrill's system of faith are inconsistent with his mode of expressing himself with regard to Cyrill's doctrinal explanations in those articles of agreement. But these observations of Theodoret refer simply to the manner in which Cyrill had expressed himself in that confession of faith. From the later declarations of Cyrill, in his work against Theodore, Theodoret must doubtless have known, that no change had really taken place in the views of Cyrill; and in his "Refutation" he had in fact repeated the charge of Apollinarianism and similar complaints against Cyrill. Neither does the manner in which Theodoret declares himself, in his eighty-third letter to Dioscurus respecting his relation to Cyrill, and especially respecting those writings of his which do not relate to the above-mentioned doctrinal differences, stand so directly at variance with the remarks in this letter. It is only necessary to pay some regard to the difference of circumstances, and to remember that the above letter was written in confidence to a friend, while this was intended for publication, and expressly pointed against the hostilely disposed official adherents of Cyrill; to which we must add, that the Orientals, according to their theory of the *οἰκονομία*, allowed themselves in many liberties, not to be reconciled with the strict laws of veracity.

But, if Theodoret really speaks of Cyrill in this letter as having died prematurely, it certainly could not have come from the hand of a contemporary, who must have known that Cyrill reached a good old age. But the reading by which he is made to say this cannot be correct, if for no other reason, because what is so expressed stands in manifest contradiction with the substance of the commencing words of the letter. The correct reading is evidently that of the Codex Paris: Illum vero miserum *et* ad; for this sense is required by the commencing words, while, in what follows, *et* may also be substituted instead of sed; or sed, which fitly marks the antithesis, may even be retained.

Finally, it would indeed be an anachronism, if this letter were addressed to the patriarch John of Antioch; but the entire contents of the letter are best suited to his successor Domnus, and we have only to suppose that the two names were confounded in the Latin translation, the only form in which this document has been preserved. Concil. œcumen. V. Collat. V.

The fragment of a sermon which Theodoret is said to have preached after the death of Cyrill at Antioch, l. c. Harduin. III. 139, has external evidence for its genu-

ner in which the disputes had been composed, contained in itself the seeds of new disorders; and to bring these to a violent outbreak, the footsteps of Cyrill were followed by his successor Dioscurus, a man of unbounded ambition, and of an irascible, boisterous temperament, who was ready to adopt any means to accomplish his purposes; bribery, court intrigue, and deeds of violence of every sort.[1] This person once more resumed the plan which Cyrill, who had only yielded to circumstances, never lost out of view, to make the system of doctrine involved in the anathemas, with regard to the one nature of the God-man, dominant in the whole Eastern church; and, like Cyrill, he would very gladly have procured for the Alexandrian church, as a truly apostolical one, founded by Mark, the highest authority in the East, and particularly have elevated it above the patriarchate of Constantinople, which was represented to have grown up merely out of secular privileges.[2] Wanting the cunning of Cyrill, which paid more regard to circumstances, he was the more inclined, where he stood in alliance with the dominant power, to resort to violent and unceremonious modes of proceeding, in which all forms and legal order were utterly disregarded. He needed here, then, for the present, only to go on, according to the system of his predecessor, and to stigmatize all that answered to the more moderate Antiochian system of faith, all that went on the distinction of the two natures in concreto, or which had any bearing on this, as Nestorian heresy. Hence, the Syrian churches, in which Theodoret stood particularly prominent on account of his zeal for the defence of this doctrinal system, would be the first object of his attack. And

ineness still more decided; being cited already by Marius Mercator. But the internal evidence would seem to be more strong against its authenticity than in the case of the letter we have just considered; for it exhibits rather the older and sterner form of the Antiochian scheme of doctrine, as it had been first taught by Theodore, than the more moderate shaping of it by Theodoret, especially as it was held by him after the Nestorian controversy. And the exclamations of triumph at the final victory of the pure doctrine, the expressions of joy at the consequent union of the Syrian and Egyptian churches, — oriens et Ægyptus sub uno jugo est, — these expressions do not seem in accordance with the prospects which would be anticipated by Theodoret after Cyrill's death, or with the solicitude which he himself evinces in the letter above mentioned. But, on the other hand, it is certainly not at all probable, that one who had before him the history of the next succeeding years would attribute to Theodoret such language as he is here made to use. And the exaggeration of rhetorical polemics requires many grains of allowance.

[1] By the complaints of several of his clergy, whom he had persecuted at the council of Chalcedon, (see Concil. Chalc. act. III. Harduin. III. f. 322,) a very unfavorable light is thrown on the character of Dioscurus, in relation to his avarice, his embezzlement of moneys designed for the churches and for the poor, the persecutions which he practised with the assistance of the most powerful men of the court, as well as in relation to other immoralities. Thus, for example, he is said to have collected together the grain which the emperor was in the habit of sending to the communities of the unfruitful districts of Libya, in times of barrenness, which he sold at a high price, and appropriated the money to his own use. True, we ought not to give too much weight to such accusations against eminent bishops, who had made themselves hateful to a party in these times of violent passions; but, compared with what we otherwise know for certainty respecting the behavior of Dioscurus, many of these charges would seem more worthy of credit.

[2] Theodoret says of him, ep. 86: Ἄνω καὶ κάτω τοῦ μακαρίου Μάρκου τὸν ὑρόνον προβάλλεται. He therefore objects to Theodoret, that taking part with a synodal letter sent by the patriarch Proclus from Constantinople, he recognized the primacy of the Constantinopolitan church in the East, and had thus betrayed the privileges alike of the Antiochian as well as of the Alexandrian church.

here he found a foothold in a party of clergy, and particularly of monks, who constituted a formidable opposition to the prevailing system in the Syrian system of faith, and who had already stood in intimate connection with Cyrill, and had been used by him as spies and creators of disturbance in the Syrian church. A certain abbot Barsumas stood at the head of this faction.

Next, he had an influential party at Constantinople, composed of those abbots and monks who had already served as the instruments of Cyrill in paving the way for the downfall of Nestorius. They were for the most part men destitute of scientific culture, who, for that very reason, would be most likely to fall in with the formulas of the Alexandrian system, as they proceeded rather from the language of feeling than from that of the understanding; whereas the Antiochian theory of distinction, on the contrary, presupposed an understanding versed in the discrimination of conceptions, and sensible of the need of it; and nothing of that kind was to be found among them. Many of these people perhaps had not even sufficient theological education to be able duly to apprehend the Alexandrian system in its whole coherence and its whole logical evolution: but its main tendency everywhere to give prominence to the ineffable, the inexplicable, the incomprehensible, was also their own; and the forms of expression which were the results of this system coincided also with their favorite expressions. "We hold fast to that which the scriptures declare," so this people were accustomed to talk: "the scriptures declare, 'The Word became flesh.' This means more than that he assumed human nature. In becoming flesh, he assuredly underwent no change. He is the same; but that is the inexpressible wonder; and every human attribute is to be ascribed to this God who became flesh. God was born; God suffered; there is a body of God. The *how* is what no reason can explain. The way in which this took place is known to God alone. We should not desire to know any more than what scripture reveals. All further inquiries and explanations are dangerous to faith." "With God all things are possible: God accomplishes everything according to his own good pleasure, and in a way known to himself alone." Such was the reply, constantly repeated, to all difficulties which might be proposed to them.[1]

At the head of this party, among the monks of Constantinople, stood the abbot and presbyter Eutyches, — one of those who, for a long series of years, lived shut up in their cloisters, and had but once left them, that they might publicly raise their voice in behalf of the Cyrillian council at Ephesus and against Nestorius. See above.[2]

Under these circumstances, the disputes could not fail to break out

[1] This people's way of thinking and reasoning are graphically described by Theodoret, in the person of Eranistes, particularly in the first of the three dialogues bearing this title; which agrees with the declarations of Eutyches at the council of Constantinople.

[2] When Eutyches declined to appear personally before the council of Constantinople, under the pretence that for many years he had not been wont to leave his cloister, he was reminded of what he had done during the Nestorian controversies: Εἰ γὰρ τότε Νεστορίου ἐναντιοῦμενον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας εἰσῆλθε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὀφείλει νῦν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ εἰσέλθειν? Concil. Chalcedonens. act. I. f. 150. Harduin. Concil. T. II.

anew. Those monks at Constantinople had, as we saw already in the case of the Nestorian controversies, great influence with the emperor; they stood closely connected with those of like disposition among the Syrian monks; and, by the reports which these latter furnished them, their zeal was still more inflamed against the revived Nestorianism. Accordingly they complained aloud at the renewed error of those who divided the one and only Christ into two Sons of God.[1]

Though Theodoret loved peace, and did all that lay in his power to preserve a good understanding even with the patriarch Dioscurus,[2] still his zeal for what he knew to be the truth did not allow him here to be silent; for he saw here the effort to spread abroad doctrines by which the immutability of the divine essence was infringed on, the true humanity of Christ denied, and the doors were thrown wide open for Docetism, Gnosticism, and Apollinarianism, in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. Beyond question, it was a rash habit of imputing consequences which led men to imagine that they could find all these heretical tendencies in the rude and exaggerated expressions of these untutored zealots of Constantinople; but there were doubtless good reasons to fear, that, if such sensuous forms of expression should once supplant the more accurate dogmatic terminology, those false doctrines and tendencies would easily find in them a point of attachment. And it might actually be the case that many among those people were led by their fears to attribute too much to the human element in the life of Christ, and, from want of mental cultivation, fell into the undeveloped form of doctrine which, before the more accurate determinations had been occasioned by means of Tertullian and Origen, had prevailed in the church. Theodoret, in the year 447, believed himself in duty bound, in a work written on purpose, to controvert the whole Eutychian-Egyptian type of doctrine; and, in in opposition to it, to unfold and defend the more mild Antiochian system, according to which the one only Christ consists of two natures ever to be distinguished in respect to their individualities, united with each other in a personal unity, without confusion and without transformation.[3] Theodoret showed here, that he found no difficulty in transporting himself into the mode of thinking and the point of view of the Eutychian,[4] whom he introduces speaking under the name of the beggar, (ἐρανιστής,) and that he understood how to distinguish these views themselves from the consequences flowing from them when consistently carried out. He purposely cited, in this work against his adversaries,

[1] See e. g. Theodoret, ep. 82 and ep. 101.

[2] See his ep. 60 to Dioscurus.

[3] His work entitled ἐρανιστὴς or πολυμόρφος, the Beggar or the Multiform; because he accused this new heresy of collecting together by begging so many scraps from divers old erroneous doctrines, that a new one had grown up which bordered closely on several of the older heresies. This work is divided into three dialogues: in the first, hence denominated ἄτρεπτος, he treats of the immutability of the divine essence; in the second, ἀσυγχύτος, of the distinctness without confusion of the two natures; in the third, ἀπαθής, of the incapability of suffering pertaining to the divine nature.

[4] We employ this designation here only for the sake of brevity, and to express the thing by a single word, though an honor is thereby ascribed to Eutyches to which he is not entitled; namely, that a new and peculiar doctrinal tendency had proceeded from him as its author.

such authorities alone as were recognized by themselves; passages, for instance, from the writings of Cyrill of Alexandria; and he abstained from quoting those church-teachers who were suspected by the opposite party, however much importance he attached to them himself;—such, for instance, as Diodorus and Theodore. The moderation which Theodoret here displayed, drew upon him, it is true, many reproaches from the zealots of his party.[1] But by this moderation, however, the entire party of those who were zealous for the doctrine of one nature in Christ could in nowise be conciliated: they saw in this mode of representation, on the contrary, nothing but a revived Nestorianism.

Dioscurus accused Theodoret before the patriarch Domnus of Antioch, that, as had been reported in Egypt, he had, in sermons preached there, taught a doctrine whereby the one Lord, Jesus Christ, was divided into two Sons of God; and he afterwards published a rude letter to Theodoret himself, in which he accused him of teaching false doctrines. Theodoret replied in a letter to Dioscurus, written with great moderation and forbearance. He begged of him that he would not listen to the representations of one side only, but that he would examine the matter calmly and without prejudice. He endeavored, by clear and accurate explanations, to ward off the charges with which he had been assailed. He drew up a full confession of faith, in which he adopted the Egyptian forms of expression, qualified by certain precautionary remarks, as closely as he was able, without doing violence to his own doctrinal convictions; and concluded with pronouncing sentence of condemnation on those who refused to call Mary the θεότοκος, and on those who called Christ a mere man, or divided the only-begotten into two Sons.[2] But Dioscurus received Theodoret's overtures of peace in bad temper. He allowed monks to come forth publicly, while he was present in the church, and pronounce the anathema on Theodoret; and he himself sanctioned the act.[3] He sent deputies to Constantinople, with instructions to accuse before the emperor the whole church of Eastern Asia, as being infected with Nestorianism. Hence, Domnus was under the necessity of sending a mission to Constantinople for the purpose of defending his church.[4] And Theodoret wrote, in defence of himself, to influential men in church and state at the imperial residence. Now it is true that no new investigation or new decision followed these controversies. But still we see how much could be effected by the influence of Dioscurus; for an imperial decree made its appearance, directing Theo-

[1] See his noble letter to the bishop Irenæus, ep. 16. He says there that the only thing of real importance was to hold fast to those conceptions which are requisite for the unfolding of the truth, and that men ought to avoid terms which excite controversy. He expressed it as his wish, that the whole controversy on the word θεότοκος had never arisen, ὅτι περὶ τουτοῦ πάσα ἡ διαμάχη γεγενήται, ὡς οὐκ ὠφέλεν. His conscience bore him witness, that he had submitted to this accommodation, not for the sake of worldly aggrandizement, not through any desire of the episcopal honor, which had occasioned him so much trouble. But it was his aim, neither to say nor to do anything to please this man or that man, but to edify the church of God, and to please its bridegroom and Lord.

[2] Ep. 83.

[3] See Theodoret, ep. 86 to Flavian, and ep. 113 to the Roman bishop, Leo the Great. He says in the latter, that this took place a year previous to the second Ephesian church assembly, therefore in the year 448.

[4] See Theodoret, ep. 92.

doret, inasmuch as he was constantly assembling synods at Antioch, and disturbing the faith of the orthodox, to keep quiet within the bounds of his own diocese, without stirring beyond its limits, or visiting any other city. Very justly might Theodoret complain of this arbitrary and inequitable proceeding, by which, without being allowed the right which even a criminal enjoys, he was condemned unheard. All he asked for was a calm and legal investigation of his case.[1] Yet this was but a prelude to the more violent outbreak of these disputes in the vicinity of the court itself. Events here ensued which were at bottom connected with what had transpired in Syria; — events which in the outset announced an altogether different issue of the Nestorian controversies, and from which the Syrian bishops, who were not sufficiently acquainted with the state of things at the court in Constantinople, were hoping that a favorable turn would be given to their cause,[2] but which were in fact destined to serve the very end of introducing from a foreign quarter a sudden and violent decision of the contest.

In the first place, an attack coming from another side was made on the man who had hitherto acted as a principal organ of the party of Dioscurus, namely, the abbot Eutyches.[3]

In the year 448, the bishops from different countries, who happened to be present on various matters of business at Constantinople, met there in an ecclesiastical assembly, under the presidency of the patriarch;[4] when one of their number presented a formal complaint against Eutyches the abbot. The person who in this case appeared as the complainant was the bishop Eusebius of Doryleum in Phrygia Salutaris, a man who had already, as a layman in the civil capacity of an imperial commissioner, (agens in rebus,) manifested his zeal for the orthodox faith, by intermeddling uncalled for in the Nestorian disputes; and perhaps in this way he may have attained to the episcopal dignity.[5]

[1] See ep. 79, etc.

[2] For it is doubtless to the condemnation of Eutyches which followed at Constantinople, that what Theodoret says in ep. 82 refers: Αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐράνου διέκυψε, καὶ τῶν τὴν συκοφαντίαν ὑφηνάντων τὴν συκοφαντίαν διηλέγξε, καὶ τὸ δύσσεβες αὐτῶν ἐγυμνῶσε φρονήμα.

[3] The patriarch Domnus of Antioch is said to have ventured first to accuse this person by name before the emperor, as the reviver of the Apollinarian heresy, who had been bold enough to condemn Theodore and Diodorus. Perhaps this was done in the letter which he wrote to the emperor in vindication of the Oriental church: see above. This accusation by Domnus has been preserved to us by Facundus of Hermione, in a Latin translation. Defens. trium capitulor. l. 8, c. 5.

[4] A σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, as it was called.

[5] In the breviculis historiæ Eutychianistarum, or the gestis de nomine Acacii, belonging to the last years of the fifth century, it is said, for instance, of this Eusebius: Zelo fidei, quem etiam cum agens in rebus esset, ostendit (ipse enim Nestorium quoque in tempore reprehendit in ecclesia rem sacrilegam prædicantem.) Sirmond. opp. II. Paris. f. 760. These words, by themselves, would render it probable, that the layman who thus interrupted Nestorius in a sermon — see above, p. 959 — was no other than this Eusebius; and this conjecture is confirmed by the manner in which Cyrill of Alexandria and Marius Mercator express themselves in mentioning the above-related incident; naming him as a person who was *still* among the laity; (τέλων μὲν λαϊκοις ἐτὶ, qui adhuc inter laicos erat;) for this *still* seems to denote, that he did not continue to remain a layman, which suits the case of this Eusebius. Nor is Garnier's conjecture improbable, that the same Eusebius was author of the first formal complaint publicly posted up against Nestorius in the church at Constantinople, in which the latter was compared to Paul of Samosata: see above. For it is said, indeed, in the superscription, that it came from the *clergy* of the Constantinopolitan church; but in the complaint itself, one individual only speaks, and he

The patriarch Flavian had thus far taken no part in the disputes between the doctrinal parties; and as he must have been well aware of the great influence possessed by the Eutychian monkish party, as well as of his own critical and hazardous situation with a court party opposed to him, which might easily convert Eutyches into an instrument for promoting their designs, he would be very little inclined, under these circumstances, to enlist himself in such controversies. He sought therefore, in the first place, to crush them in the bud; and sought to induce the bishop Eusebius to give up his suit. He begged of him, that he would but make one visit to the abbot Eutyches in his cell, with a purpose of coming to some understanding with him, and settling the terms of peace, so that new disturbances might not arise in the church.[1] But as Eusebius could not be persuaded to withdraw his complaint, a summons was served upon Eutyches. The latter, in a haughty and imperious manner, at first declined personally to obey the summons. The synod, after the third summons, were about to proceed with him according to the ecclesiastical law, as one who, by refusing to appear, had confessed that he was guilty; when finally he presented himself; not alone however, but accompanied by a large train of monks, soldiers, and notables of state, who would not part with him till the synod gave their promise that he should be permitted to return in safety to his cloister. At the same time appeared one of the emperor's secretaries of state, (Silentiarius,) with a letter of the emperor, in which the great influence of the party of Dioscurus and of Eutyches, and the mistrust which these men had contrived to inspire in the emperor's mind against the synod, were clearly manifested. The emperor declared it to be his will, that the creed expressed by the fathers, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, at Nice, and at Ephesus when Nestorius was deposed, should be maintained, and that nothing should be done which tended to detract from it. This declaration was without meaning, except it implied that the emperor had somehow been filled with solicitude lest Eutyches should be condemned as a defender of the pure doctrine established at Nice and at Ephesus. And as it respects the clause which spoke of the Ephesian council, since it might be disputed what was meant by the Ephesian council, the point was left thus undetermined, in order that a great deal else might be introduced, as it might suit the designs of the party of Dioscurus. If by it was understood the illegal assembly of the party of Cyrill, then there would be an opportunity of introducing also Cyrill's anathemas. We may discern here the same plan which afterwards, and so long as the influence of Dioscurus predominated, was undeviatingly pursued.

addresses the clergy and laity. Moreover, Leontius of Byzantium says (l. III. c. Nestorianos et Eutychianos) that this document proceeded from a certain Eusebius, qui tunc florebat in judicandi potestate, but who afterwards became bishop of Doryleum. The first remark should be corrected, it is true, by the breviculus; for the agens in rebus possessed no judicial powers. Now if this conjecture is correct, Eusebius, while a minister of state, must have already busied himself a good deal with the study of the doctrines of the church, and hence would be the more zealous about them when he became a bishop.

[1] Ἵνα μὴ τίνα πάλιν ταραχὴν καὶ θόρυβον ἐγγένεσθαι ταῖς Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίαις. See Harduin. T. II. Acta Concil. Chalc. Acta I. f. 111. E.

This mistrust of the emperor towards the synod was still further manifested, and in a way certainly disrespectful to them, by the fact, that he deemed it necessary, as he declared in the letter above mentioned, to send one of his high officers of state, the patrician Florentius, a man approved on the score of his orthodoxy, to attend the synod, on the ground expressly assigned, that the *matters in discussion related to the faith:* hence he was not merely to see to the preservation of outward order, which was hitherto considered to be the business of the emperor's commissioner, but also to watch for the preservation of sound doctrine. Insulting, however, as this letter was to the synod, it was yet received with the customary loudly reiterated demonstrations of applause, and the adulation even went to the extreme of saluting the emperor as high priest.[1]

Eutyches possessed the doctrinal bent which we have described at length on a former page: he professed to be unwilling to hold to anything, except what he found expressly affirmed in the holy scriptures. He reverenced — he said — the sayings of the older church-teachers; *but they could not possess, in his view, the authority of a rule of faith; for they were not free from error, and they sometimes contradicted one another.*[2] To all questions proposed to him concerning Christ, he had always ready the reply: "I confess him to be my God, the Lord of heaven and earth: his essence I do not allow myself to wish to comprehend."[3] Finally, on being pressed, he declared that he did indeed suppose there were two natures before the incarnation, but that after it he could confess but one nature. By this, beyond all question, Eutyches intended to say, as that which was meant by the adherents of the Alexandrian system of doctrine, that two natures should be distinguished in conception; but in actual manifestation only the one nature of the Logos become flesh must be recognized. But by his rude form of expression, he furnished occasion, it must be acknowledged, for many suspicions of heresy, to those who fastened only on the letter of the expression — as though he believed in a preëxistence of Christ's humanity, and the like. Furthermore, Eutyches was wont to call the body of Christ, the body of God; and though he did not deny that Christ possessed a human body, yet it seemed to him derogatory to its dignity, as the body of God, to call it the same in essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with other human bodies. A certain mistaken and undefined feeling of reverence

[1] One of the exclamations: "Many years to our high priest the emperor!" Πόλλα τὰ ἔτη τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ βασιλεῖ. See Concil. Chalc. l. c. f. 150, D.

[2] These were the words which Eutyches, somewhat earlier, addressed to the deputies of the council in his cloister. The original substance of his declaration, in words, cannot, it is true, be precisely ascertained. Eutyches and his friends asserted, that his words had not been faithfully reported. And the deputies themselves did allow, that they might have taken some things which were said not wholly according to their literal meaning. The party of Eutyches, however, had a particular interest in refusing to recognize as faithfully reported many things which seem to have been too freely expressed for the faith of the church grounded on outward authority, and which might give offence to the bishops. It is clearly manifest, on comparison, that the difference between the original form of the expression actually employed by Eutyches, and that in which his declaration is presented in the acts of the council of Constantinople, cannot be regarded as a very important one. See Harduin. Concil. f. 182.

[3] Φυσιολόγειν ἐμαυτῷ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω.

kept him from this. True, he would have found no difficulty in expressing himself precisely as the synod required that he should, although he had hitherto never expressed himself thus; but yet he would not consent to condemn the opposite form of expression, which in truth appeared to him the better one. Since, then, he could not make up his mind to recognize the two natures in Christ, nor to join in the above-mentioned formula of condemnation, the synod gave sentence against him, that he should be divested of all his spiritual titles, and excommunicated from the church.

Flavian — who, as we have already said, had from the very first engaged, not without solicitude, in this whole affair — must have been well aware of the danger into which he was plunging, by proceeding thus against the head of a monkish party possessed of so much influence at court, and connected with the powerful patriarch of Alexandria. Even as the leader of that monkish clan which had proved to be so influential amidst the Nestorian controversies, Eutyches was a dangerous man.[1] But, besides this, the case now was, that the most powerful men of the court, the eunuch, and chief lord of the bed-chamber, Chrysaphius, whose influence was then unbounded, and Nomus, the most eminent of the officers of state, maintained a close correspondence with the patriarch Dioscurus, and consented to assist in the promotion of his ends; and that Chrysaphius was a personal friend of Eutyches, whom he respected as his godfather,[2] and hostile to the patriarch Flavian, with whom his avarice found it more difficult to drive a profitable bargain than with a Dioscurus.[3] Chrysaphius was at the head of a court-party, opposed to the influence of Pulcheria, the emperor's sister; and the latter was a patroness of Flavian. Chrysaphius, having succeeded then in forming a league with the empress Eudocia against Pulcheria, and in depriving the latter of her influence, and finally removing her entirely from the court, was now armed with all necessary power to proceed against the patriarch. It might well be, therefore, that the whole contest, if not instigated by his own secret arts and those of Dioscurus, yet furnished him with a welcome occasion for prosecuting a plan which had been devised before.

[1] See the complaint of an Alexandrian presbyter against Dioscurus, in Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 332. Of Nomus it is here said: Τότε τὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν χέρσιν ἔχοντι πράγματα. Theodoret also had proofs of the unfavorable disposition of the patrician Nomus towards his party, as two letters which he sent him were not answered. See ep. 26.

Eusebius of Doryleum shows, by a remarkable expression of his during the proceedings at Constantinople, how much reason he had to fear the power of Eutyches. "I fear his running about," says he; "I am poor, he has money; he threatens me with exile, he already depicts to me the Oasis." Δεδοίκα αὐτοῦ τὴν περιδρόμην, ἐγω πένης εἰμί, ἐξόριαν μοὶ ἀπειλεῖ, χρήματα ἔχει, ἀναζωγράφει μοι ἤδη τὴν Ὄασιν. See acta Concil. Chalc. Harduin. T. II. f. 162, E.

[2] See Liberat. breviar. c. XI.

[3] See Theophan. Chronograph. ed. Venet. f. 68. Chrysaphius, according to this historian, had invited the emperor to require of the patriarch Flavian a present in gold (εὐλογία) on the occasion of his entering into his office. Flavian sent him an episcopal gift, consecrated bread, (εὐλογία in another sense,) with which, however, Chrysaphius was not satisfied. As it is intimated in Theophanes (l. c.) that Flavian took the part of certain Alexandrian clergy, Cyrill's relations, persecuted by Dioscurus, in opposition to Chrysaphius, who here acted in subserviency to the revengeful spirit of Dioscurus, while he sought at the same time to gratify his own avarice, (see Harduin. l. c.) we may perhaps find in this also a reason for the hatred of both these men to Flavian.

The way in which Eutyches presented himself before the assembly plainly showed that he was conscious of being able to depend on the assistance of a powerful party. Thus it became known, even in distant lands, how much Flavian had hazarded by this mode of proceeding. The advocates of the doctrine of the two natures, in Syria, saw in this case a triumph of the truth, which they attributed to the zeal and courage of Flavian overcoming the fear of human power; and they sent messages to assure him of their sympathy and joy on the occasion.[1]

But Eutyches applied to the emperor with a petition, demanding a new trial. He endeavored to show, that, in the proceedings against him, the prescribed legal forms had been violated; that the sentence of condemnation had been already prepared before he was tried; and that, in the drawing up of the protocol, many things had been stated that were untrue. The emperor received the petition, and ordered a revision of the earlier proceedings. But as Flavian, with all his respect for the emperor, yet did not suffer himself to be influenced in the least in his judicial proceedings by fear of the imperial power, the revision resulted in a confirmation of the sentence pronounced upon Eutyches.

This was, however, by no means the end of the business: it was rather but the beginning of greater and more general commotions in the Eastern church. Eutyches had already, during the proceedings at Constantinople, let fall an expression, from which his ulterior designs might have been conjectured. He had said he would consent to profess his belief in the two natures of Christ, if the bishops of Alexandria and of Rome would also approve of it. The sentiments of his ally Dioscurus were well known to him; and he expected to be upheld by the Roman bishop, judging from the manner in which the predecessors of that bishop had espoused the cause of the monkish party in the contest with Nestorius. But he did not consider, that the doctrines of Nestorius might be opposed from some other point of view than that of the Monophysites. Eutyches himself wished to have that expression considered as an appeal to a general council to be attended by both the other patriarchs. This appeal to another council was thenceforward the mark at which he constantly aimed. Of this he spoke in his letter to the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, complaining that Nestorianism was starting up afresh. Of this he treated also in his conferences with the emperor; and the emperor, already reminded from those at Alexandria that new and energetic measures were required in order to supplant the reviving Nestorianism, was therefore easily induced to comply with Eutyches' request. Already, when the revision of this matter at Constantinople was ordered by the emperor, arrangements were at the same time in progress for assembling a general council, which should pass definitive sentence on all the matters in dispute.[2]

Flavian, however, was desirous of preventing the convocation of a new council of this sort. In his view, no such assembly was needed,

[1] Theodoret. ep. XI.

[2] The remark of a bishop, from which we may see that all this was only intended as a provisory transaction: *Εἰ καὶ τὰ μαλίστα οἰκουμενίκη ἐκελεύσθη γίνεσθαι σύνοδος καὶ πεφυλάκται τὰ καιριώτερα τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν ἐκεινῃ τῇ συνόδῳ καὶ μετεσταλήσαν πόλλοι.* Conc. Chalc. Harduin. T. II. f. 176, D.

since the doctrine of the church, as hitherto expressed, was sufficiently decided against Eutyches. This, we must allow, was not necessarily clear to all; for nothing, at least in the public declarations of the church, had been expressly determined on the points in dispute; as the antagonism between the doctrines of the Antiochian and the Alexandrian church had not as yet been resolved by any public decisions; and the articles of agreement entered into with Cyrill, which might pass for such conciliation, had from the first been differently construed by the different parties. Beyond question, in the existing state of feeling of which we have spoken above, and with the known disposition of Dioscurus, and the mighty influence of his party, which was also the party of Eutyches, no good could be expected from a new general synod. Hence Flavian called upon the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, to use his authority also to prevent the assembling of another general council, lest all the churches should be thrown into disturbance.[1] These words show what prospects were anticipated from the council in question; and similar were the expectations of all unprejudiced men who were honestly solicitous for the welfare of the church.

But Flavian could not obtain what he desired. The emperor could not forgive him for condemning Eutyches, which from the first was contrary to his will; and for this very reason he became more closely connected with the opposite party, under whose supremacy the general council was to be placed.

The manner in which this new council, the second general council of Ephesus, appointed to meet at Ephesus in the year 449, was first announced by the emperor, and the arrangement of its course of proceedings could but serve to deepen the solicitude which had been awakened at the outset; since it was plainly manifest, that the emperor had a perfect understanding with Dioscurus, and that the assembly was to be used by the latter and his party only as an instrument for the accomplishment of a plan which had already been prepared. In his ordinance addressed to this synod, the emperor declared, that as the patriarch Flavian had stirred up a dispute concerning the doctrines of faith with the abbot Eutyches, he, the emperor, had taken great pains to suppress the disorders which had arisen, and for this reason had often sent to the patriarch; for, in his opinion, the true faith had been sufficiently established by what had been taught by the fathers at Nice and at Ephesus. But as the patriarch was not to be moved by his repeated entreaties that he would abstain from these disputes, therefore the emperor had not deemed it safe to let such a controversy be managed without calling in the assistance of all the most eminent bishops from all countries; and hence this general council had been convoked, for the purpose of investigating the whole matter anew, and of extirpating every devilish root;[2] for the purpose of thrusting the adherents of the blasphemies of the godless Nestorius out of the church, and of ordering that the orthodox doctrine should be maintained with unshaken con-

[1] Ὥστε μὴ τὰς ἁπανταχοσε ἐκκλησίας διαταραχθῆναι.

[2] Πᾶσαν διαβολικὴν ἔκκοψαι ῥίζαν, i. e. as is in fact immediately afterwards explained, the devilish heresy of Nestorius.

stancy. Dioscurus was nominated by the emperor, president of the council; and his assessors were to be the bishops Juvenalis of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. The last, however, were mentioned in such a way as made it sufficiently evident, that they were to be used only as the tools of Dioscurus; for it was said of both those bishops, that they, and all such warm friends of orthodoxy, would be of the same mind with Dioscurus. The judges of Eutyches — for example, the patriarch Flavian — should attend the council, not as judges however, nor as voters, but in order to learn the decision of the council, which was to investigate the matter anew. Already, in the first letters missive, the emperor had ordered that Theodoret should be present only on condition it should be deemed good by the whole assembly; but, in case of any difference of opinion on this point, he should remain excluded. By this it was very clearly announced beforehand, that Theodoret was not to be admitted. Yet too many apprehensions were still entertained of the influence of the well-merited esteem in which that excellent man stood with many. For this reason, in his letter to Dioscurus, the emperor declared why he had nominated him to be president of the assembly: "Because it might happen, that numbers inclined to Nestorianism would take every pains to bring it about, in some way or other, that Theodoret should attend the council. On this account, Dioscurus only should decide that point; for those who ventured to add or take away anything from the doctrines of faith, as they had been established at Nice, and afterwards at Ephesus, ought to have no voice at the synod, but, on the contrary, to be subjected to its judicial sentence." While all the opponents of the Alexandrian system of faith were thus plainly enough excluded from the synod, as Nestorians; the other party, on the contrary, were favored in the most arbitrary manner. The emperor directed: "Because, in many districts of the East, the orthodox Archimandrites [1] were in controversy with the bishops, who were said to be infected with the Nestorian blasphemy, therefore the abbot Barsumas, as their representative, should have a seat and a voice at the council." The emperor had appointed two civil officers, — men, as he declared, of approved orthodoxy,— to attend the proceedings, as his plenipotentiaries. In the instructions given to them, they were directed, in case they observed any one creating disturbance to the prejudice of the holy faith, to place such person in safe custody, and report the fact to the emperor; that is, they were authorized to remove every man who was bold enough to express freely his own convictions in opposition to the Alexandrian monophysitism.

In correspondence with these arrangements was the actual course of this council, justly branded in the history of the church with the title *robber-synod*, (σύνοδος ληστρική.) Dioscurus here ruled supreme, by his vote, which was paramount to every other; by the influence of the imperial commissioners, which gave meaning and force to his threats; by the fanatical violence of his Egyptian party, and particularly of the

[1] The very party with which, as we have before remarked, Theodoret and his friends had so many contests.

great body of monks who attended Barsumas, whose fierce shouts might well give reason to apprehend that they were capable of any outrage; by a troop of brawny hospital-waiters, (parabolani, see above, vol. II. p. 159,) and soldiers, who were admitted into the assembly for the purpose of intimidating refractory members seated before them;[1] and, finally, through the cowardice or entire want of character shown by so many bishops, to whom the truth was not the highest of all interests. Nothing could be more contrary to the spirit of the gospel than the fanaticism which actuated the dominant party in this council in favor of certain dogmatic formulas of conception, in which men dreamed of possessing Christ, who is spirit and life, though in temper and action they denied him. Theodoret relates,[2] that, when the assembly were about to bring a formal complaint against a bishop who was accused of unchastity and various other crimes, the president Dioscurus dismissed the whole matter, remarking: "If you have a complaint against his orthodoxy, we shall receive it; but we have not come here to pass judgment on unchastity." Theodoret takes this occasion to set forth the character of the synod. "They were for acting," he said, "as if Christ had merely prescribed a rule of faith, without giving rules of practice." Some examples from the proceedings may serve to verify this description.

The general plan which Dioscurus pursued at this council was the same which he had thus far been prosecuting by his subservient instruments, — to condemn whatever was opposed to the Alexandrian system of doctrine, as a heretical innovation overstepping the determinations of doctrine settled at the councils of Nice and of Ephesus. He opened the proceedings by declaring that the council of Nice and the council of Ephesus had both established the same creed; everything had on these occasions been settled in an unalterable manner. Accursed be he who would unsettle again, and subject to new examination, what had there been determined! This proposition was received with shouts of approbation like the following: "On this depends the salvation of the world! God save the bishop Dioscurus, the great guardian of the faith!" He then cited the passage in 1 Sam. 2: 25, from which the misapprehended distinction had been drawn between sins against God and sins against man, and the perverted principle that heresies were sins of far deeper dye than all others. And he added, applying this principle to the present case: "If the Holy Ghost then dwelt with our fathers, and determined whatever was determined, then he who has introduced any alterations here has proved himself to be a despiser of the divine grace." This also was received "as the voice of the Holy Spirit," as the synod expressed it in their shout of applause. The very announcement of the proposition, that Christ consists of two

[1] The bishop Basil of Seleucia, in Isauria, said to Dioscurus, at the council of Chalcedon, in excuse of what he had done contrary to his own convictions, at the council of Ephesus: Πολλὴν ἐπιστήσας ἡμῖν τότε ἀνάγκην τὴν μὲν ἐξώθεν, τὴν δὲ ἐνδοθεν, τὴν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς γλώσσης σόν· εἰσετρέχον γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν στρατιῶται μετὰ ὅπλων καὶ εἰσηκείσαν οἱ μοναζόντες μετὰ Βαρσούμα καὶ οἱ παραβαλάνειες καὶ πλῆθος ἄλλο πολύ. Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 213, l. c.

[2] Ep. 147 ad Joannem Germaniciæ.

natures, produced such an excitement that all the Egyptian bishops, and the whole throng of monks that accompanied Barsumas, exclaimed, "Divide asunder the man himself who speaks of two natures. He who speaks of two natures is a *Nestorius*." When the bishop Eusebius, of Doryleum, attempted to explain the doctrine of two natures in Christ, many voices exclaimed, "Burn Eusebius; let him be burnt alive. As he has cut asunder Christ, so let *him* be cut asunder."[1] Such exclamations, with the sight of the soldiers and the ferocious monks, were quite sufficient to stupify many who otherwise would not have given their assent to the propositions of Dioscurus. Thrown off from their self-possession, and hurried along against their will, they repeated by rote whatever was prescribed to them.[2]

True, the bishops who attended this Ephesian synod had strong inducements afterwards, at the council of Chalcedon, to exaggerate the scenes of violence which there occurred, in palliation of their own conduct on that occasion; and, besides, many contradictions may be detected in their remarks: but still it is clear that force was resorted to in various ways to compel men to subscribe the decisions of the council; that the bishops were kept confined for a whole day in the church; that they were menaced by soldiers and monks till they had subscribed; and that *blank papers* were laid before them for their signature, which could afterwards be filled up with whatever the leaders chose.[3]

After Dioscurus had thus carried through the principle that the Nicene-Ephesian creed was alone valid, the canon established at the first council of Ephesus was now confirmed anew, that whoever taught or endeavored to introduce anything different from these articles, should, if a bishop or ecclesiastic, be deposed from his spiritual office, and, if a layman, excommunicated from the church. This law was next applied, in a wholly arbitrary manner, and without any trial of the cases, to the bishops Flavian and Eusebius. Inasmuch as these bishops had deviated on almost every point from this creed, and thus excited disturbances and scandal in all countries, they had of themselves incurred those established and unalterable penalties, and should be deposed from their spiritual office.[4] Many who were impelled by their

[1] Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 162, E.

[2] A bishop, Basil of Seleucia, says himself afterwards, at the council of Chalcedon, in his own excuse: Τοσούτος ἐγένετο κρότος, ὥστε πάντων ἡμῶν τιναχθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν . . . . ἀχλύος δὲ πληρώθεις εἶπον. F. 102.

[3] F. 94. Theodoret also says, soon after these events: Τῶν συνελθόντων οἱ πλείστοι βιασθέντες συνέθεντο. Ep. 142.

[4] When that canon was brought forward by Dioscurus, several bishops remarked at once, that the deposition of Flavian was the real object at bottom. And when, soon after, Dioscurus actually proposed this deposition, many of the bishops arose, and, clasping his knees, begged him to desist from that judgment. One of the bishops alleged the very characteristic reason, that he too had presbyters, and should therefore be cautious how he let a bishop be deposed for the sake of a presbyter. But Dioscurus remained firm: he would rather let his tongue be cut out, he said, than pass any other sentence, and he threatened to call upon the imperial commissioners. Dioscurus asserted, it is true, that this whole account of the matter, given by some bishops at the council of Chalcedon, was false, and appealed to witnesses. But he may have easily forgotten himself what he had said in the heat of passion; and, as a matter of course, such things were not entered on the minutes of the scribes. A great deal in

fears to acquiesce in these judgments, quieted their consciences with the reflection that at least no new doctrines had been proposed, to which they were forced to give their assent; for the only point in question was whether they should hold fast the form of doctrine set forth in the Nicene and Ephesian councils. But they would not distinctly look at the fact, that Flavian and Eusebius were at any rate deposed solely on grounds of doctrine.[1] Accordingly those very bishops who had taken part in the council of Constantinople under Flavian gave their assent to these decrees. Even the patriarch Domnus, of Antioch, who, on account of the position which he held in the church, stood at the head of the Orientals, was persuaded to yield with the rest, heedless of the warnings which the excellent Theodoret, with a wise foresight of the future, gave him when the council was about to be opened.[2] But this compliance could not avail him. Dioscurus could not for this forgive him his opposition to the Cyrillian anathemas; and, being compelled by sickness to withdraw from the council, sentence of deposition was pronounced afterwards also upon him.[3] The same sentence was passed upon Theodoret, and several others who were among the most worthy bishops of the East.

By an imperial edict, Theodoret was also removed from his diocese, and obliged to retire to the cloister where he had received his early education. His enemies endeavored so to contrive it that he should be deprived even of the necessaries of life; and many were so awed by the power of the dominant party that they dared not interfere in his behalf.[4] There were, however, a few pious bishops who vied with each other in testifying their affection for a man who was thus suffering for the truth. Theodoret, who was accustomed to moderate his bodily wants and needed but very little to satisfy them, declined most of the gifts which were offered him, writing to his friends "that the God who gave the very ravens their abundance of food, had provided him thus far with all that was needful for his support."[5] When we compare the spirit of ambition and violence on the one hand, and of servile compliance and cowardice on the other, exhibited by so many bishops of the East, with the firmness rising above all fear of man, the tranquil composure amid all the storms of the times, and the confidence of faith in contending for the truth, which shine forth in this example of Theodoret, the striking contrast leaves upon us but a still more agreeable impression of his character.[6]

those remarks bears at least an impress too distinctly characteristic to be liable to the suspicion of having been invented. Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 215.

[1] Μηδεμίαν γεγενῆσθαι περὶ τὸ δόγμα καινοτομίαν. Ep. 147.

[2] See Theodoret, ep. 112. Theodoret here very justly reminds the patriarch, that no good had come of all the previous councils.

[3] See Liberatus, cap. 12. Dioscurus brought in evidence against him a letter in which he had declared against the anathemas, though certainly in very moderate terms, (eo quod essent obscura.)

[4] He writes himself, ep. 134: Εἰ πάντες ταύτην ἐξηλώσαν τὴν ὁμοτήτα, οὐδεν ἑτέρον ὑπελείπετο, ἢ ζῶντας μὲν ὑπ' ἐνδείας ἀναλωθῆναι, τελευτήσαντες δὲ μὴ τάφῳ παραδοθῆναι, ἀλλὰ κύνων καὶ θήρων γένεσθαι βόραν.

[5] Ep. 123.

[6] A few characteristic facts selected from his letters may here serve as illustrations. When he first received the tidings of his deposition, he wrote: (ep. 21:) "All the sufferings we meet for the sake of the divine doctrines are very welcome to us. It cannot be otherwise, if we truly believe in the promises of our Lord, that the suffer-

Thus, then, the party of Dioscurus, by availing itself of the power of the court, had succeeded in crushing the Oriental church. Some changed their faith with the change of circumstances, and bowed the knee to the dominant party.[1] Others, although they remained faithful to the truth themselves, yet dared not lift up their voice in its defence. The men of free and fearless spirit were separated from their churches and banished. In this lamentable state of things, but one refuge was left to the oppressed church of the East, namely, to appeal for redress to the Western church, which had remained free from the influence of the political power, and had not been affected by any of these contests; and especially to the bishop of the ancient capital of the world, through whose all-powerful influence at the court of the Roman emperor, they might hope to receive assistance also from the latter quarter.

This important station in the church was then occupied by Leo the Great, a person of great energy and firmness of character. Leo had from the first been drawn into some participation in these controversies. Eutyches in the first place, and then Flavian, had had recourse to him. As soon as he obtained exact information respecting the subject of the dispute with Eutyches, he acquiesced in the sentence of condemnation passed on his doctrine, and simply expressed a wish that gentle methods might be employed to induce Eutyches to recant, and, if he could not be persuaded, that he might be forgiven. He afterwards wrote Flavian a letter constituting an epoch in the history of the doctrines of faith, in which he endeavored to prescribe the law for the decision of those disputes, and unfolded in detail the doctrine of the unity of Christ, as one person in two natures, both retaining unaltered their respective attributes, but acting in union with each other; and to this letter he constantly refers in all his succeeding communications. The emperor Theodosius having invited him to take a part in the Ephesian council, he sent, as his deputies, the bishop Julius of Puteoli, the presbyter Renatus, the deacon Hilarus, and the notary Dulcitius. These deputies witnessed the scenes of violence which were exhibited at that synod; but they played there a very insignificant part, having attempted in vain to get permission even to do so much as to read publicly before

ings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. Rom. 8: 18. But why do I mention the enjoyment of future blessings? For even though no reward were bestowed on the combatants, yet the truth, itself alone, were enough to move its friends to encounter with all joy every danger in its behalf." He then proceeds to unfold in a beautiful manner, from the epistles of Paul, from the passage in Rom. 8: 35–38, how the apostle asked for no recompense, but the love of the Saviour was to him more than all recompense; — the doctrine, preëminently shining through the writings of the Antiochian church-teachers, of disinterested love: Those who counselled him to be silent, and yield to the times, — a so-called *οἰκονομία*, — he repelled, opposing to them the precepts of holy writ, which require the bold annunciation of the truth: and he reminds them of that truth worthy of all acceptation, that none of the other cardinal virtues can avail anything without fortitude, ep. 122. In predicting the judgment of God which awaited the authors of injustice, he only expressed the wish, that they might seasonably desist from their wrong-doing, "that we may not be compelled to sorrow over them when we see them suffering punishment." Ep. 124. "What can be more feeble than they are who lack the truth?" he writes, ep. 129.

[1] Of such Theodoret says, ep. 147: *Ποίοι πολύποδες οὕτως πρὸς τὰς πέτρας τὴν οἰκείαν ἐναλλάττουσι χρόαν ἢ χαμαιλέοντες πρὸς τὰ φύλλα τὸ χρῶμα, ὡς οὗτοι τὴν γνώμην πρὸς τοὺς καίρους μεταβάλλουσιν;*

the synod the letter of Leo. Without directly giving them a refusal, the all-controlling Dioscurus still contrived always to find some plausible reason for delay.[1] When the patriarch Flavian protested against the unrighteous judgment passed by the Ephesian council, the Roman deacon had courage enough to join in this protest;[2] and Flavian handed over to him an appeal to a larger council which should be held in Italy. Hilarus succeeded in escaping from the high-handed violence of Dioscurus; and, by choosing the less frequented routes, arrived at Rome, where he drew up a faithful description to his bishop of the proceedings of the Ephesian council, and presented to him the appeal.[3] The bishop Theodoret also, in a remarkable letter,[4] resorted to an appeal of the same kind.

Many and various were the motives which now conspired to determine Leo as to the course he should pursue, and as to the way in which he should embark in these affairs. On the one hand, the zeal for pure doctrine, sympathy for oppressed innocence, indignation at the unspiritual mode of proceeding at Ephesus, — on the other hand, the idea which already completely absorbed his mind, that a certain superintendence and jurisdiction over the whole church belonged to him as the successor of Peter, — all these considerations combined to give a certain direction to his mode of conduct. No sooner had he received these accounts from his deacon, than, in his letter addressed to the East, he expressed in the most emphatic tone his dissatisfaction at the arbitrary behavior of the Ephesian council,[5] and urged the necessity of assembling a new council in Italy. Through the influence of Leo, a letter written in the same spirit was addressed from the court of the

[1] Dioscurus at first had even proposed that the letter should be read before the synod, though perhaps he was not in earnest about it. But upon this, the first secretary of the Alexandrian church, (Primicerius notariorum,) the presbyter John, whose duty it was to present the official records, said that he held in his hands the imperial *sacra* addressed to the council. Respect to the emperor now required, that this document should be read first, and the letter of Leo was then forgotten. See Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 90. When it was proposed afterwards, that the acts of the σύνοδος ἐνδημούσα, by which Eutyches was condemned, should be read, and the Roman deputies were asked whether they also were satisfied with this course, they declared they would agree to it on condition that Leo's letter to Flavian should first be read. But now Eutyches declared the Roman deputies were suspected by him; for on their arrival they had alighted at the house of the patriarch Flavian, they had breakfasted with him, had frequently been in conference with him; and Flavian had shown them all possible honor. He must therefore require, that, if they proposed doing him any wrong, this should not be used to his disadvantage. The bishop Dioscurus then declared, it was certainly no more than right that those acts should first be read, and then the reading of the letter might follow afterwards. But when this was done, no one remembered that Leo's letter was next to be read. Act. Chalc. I. f. 110. For a third time, the Roman deacon, Hilarus, took the opportunity, when Dioscurus brought forward his proposition respecting the unalterable validity of the Nicene-Ephesian articles of faith, to affirm that these doctrines agreed with the faith of the fathers, as also with that letter of Leo; and added, that if they would allow that letter to be read, they would perceive that it contained nothing but the truth. But again this invitation was neglected. L. c. f. 255, E.

[2] L. c. f. 258.

[3] L. c. f. 34.

[4] See above, vol. II. p. 165, in the history of the church constitution.

[5] With him originated the name by which this council was stigmatized in the history of the church. Ephesinum non judicium; sed latrocinium, ep. 95, ed. Ballerin, according to other editions, ep. 75.

Western emperor to Constantinople. By all these means, nothing, however, could for the present be effected. So false a representation of all that had happened had been given to the emperor Theodosius, who, at the same time, depended entirely upon it; so completely concealed from him was the true condition of the Eastern church, that he wrote to the emperor Valentinian III. everything had been transacted at Ephesus with perfect freedom, and in strict conformity to truth; none but the unworthy bishops had been deposed; Flavian had met with the punishment he deserved; and, since his deposition, perfect peace and unanimity prevailed in the churches, where nothing else was now supreme but the pure truth.

Meanwhile, however, the choice of Anatolius as the new patriarch of Constantinople, in place of the deposed Flavian, rendered it necessary to enter into new negotiations with the Roman bishop; for it was wished that he should be recognized also in the Western church, which could not be done without the concurrence of the Roman bishop. But Leo would not otherwise consent to recognize Anatolius, except on condition he gave unambiguous proofs of his orthodoxy, condemned the doctrines of Eutyches as well as of Nestorius, and consented to subscribe, with several other documents, the letter of Leo to Flavian.[1] To settle the details of the business with the patriarch, he moreover sent to Constantinople a delegation consisting of two bishops, one of whom was Abundius, bishop of Como, and two presbyters.

In the meantime, important changes had occurred at Constantinople in the state of public affairs, altogether favorable to Leo's designs. Dioscurus had in truth been indebted, in a great measure, for his triumph, to the power of Chrysaphius and of the empress Eudocia. But now Chrysaphius had fallen into disgrace, and was banished. The emperor had separated from his wife Eudocia, and the latter retired to the district of Jerusalem. Pulcheria, the patroness of Flavian, was recalled to court, and once more obtained unbounded influence.[2] These changes alone enabled Leo now to accomplish vastly more at Constantinople. Already had Pulcheria caused Flavian's body to be brought to Constantinople, and buried with all the honors due to a patriarch. In addition to this, an event now occurred which gave the decisive blow. Theodosius died in the year 450, when Pulcheria united herself in marriage with Marcian, and procured for him the imperial dignity. The prevailing religion at court now took an altogether different turn. The bishops who had been deposed and exiled on account of their faith were recalled, and directed to resume their dioceses. As the prevailing doctrinal inclination of the court was wont to have great influence on the conduct of very many bishops, so it happened too in the present case. Many, who under the former reign had taken the side of Dioscurus, under the influence of force or of fear, or who were already in the habit of making their doctrinal opinions subservient to circum-

[1] See Leo's letter to the emperor Theodosius, to Pulcheria, and to the abbots of Constantinople, ep. 69–71, and the life of the bishop Abundius of Como, in the Acta Sanctorum, II. April.

[2] See Theophanes chronograph.

stances, now signified their repentance. The patriarch Anatolius transacted all matters relating to the healing of the schism of the churches, in a common understanding with the Roman bishop Leo; and, to facilitate this, the latter sent a new deputation to Constantinople. He declared it to be his own mind, that the bishops who had erred simply through weakness or fear, should be granted forgiveness if they signified their repentance, and, as he had already required of Anatolius, should present satisfactory testimonies of their orthodoxy. An exception only should be made of the case of those bishops who had taken the lead in the second Ephesian council, Dioscurus, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem. The definitive sentence with regard to these last should remain reserved to the Roman bishop until after a more exact investigation.

At the same time, however, the objects and interests of the Roman bishop and of the imperial court could not be brought perfectly to agree with each other. Leo proceeded on the supposition, that a new investigation of the doctrines of faith was wholly unnecessary; since everything had been sufficiently decided already by what had been determined during the previous disputes, and especially by his own letter to Flavian; and that the only proper subject for deliberation and counsel was, how to proceed with those who had lately espoused the party of the second Ephesian synod. Should it be thought advisable on this account to assemble a general council, this ought to be appointed to meet in some Italian city; Flavian having in fact appealed to a council to be convened in Italy.[1] But the emperor had in view, at the same time with the doctrinal interest, also a political one: he did not wish to suppress, by force, a schism which was so deeply rooted and so widely spread, and the suppression of which might be attended with such disastrous consequences both to church and state; but he wished to devise means for a peaceable settlement. It was his desire, therefore, to avoid offending either of the two contending parties, and especially did he need to be indulgent towards a sect so powerful in one part of the empire, and so dangerous on account of their wild fanaticism, as was the monophysite or Egyptian party. Hence the object to be accomplished could not appear so easy to the emperor as it did to the Roman bishop, neither could he agree with the latter in respect to the choice of means. He wished and hoped — a hope which no one but a layman ignorant of the common course of theological controversies could entertain — to bring about, by means of negotiations at a general council, a concordat, which might serve as the basis of a reconciliation between the two parties. But this object was one which he could hope to accomplish only by means of a council, whose place of assembling should be so near that an influence might be brought to bear upon its proceedings from Constantinople; and that,

[1] E. g. ep. 82 ad Marcian. Non cujusmodi sit fides tenenda tractandum est; sed quorum precibus et qualiter annuendum. Ep. 94 ad eundem. Quamvis synodum fieri *intra Italiam* poposcissem, — which he often repeated in his letters to Constantinople.

if necessary, the emperor might attend it himself. He therefore sent out his letters missive for such a council to meet at Nice in Bithynia in the year 451. This particular town was doubtless selected for the express purpose of giving greater authority to the council by the remembrance of the first council of Nice, whose creed it was once more to assert in opposition to strange doctrines of erroneous tendency. Moreover, the bishop of Rome was invited to take a share in the deliberations of this council.

During these transactions, Leo proceeded according to the same consistent principles and in the same spirit as he had ever maintained. The position which he assumed for himself was that of a certain primacy, a certain supreme jurisdiction, which it belonged to him to assert over the whole church. He alleged as the reason why he could not himself appear at that council, not only the then political situation of the Western empire, but also the ancient usage, which did not permit a Roman bishop to be personally present at a foreign general council,[1] as if this was beneath the dignity of a bishop of Rome; and yet he deemed himself warranted to exercise the presidency there through his delegates, three bishops, and two presbyters, whom he sent to Chalcedon:[2] and in fact they often conducted in the council in such a manner, as that they seemed to arrogate to themselves in the name of the Roman bishop a certain supreme judicial authority;[3] although at the same time the patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople considered himself the president of the synod.[4]

The church assembly was now about to be opened at Nice, where 630 bishops had already convened; but the disturbances excited there by fanatical ecclesiastics, monks, and laymen, probably belonging to the party of Dioscurus, and who threatened to repeat over the scenes of the second Ephesian council, doubtless convinced the emperor that it would be necessary to bring the place for the assembling of the council nearer to the imperial residence, and more under the influence of the government. The Roman delegates also informed the emperor, that they dared not attend the council, unless he himself would be present. In order, therefore, to the better guidance of the council, the emperor transferred it from Nice to Chalcedon.[5] Thus, by its vicinity to the seat of government, the object could now be secured, which was originally had in view, that the first officers of state and

[1] See ep. 93 to the synod at Nice: Nec ulla poterat consuetudo permittere. So, too, the deputies of Leo, in the beginning of the third act of the council, *ἐπειδήπερ οὔτε τὸ τῆς ἀρχαιοτήτος ἔθος ἐσχήκε τούτο.*

[2] Ep. 93 to the synod at Nice: In his fratribus, qui ab apostolica directi sunt, me synodo vestra fraternitas æstimet præsidere.

[3] So e. g. the Roman delegate, in the third act, said the apostolic see had granted pardon to the penitent bishops of the second Ephesian council, l. c. 346. When Dioscurus was about to take his seat in the synod, the Roman delegates declared they had been instructed by the bishop of the city of Rome, which is the head of all the churches, *κεφάλης ὑπάρχοντος πάσων τῶν ἐκκλησίων*, not to suffer this; for he had presumed to hold a synod without the assistance of the apostolic seat, a thing which never had been done, and which ought not to be done. They declared that they were resolved to take their leave if this was permitted. Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 68.

[4] Leo and Anatolius are named together as *ἐξαρχόντες τῆς συνόδου.* Act. IV. f. 436.

[5] See the letter of Marcian to the synod at Nice, f. 48 and 49, l. c., and Liberatus, c. 13.

the imperial senate might be present at the meetings; and that, whenever aught occurred of doubtful character, the emperor might be immediately informed of it, and interpose his veto.

The imperial court had set itself a problem, the solution of which was attended with the utmost difficulty — to reconcile and unite together two parties irritated and inflamed with fanatical hatred towards each other. This was apparent at the very outset, in the manner in which Theodoret was received by the two parties, when he appeared in the midst of the council, as the accuser of his former judges, and to obtain a solemn act of justification. While he was welcomed by the Orientals with expressions of enthusiastic sympathy, the bishops of the Egyptian party degraded their spiritual character by repeated outcries of blind and frantic fanaticism: "Cast forth the Jew, the enemy of God, the blasphemer of Christ!" — and to remind the empress, that she who had wrought the overthrow of Nestorianism ought not to tolerate this Nestorian; they added, "Long live the empress! long live the orthodox emperor!" so that the very laymen of rank, who attended the synod in the name of the emperor, were constrained to say that such vulgar outcries ill beseemed bishops, and could be of no advantage to any party. But the bishops justified themselves on the ground, that "they were lifting up their voice in defence of piety and the orthodox faith."[1]

True, the influence of the altered tone of the court soon manifested itself in the case of those bishops who had attached themselves to Dioscurus at the Ephesian council, even such of them as had stood with him at the head of the synod. Already, during the first proceedings, the majority went over from the right side, where the Egyptian party sat, to the left, where the Orientals were seated under the presidency of the Roman delegates.[2] Often, especially when the question related to the deposing of all those bishops who had stood foremost in the second Ephesian council, the council resounded with the cry, "We have all sinned, we all ask forgiveness." Many with very ill grace excused the part they had taken at that former council, by pleading the command of imperial authority, and the constraint to which they were put; whereupon the lay dignitaries must reply, that in matters of faith such an excuse could not pass;[3] and Dioscurus was doubtless right in saying, that such an excuse implied in its very terms an accusation.[4]

But although the tone of the court exercised so great an influence on the conduct of the bishops, and although both parties joined in annihilating the Ephesian transactions; yet the breach between them

[1] Δι' εὐσεβείαν κράξομεν, act. I. l. c. f. 74.
[2] Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 130.
[3] Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 106.
[4] The bishop Basil of Seleucia in Isauria excused his signature to the judgment pronounced on the patriarch Flavian, on the plea that deference to a tribunal composed of a hundred and twenty or thirty bishops compelled him to obey their decrees. When, upon this, Dioscurus remarked, that he had passed judgment on himself of having trampled on right through the fear of man, he gave this singular reply: If he had stood before secular magistrates, he would have been ready to die as a martyr; but he had no power to contend with his fathers. L. c. f. 102.

still continued, and the imperial ministers, who were to see to it that the emperor's designs at the council were carried into effect, found it by no means so easy to unite them together by means of a common symbol of faith, and thereby to put an end to the divisions in the Oriental church, the fresh outbreaks of which was an object of continual dread. The very proposal to draw up a new symbol of this kind met from many with determined resistance, because doubtless they saw through the motives of policy, which would not harmonize with their dogmatic zeal, and hence wanted confidence in the whole thing.[1] Meantime the patriarch Anatolius, while the other business of the council went on, proceeded to discuss with a select number of bishops the matters of faith. With those who had many objections to make against the articles in the letter of Leo, which was to obtain the authority of a creed, he entered into an examination of their scruples, and endeavored to remove them, in which too he seems to have been successful. But when the symbol which resulted from those secret deliberations came to be laid before the assembly, new difficulties and objections could not fail to arise. For although a reconciliation was thereby to be brought about between the two parties, yet it was unavoidable that there should be a decided preponderance one way or the other, either in favor of the Egyptian, or else in favor of the Romano-Oriental form of doctrine; and accordingly either one or the other of the parties must be offended. The symbol of faith first proposed[2] seems to have been drawn up particularly with a view to accommodate the prevailing interest of the Egyptian party. It contained the article, that Christ consists of two natures, which doubtless accorded with the Egyptian creed; for that affirmed that the natures should be distinguished from each other in conception, though not in their actual being.[3] But some of the Oriental bishops were dissatisfied with that symbol, which was received by the other party with loud demonstrations of applause. The Roman delegates declared, that, if the council could not agree with the letter of Leo, they wished liberty to return home; and a council should be held at Rome. This threat, which caused a schism to be feared between the Oriental and the Occidental church, was sufficient to frighten the imperial court; and it was the more earnestly desired to gratify Leo, inasmuch as it was hoped, that, by showing respect to his doctrinal decisions, he might be induced

[1] See Concil. Chalc. act. II. f. 286.

[2] There were doubtless good reasons for not incorporating this with the other acts of the council; and hence we can only gather its contents from the way in which it was received.

[3] That this was the main point may be collected from the negotiations of the patriarch Anatolius with the bishops whom he sought to persuade to agree in an alteration of the creed. On the same principles which had moved them to consent to the deposition of Dioscurus, said he to them, they must also consent to reject the creed; for Dioscurus had deposed Flavian for no other reason than because he maintained the doctrine of the two natures; but the creed contained the article, that Christ consists of (not subsists in) two natures. He would doubtless say, the creed contained the doctrine of Dioscurus, who had been condemned, not of Flavian, who had been justified by the council. But the bishops who were in favor of the symbol maintained, on the other hand, that Dioscurus had not been deposed for doctrinal reasons. See act. V. f. 449.

to recognize the rank conceded to the patriarch of Constantinople, (See vol. II. p. 169.) It was for this reason so much pains had already been taken to give the validity of a creed to the letter of Leo addressed to Flavian, with which a part of the bishops could not be satisfied.[1] The civil dignitaries therefore proposed the appointment of a new committee to examine the symbol of faith, to which delegates should be chosen from the different parties, particularly six Orientals; and these should hold their meetings and deliberations under the presidency of the Roman delegates, as well as of the patriarch Anatolius. But the proposal to change the symbol of faith was received by many of the bishops with loud tokens of disapprobation. The imperial commissioners deemed it necessary to draw up a report of the doubtful temper of the bishops to the emperor, and wait for his commands. The emperor's decision appeared; and it was ordered that either the proposal for the nomination of a committee should be adopted, and that by these such a symbol should be drawn up as all could be satisfied with, and against which no scruples could be raised; or else all should, by their metropolitans, propose their own faith, and in this way all discord be removed; or, if they could not be satisfied with this, no other course remained than to take measures, since the unity of faith could not be settled here, for holding a general council in the West. This last was a threat well calculated to have an effect on the bishops. They must have a creed dictated to them by the Roman bishop and a Roman council. But the threat produced at first nothing but exasperation. Such expressions were heard as the following: those who were not satisfied with the ancient symbol were Nestorians; these might go; they might take up their journey to Rome. The commissioners then declared, though doubtless not till after many other things had transpired which have not been reported to us, Dioscurus had avowed it as his doctrine that Christ consists of two natures; but could not allow that two natures subsisted in Christ. Leo teaches that two natures are united without confusion, without change, and without separation, in one and the same Christ. With which of these two do you agree? The bishops — who could hardly all of them be the same as had opposed every change in the ancient creed — now exclaimed: "We all have the same faith with Leo; whoever contradicts this faith is a Eutychian. Upon this the commissioners suggested, that nothing more was needed than to receive into the creed that article from the letter of Leo. After this proposal had been generally received, they held with the select committee a secret meeting, in which the new symbol of faith was drawn up accordingly. In this it was defined that the one Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, should be recognized in two

[1] Leo was asked, in a letter addressed to him by the synod, to manifest, by that concession, his thanks to the emperor for having given the force of law to the doctrinal decision of the Roman bishop, and to the patriarch, for having united with him in establishing the pure doctrine. See Mansi concil. T. VII. f. 154. So too, for the like purpose, the patriarch Anatolius himself hinted at his own services in this respect to the bishop Leo, in a letter addressed to the latter, which was first published among the works of Leo, by the brothers Ballerini. Mansi VII. f. 171.

natures,[1] so that all confusion, change, and division of the two natures is excluded.[2] No one should be allowed to profess any other creed than this; to teach or *to think otherwise*.

While all the rest who had been active in the second Ephesian council, testified their repentance and requested to be forgiven, the patriarch Dioscurus, on the other hand, persisted in his opposition. He refused to recognize the judicial authority of the council; and, after having been thrice summoned in the customary form, still remained firm in his refusal. Meanwhile, in addition to what was objected to his behavior at the second Ephesian council, many grave charges, affecting his moral character and his administration of the episcopal office, were brought against him by Alexandrian ecclesiastics. Instead of being humbled, he had the boldness himself to excommunicate the Roman bishop. He was accordingly deprived of all his spiritual titles and dignities.

But although the person of Dioscurus was sacrificed, even by those who had previously consented to serve as his instruments, yet the fanatical hatred of his party towards the Orientals was still manifested in various ways, and particularly by the outrageous manner in which the venerable bishop Theodoret was received by the council. When, in compliance with a petition of his own, the case of Theodoret in the eighth session of the council was to be taken up, and he accordingly appeared among the assembled ecclesiastics, and referred to the petition about to be read as a testimony of his faith, he was constantly interrupted by the cry: They would allow nothing to be read; all he had to do was to condemn Nestorius. "Speak out clearly, Anathema to Nestorius and his doctrines; anathema to Nestorius and his friends!" It is easy to see that Theodoret was not prepared to condemn Nestorius at once and without any farther qualification; but that yet he was ready to make any sacrifice for the sake of peace, which he could do consistently with his convictions and with the demands of conscience. He had no hesitation in condemning what men had become wont to designate as the Nestorian heresy. We see that Theodoret could now yield more than he would have been willing to concede at an earlier period. "Truly," said he with dignified composure, "I speak not otherwise than as I know is well-pleasing to God. In the first place, I would convince you, that my bishopric is not to me so very dear an interest; that I am not solicitous for the honor, and that it is not *for the sake of it* I have come here, but because I have been calumniated.

[1] Not only the report of the monk Euthymius (see his account of the life of Cyrill in Analectis Græcis, Paris, 1688) and of Evagrius prove that the reading of the Latin copies of the symbol is the correct one, and the reading of the Greek ἐκ δύο φυσέων is false; but also the whole course of proceedings in the council proves this. Manifestly the earlier symbol, more favorable to the Egyptian system of doctrine, contained the ἐκ δύο φυσέων, and the favoring of the other party consisted mainly in converting the ἐκ into ἐν. Moreover the ἐκ δύο φυσέων does not suit the connection: the verb γνωριζόμενον points rather to the original ἐν. The ἐν δύο φύσεσι or the ἐκ δύο φυσέων was the turning-point of the whole controversy between the Monophysites and the Duophysites.

[2] Ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως.

I have come to prove myself an orthodox man, to show you that I condemn Nestorius and Eutyches, and every man who speaks of two Sons of God." Again it was loudly vociferated: "Say anathema to Nestorius, and to all who think like him." But he was afraid to condemn Nestorianism, without having first unfolded what he deemed to be *the pure doctrine*, lest some occasion should be given for employing that vague word Nestorianism, for the purpose of condemning that which, according to *his own convictions*, was much rather the true doctrine. Hence he said: "If I may not be allowed in the first place to explain how I believe, I cannot express that anathema; but I believe"—here the bishops cried out: "He is a heretic; he is a Nestorian; cast forth the Nestorian." Theodoret then said: "Anathema to Nestorius, and to every one who calls not Mary the mother of God, and who divides the one only-begotten Son into two sons. I have subscribed the confession of faith and the letter of the bishop Leo; and so I believe. Farewell." The emperor's commissioners thereupon declared that Theodoret had now given sufficient proof of his orthodoxy, and it only remained, that, as he had been justified by the Roman bishop, he should be restored to his church. To this proposal of the court, the assembly now acceded by acclamation.[1]

Again, an incident which happened during the fourth action of the council foreshadowed what was to be expected from the dominant fanaticism in Egypt. Ten aged bishops from this country declined to anathematize at once, as they were required to do, the doctrines of Eutyches, and to subscribe the letter of Leo to Flavian. Such was the despotic authority of the Alexandrian bishops over the Egyptian church, that they declared it impossible for them, according to the church laws, to act in this case independently: they must wait for the

[1] Amidst these scenes at Chalcedon, we no longer perceive in Theodoret that constancy and firmness with which he had hitherto defended his innocent friend. He appears no longer faithful even to those professions which he earlier expressed; yet this may have been the effect of a momentary weakness. He may have deemed it best to yield for the moment to the fury of blind zealots, who would not listen to the voice of reason; especially as he explicitly stated, that with the name Nestorius he really condemned only a particular error, to express which men had been pleased to coin this term, — and it is easy to see that he felt himself placed under constraint. But in the strongest contrast with his former behavior stands the way in which he speaks, as, for instance, near the conclusion, in one of his latest works, his account of the heresies, (*αἱρετικῆς κακομυθίας ἐπιτομή*,) respecting his old friend; where he describes him as an instrument of Satan; as a man who by his pride plunged the church into disorders; who, under the pretext of orthodoxy, introduced at one and the same time the denial of the divinity and of the incarnation of the only-begotten Son; one who met at last with the punishment he deserved, and the premonitory sign of his future punishment. Fear of the blind zealots alone assuredly could not lead him thus to contradict himself; vexation at the disorders which had grown out of Nestorius' attack upon the term *θεότοκος*, (with which even *he* was not satisfied,) must in the end have cast a shade in his soul on the memory of the author of those disturbances. But, nevertheless, we have here a melancholy proof of human weakness in a man who otherwise appears to us as a light in an age of darkness. Fain would we agree with those who have considered this clause to be spurious, were there not so much stronger reasons for the contrary supposition, and were it possible also to consider the letter addressed to Sporacius on the Nestorian heresy an interpolated piece, derived for the most part from that latter clause. For the rest, Theodoret perhaps spent the last six or seven years of his life, as he designed to do, ep. 146, in seclusion and in the occupation of writing.

decision of the new patriarch of Alexandria, who was still to be elected, and govern themselves accordingly. In vain it was objected, that they ought not in matters of religious conviction to make themselves dependent on the authority of any individual man; and that the sentence of the general council must possess more force than that of an individual bishop. They implored the council to allow them indulgence, because in their own country they could not be certain of their lives if they ventured to declare themselves independent of their patriarch. This delay was finally granted them, under the condition that they should not leave Ephesus until the new patriarch was elected.

The council of Chalcedon, by proceeding in this manner, could not, of course, secure the object they had in view, which was to effect a union of the two parties. The weak spots which this assembly discovered by the inward contradictions brought to view during the course of its proceedings; the exchange of one confession of faith for another; the influence of court policy on the final result — all this was, of course, ill suited to procure authority for the decisions of this council in the minds of those who entertained other opinions.[1]

When so passionate a fanaticism in favor of the Egyptian monophysitism had manifested itself at this council of Chalcedon, it was no wonder that it should soon be more widely spread by the adherents of Dioscurus on their return home; and that it should find its way among the swarms of wild and untutored monks who were used to these formulas, and produce among them the most violent agitations. In the doctrine of the two natures, these people saw nothing but pure Nestorianism, a dividing of the one Christ into two Sons of God, two persons. That he who is supreme over nature was still born in the natural way, — this, they declared, was enough for them to know. The *how* was what they could not explain.[2] This was the germ of the *Monophysite* controversies, so disastrous to the Oriental church, so pernicious to practical Christianity.

Palestine and Egypt were, at first, the chief seats of this controversy. The fanatical monk Theodosius, who returned from the Chalcedonian council to Palestine, conveyed thither the seeds of discord. He attached himself to the party of the deceased emperor's widow Eudocia, and soon ruled supreme in all the cloisters. He set every thing in commotion, raging furiously against all who would not secede from the Chalcedonian council. The patriarch Juvenalis of Jerusalem was banished from his city, and Theodosius himself nominated patri-

[1] The Monophysites well understood how to avail themselves of these weak spots laid open by the council, as we may see from the charges they brought against it; to which Leontius of Byzantium or Jerusalem, at the end of the sixth century, replied in his work against the Nestorians and the Eutychians. See this work in the Greek original, published by Mansi, Concil. VII. f. 799. If the charge brought by the Monophysites (f. 813) really implied that many votes at the council had been purchased with gold, this accusation would assuredly be confirmed by the bad defence of Leontius. But this does not lie in the words: they speak only of simony in the appointment of bishops. The word χειροτονίαι must be understood to refer, not to a vote in the council, but to ordinations.

[2] In the petition of the monks from Palestine: The μὴ χρῆναι φυσιόλογειν πῶς γεννᾷ κατὰ φύσιν τὸν ὑπὲρ φύσιν; Harduin. Concil. II. f. 672.

arch there by his party. Similar things occurred in other cities. Provinces were wasted with fire and sword; Theodosius deposed and appointed bishops. It was finally necessary to check this evil by resorting to forcible measures.

The second theatre of these contests was Egypt, and particularly Alexandria. There Proterius had been nominated patriarch in the place of the deposed Dioscurus; but, from what we have already seen taking place at Chalcedon, we may easily gather that Dioscurus would still have a weighty party in his favor. There arose a schism, which gave rise to the most violent disorders. It became necessary to call in the aid of soldiers: the attempt to suppress the schism by force only served, as usual, to exasperate men's minds, and many scenes of violence ensued. Finally, quiet was restored, and so it continued as long as Marcian lived; although the Monophysite party, headed by the presbyter Timotheus Ailurus, continued to subsist as a separate and distinct one. But as the Monophysite party, after the death of this emperor in 457, indulged the expectation of finding a more favorable disposition in his successor, they ventured to appoint and to ordain Timotheus as their patriarch. The attempt made by the military commandant, to put an end to the difficulties by force, led to a tumult, in which Proterius was murdered. Both parties now applied to the emperor with petitions. The latter, being aware of the great importance of the Monophysite party, was the more desirous of removing the schism by means of some mutual agreement, without resorting to force. He begged the Roman bishop Leo the Great to come himself to the East, and direct the negotiations. But Leo had no inclination to do this. Moreover, he was of the opinion that no concessions ought to be made at the expense of doctrines expressed by a council under the guidance of the Holy Ghost; but that these must only be strictly maintained. The bad result of a general council assembled for the purpose of restoring peace having at last been made evident by the example of the council of Chalcedon, the emperor made trial of another expedient. He issued a command to all the metropolitans to consult with their bishops respecting the manner in which the council of Chalcedon and the ordination of Timotheus ought to be regarded and treated, and to report to him the result of their deliberations. Distinguished above others for a wise moderation, rare in this age, was the opinion expressed on this occasion by the bishops of Pamphylia. We here meet with a distinction lying far remote from the fanatical habits of doctrinal conception peculiar to this period — the distinction between that which belongs to the essence of Christian faith, and that which belongs to the exactness of doctrinal definitions requisite for the development of theology. "Those definitions," said they, "were drawn up by the Roman bishop Leo, and by the council of Chalcedon, not for this purpose of having them pass to the laity, and give offence to them; but they were designed for the priests, that they might have wherewith to answer gainsayers. The doctrine concerning the union of two natures in one Christ was not employed for the instruction of catechumens, but only for the purposes of theological discussion.

They were of the opinion that there ought to be no dispute on the questions, whether Christ *subsisted in* two natures, or *consisted of* two natures, and whether we should speak of one nature of the Word which became man: the only important thing was, that the union of the two natures should be maintained, but without being confounded. They recommended the condescending indulgence, of which Christ was the pattern, as the best and readiest means of reclaiming errorists, and of restoring tranquillity.[1]

Since the majority of voices, however, now maintained the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and were opposed to the ordination of Timotheus Ailurus, the emperor Leo resolved that he would put an end to the difficulties by force. In the year 460, Timotheus Ailurus was banished to Cherson, and in his place Timotheus Salophaciolus was appointed patriarch of Alexandria. The mild character of the latter enabled him for the moment to do something towards restoring tranquillity.

So much the more violent, however, was the ferment which ensued, when, by a political revolution, the hitherto oppressed party of the Monophysites at once obtained the preponderance. This took place in 476, when Basiliscus succeeded in expelling the emperor Zeno, successor to his father-in-law Leo in the year 474, from the imperial throne, and securing it for himself. Whether the fact was that he had not attained to this high eminence without the aid of the Monophysite party, or whether he hoped to find in this party an important support, he showed from the beginning that it was his purpose to make it the ruling party in the East. He was the first to publish decisions on matters of faith by imperial laws; for, in entering on his reign, he issued a circular letter (ἐγκύκλιον) to be signed by all the bishops on pain of being deposed from their office; whereby it was established, that the Nicene creed, together with the several decrees in confirmation of it passed at the councils of Constantinople and Ephesus, should alone be valid; while, on the other hand, the Chalcedonian symbol and the letter of Leo were condemned as standing at variance with this, and ordered to be burned wherever they might be found. Many of the bishops readily complied with the imperial command; partly such as, being rather inclined of themselves to adopt the Monophysite opinion, had only been moved by the ruling power to accept the Chalcedonian articles; and partly such as were always in the habit of shaping their opinions according to the doctrinal tendency of the court.

At Alexandria, the victory of the Monophysite party would take place without any violent struggle; for this party had there a natural preponderance. Timotheus Ailurus resumed his patriarchate, and the mild Timotheus Salophaciolus quietly returned back to his cloister. But violent commotions arose in many districts, where hitherto the party of the Chalcedonian council had prevailed; and enthusiastic monks, who exercised the greatest influence over the people, stirred them up to resistance against the imperial command. The patriarch

[1] See Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 731.

Acacius of Constantinople, although wavering himself, yet took courage from the strength of the zealots, to show resistance to the emperor. And as, in addition to this, Zeno had, in the mean time, strengthened his power, Basiliscus issued in 477 a second circular, (ἀντεγκύκλιον,) whereby the first was revoked. Soon after this, the victory of Zeno, who once more made himself master of the empire, changed the whole face of affairs.

This emperor was the more firmly resolved in the outset to do all in his power to advance the party of the council of Chalcedon, because doubtless he was especially indebted to this party for the recovery of his throne, and because his political interests would make him hostile to the other party, which Basiliscus had favored. This change of court orthodoxy was soon followed by the usual consequences attending such lamentable dependence of the church on the state. Those same bishops of Asia Minor who, under the preceding reign, had defended themselves before the emperor Basiliscus against the charge of having only subscribed his circular letter by constraint, and from motives of fear; who had styled this document, in their communication to him, a divine and apostolic letter;[1] who had declared to him that the world must go to ruin, if he did not uphold the authority of his religious edict; who called on him to depose the patriarch Acacius from his seat, — these same bishops now testified to this very patriarch their repentance; writing to him, that they had subscribed the circular letter of Basiliscus, not from conviction, but because they were compelled to it; but that in their faith they really agreed with that which had been piously and rightly determined at the council of Chalcedon.[2]

This change must have had a very great influence, especially on the condition of the Alexandrian church, in which the Monophysite party was ever predominant. Timotheus Ailurus was allowed, it is true, peacefully to end the few remaining days of his old age in the patriarchal office; but when, after his death in 477, the Monophysite party proceeded to choose the archdeacon Petrus Mongus as his successor, the emperor looked upon this as an insurrection; he pronounced sentence of death on Petrus Mongus, and the latter seems to have escaped the execution of this sentence only by flight. It was ordered that Timotheus Salophaciolus should be restored to the patriarchate of Alexandria. The emperor threatened all laymen and ecclesiastics who should not within two months recognize Salophaciolus as their patriarch, with the loss of all their dignities and churches, and with exile.[3] The restored patriarch Timotheus was enabled for the moment, by his moderation and gentleness, to preserve quiet at Alexandria. He presented a rare example for this age; protecting instead of persecuting the Monophysite party, — insomuch that the emperor had to

[1] The θεῖον, — divinum, — the usual designation, indeed, derived from the pagan times, and applied to whatever came from the emperor; but it was bad enough in bishops, when speaking of religious matters, to imitate such phraseology.

[2] Comp. Evagr. hist. eccles. III. c. 5 and 9.

[3] See the letters of the Roman bishop Felix III. to the patriarch Acacius, and to the emperor Zeno.

admonish him to use greater severity towards the heretics, and not allow them to hold their church assemblies and to baptize; but, notwithstanding this, he still continued to pursue the same course of conduct. Hence he was universally esteemed by the Alexandrians; and they would call out to him in the streets and in the churches: "Although we have no church-fellowship with you, yet we love you."[1]

But after the death of Timotheus Salophaciolus, which soon ensued, there arose a new schism. The party which was by far the most numerous, that of the Monophysites, chose for their patriarch the archdeacon Petrus Mongus: the minor party of the Chalcedonian council chose the chief treasurer of the Alexandrian church, John Talaya. The emperor at first was resolved to approve the choice of the Chalcedonian faction alone; but a complication of events led him to change his mind.

John Talaya, at that time presiding as presbyter over the churches on the island of Tabennæ, had been sent by the patriarch Timotheus Salophaciolus, after the latter had been reinstated in his office by the emperor Zeno, on a mission to Constantinople, in company with Gennadius, a kinsman of the patriarch, and bishop of Lower Hermupolis. Gennadius remained behind at Constantinople, and had there acquired great influence as plenipotentiary or agent (apocrisiarius) of the Egyptian patriarch. John Talaya, however, had entered into a connection with Illus, one of the first men of the empire, to whom the emperor was in part indebted for the recovery of his throne; and probably at this time Illus engaged, perhaps not without the assurance of receiving a splendid remuneration from Talaya, that he would procure for him the patriarchate after the death of the aged Timotheus. For this reason, after his return to Egypt, Talaya gave up his office in the church at Tabennæ, and resumed the post which he had before occupied at Alexandria, so that he might be ready, on the death of Timotheus, immediately to make such arrangements as would secure the attainment of his object, beyond all fear of a failure. From this place he sent many and valuable presents to Illus. Relying on the patronage of this powerful man, he deemed it the less necessary to secure the good will of Gennadius, whom he had left behind at Constantinople, or of the patriarch himself; and by this neglect he made them both his enemies. The deputy whom he sent with his inaugural letter (ἐνθρονιστικα) to Constantinople, was instructed not to present this immediately to the patriarch, but first inquire after his patron, the influential Illus, and to proceed in all respects as he should direct. But as the latter was then at Antioch, the deputy of John Talaya set off for that city, without presenting his letter to the patriarch.[2] By this unexampled neglect of the honor due to him as bishop of the imperial residence, the patriarch Acacius was completely disgusted; and, as Illus soon after rebelled against the emperor, Acacius was the more

[1] See Liberati Diaconi breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum, ed. Garnier, pag. 108.

[2] See Liberat. c. 16 and 17, and Theophanes' chronography.

easily enabled to make John Talaya hateful also to the emperor Zeno. Peter Mongus, the head of the Monophysite party, was cunning enough to turn these circumstances to his own advantage. He visited Constantinople in person, and pointed out the danger to which the exasperation of the numerous party of the Monophysites might expose the tranquillity of the state, if a patriarch were thrust upon them whom they could not approve. He proposed, on the other hand, a treaty by which he hoped to unite all in one church. Acacius entered into this scheme, and persuaded the emperor to favor it. The latter issued, in the year 482, a treaty of agreement addressed to the churches of the Alexandrian patriarchate, which, by omitting the expressions employed in the disputed questions, and abiding only by general terms, was expected to bring about the removal of this opposition. It was here determined, that no other creed should be valid than the Nicene-Constantinopolitan symbol, which had been confirmed at Ephesus. A symbolical authority was given to the anathemas of Cyrill; and, without mentioning names and persons, or the nature of the dispute, it was declared that Christ is one and not two,[1] since miracles and sufferings were referred to one and the same person. Moreover, sentence of condemnation was pronounced on Nestorianism and Eutychianism, but also on all who taught or had taught contrary to these articles, whether at Chalcedon, or in any other synod or place whatsoever.[2]

This *concordate* was now designed, in the purpose of the emperor, to serve as a basis for the peace of the church. Those among the Monophysites who agreed to subscribe it should, without being required to give up their peculiar opinions, be received by the other party into the communion of the church; and also the latter should be left free to retain their peculiar doctrines, and for themselves to maintain the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and of Leo's letter to Flavian. But without interfering with these differences, the concordate should stand valid as the basis of church fellowship, and neither party should stigmatize the other as heretical. But such an object was not to be attained in this way. The zealous Monophysites demanded an explicit condemnation of the council of Chalcedon, and of the letter to Flavian; and as they separated from the moderates, who were satisfied with the concordate, without having any principal leader, they were from henceforth designated as the headless sect, (Acephaloi.) Now when those bishops who chiefly agreed with this party in their doctrinal opinions, allowed themselves to be influenced by their respect for it, they lost the confidence of those with whom, by means of the compromise, they had concluded a peace. On the other hand, the zealous adherents of the Chalcedonian council were far from being satisfied with a written contract in which this council was spoken of in such disparaging terms; and all who accepted the compromise appeared to them as Monophysites. Thus it happened, that the henoticon, instead of doing away the schism, only made it worse than it was before. Instead of two parties, there were now four; the zealots on both sides, and the

[1] Ἓν τύγχανειν καὶ οὐ δύο.

[2] Evagr. III. 14.

moderates of the two parties who accepted the compromise. The warm adherents of the Chalcedonian council found great sympathy in the Roman church, and these stigmatized the dominant party of the Oriental church as heretical. A schism between the Eastern and the Western church was the consequence of this.

While these commotions growing out of the henoticon were still in progress, the emperor Zeno, A.D. 491, died, and was succeeded by Anastasius. The latter was only desirous of preserving peace and of silencing the heretic-makers on both sides; and for this reason he would not suffer the treaty of coalition to drop. But this moderation, proceeding from motives of policy, could only make him an object of suspicion to the zealots; and as he would tolerate nothing which was opposed to his plans, in seeking to preserve peace, he appeared in the light of a persecutor. Serious disturbances, arising out of the struggle between the two parties, broke out during this emperor's reign, in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Constantinople; and his efforts to compel the enthusiasts to moderation were attended with no other result than to render the commotions more violent. As he exerted himself with the most vigor to repress the enthusiasts near by, in Constantinople itself, he must of course become suspected of favoring the Monophysites. In the patriarch of Constantinople he found a violent antagonist. By the patriarch Euphemius, the orthodoxy of the emperor had been suspected from the first; he had consented to his taking the throne, only on condition that the emperor should give him a written assurance, that he would attempt to do nothing against the authority of the Chalcedonian council. Anastasius soon endeavored to get rid of him, which he could not do without exciting a tumult among the people. The presbyter Macedonius, in whom, until now, no one had ever witnessed any symptom of passionate zeal, was nominated his successor; but he too must soon incur the imperial displeasure, since he was not willing to lose his character for orthodoxy among the zealots of the party attached to the Chalcedonian council; and therefore connected himself more closely with them than suited the emperor's plans. Besides this, two men of vigorous activity now took the lead of the hitherto headless but zealous Monophysite party; and, in other districts, disturbances arose, the influence of which spread to Constantinople. One of these persons, Xenayas, of Tahal in Persia, had already contended zealously against the Nestorians in his own country. Afterwards, he had betaken himself to Syria; and the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, Peter the clothier, so called after the trade which he pursued as a monk,[1] (originally one of the monks associated with Eutyches at Constantinople,) had made him bishop of the city of Hieropolis or Mabug. By the same dignitary his name also was changed into the Greek form Philoxenos, and by this name he is best known as the promoter of the so-called Philoxenian Syriac translation of the New Testament. But with the successor of this Monophysite patriarch, with Flavian, who was more inclined to the doctrines of the

[1] Πέτρος ὁ κναφεύς.

Chalcedonian council, his zeal in giving spread to the Monophysite doctrines involved him in a quarrel; for though Flavian was willing to purchase peace by yielding many points, yet nothing could induce him expressly to condemn the doctrine of the two natures. Violent contests ensued, which spread even to the adjacent Palestine.

The second of these two new leaders of the Monophysite party was Severus, who came from Sozopolis in Pisidia. While a Pagan, he had devoted himself to the study of the law, in the famous law-school at Berytum, and afterwards became an advocate. At Tripoli in Phœnicia he received baptism, became a monk, and united himself with a society of zealous Monophysites. Banished by a hostile party, he came with a number of his companions to Constantinople, to seek protection from the emperor. He told him that the defence of the Chalcedonian council was the cause of all the disturbances; he sought to introduce a certain addition to the old and venerated church song, the trisagion, (the thrice holy, from Isa. 6,) which might serve as the basis of a coalition between the two parties. Some time before, the above-named Monophysite church-teacher, Peter the clothier, had already added, to one of the invocations to God in that church hymn, the clause, Thou who wast crucified for us, (ὁ σταυρώθεις δι' ἡμᾶς.) The transfer of predicates, which was expressed in this clause, in fact perfectly coincided with the Monophysite type of doctrine; but it might also, in another sense, precisely after the same manner as the term θεότοκος had already been adopted into the church phraseology, be admitted by the Duophysites as being opposed to Nestorianism; and so, by this opposite reference of the same term, both parties might come together. Of this ambiguity Severus availed himself; but in the then existing ferment of minds at Constantinople, this addition appeared as a crass Monophysitism, as impinging on the immutability of the divine essence; and this innovation met with the most determined resistance. While, in the public worship of God, one party sang the old church hymn in its simple form, the other burst in, loudly vociferating the added words. Thus the very solemnities of worship were profaned by expressions of worldly passion, and even by bloody contests. As the rumor spread that the emperor favored the addition to the church hymn, and was threatening to remove the patriarch Macedonius, a violent tumult broke forth. The houses of many of the grandees were burned; a monk, who was supposed to be the author of the addition, was seized by the infuriate populace and murdered, and his head was carried about in triumph stuck upon a pole. Then appeared the emperor at the circus before the assembled people, without his crown. He declared himself willing to lay down the government; but all could not reign at once, one must be sovereign. These words had their effect on the excited multitude; the people besought the emperor to retain the government, and promised tranquillity. The emperor took advantage of this favorable moment: he caused the patriarch Macedonius to be removed, and Timotheus, a presbyter who had accepted the henoticon, was appointed his successor. Meanwhile, the emperor saw himself under the necessity, for many reasons, of yielding to the fury of the exasperated

party of the Chalcedonian council, where this predominated. By this exasperation, aid and comfort was given to the insurrection of the military commander Vitalian, which broke out in the year 514; and Anastasius found himself compelled to enter into conditions of peace, to the advantage of the adherents of the Chalcedonian council. He promised to assemble a council at Heraclea in Thrace, and moreover to invite the assistance of the Roman bishop, so that, above all things, the church-fellowship might thus be restored with the latter, which amounted to no more nor less than that the Chalcedonian council should be reinstated in its authority; for no hope certainly could be entertained of making peace with the Roman church, *on any other terms than these*. Yet Anastasius sought to put off the fulfilment of these irksome conditions as long as he could; and the difficulties which were raised by the Roman church in conducting the negotiations for peace, facilitated his plans. The enthusiasm for the Chalcedonian council, and the hatred of Monophysitism and of the emperor Anastasius, who was considered to be its champion, did but mount so much the higher after that emperor's death, and at the commencement of the reign of his successor Justin, in 518.

When John, the patriarch of Constantinople under the new government, made his first appearance at the public worship, he was received by the assembled people with loud shouts, demanding that since the Manichean Anastasius no longer reigned, but the orthodox Justin, the authority of the Chalcedonian council should once more be publicly recognized; that the anathema should be pronounced on Severus, and on all the leaders of the Monophysite party; that all Monophysites should be removed from the imperial court and from the capital;[1] and that fellowship should be restored with the Roman church. The assembled multitude did not desist from their impetuous outcries, till the patriarch yielded. Similar demands of ecclesiastics, monks, and laity, came also from other churches. As the emperor Justin, a rude Thra-

[1] See the protocol in the acts of the council under Mennas, Harduin. T. II. f. 1334 and 1355. The hatred was particularly manifested against the powerful lord chamberlain (Præpositus sacri cubiculi) Amantius. The multitude shouted, in allusion to him: Τὸν λῆρον τοῦ παλατίου ἔξω βάλε. He must doubtless have had great influence under Anastasius, in promoting Monophysitism; for, in calling upon the patriarch publicly to declare himself, it was exclaimed, that, under the reign of a Justin, he needed have no fear of Amantius: Οὐ φοβῆσαι Ἀμαντίον τὸν Μανιχαίον, Ἰούστινος βασιλεύει, l. c. Harduin. f. 1339. This Amantius, however, was hated and suspected by the emperor Justin; for he had conceived the project of making a certain count Theocritus emperor, through whom he might hope to be ruler himself. He had for this purpose given a sum of money to Justin, then commander of the emperor's bodyguard, in order that, by a skilful distribution of it, he might purchase votes in favor of Theocritus. But Justin used the gold in behalf of himself, and became emperor. Of course he must now stand in dread of Amantius; and hence soon caused him to be executed. See Evagr. l. IV. c. 2, Theophanes, Chronograph. at the commencement of the reign of Justin. The assassination of Amantius, however, was deemed a judgment on the heretic. See the popular exclamation in an assembly in the church at Tyre, which likewise demanded the condemnation of the Monophysites. Harduin. l. c. f. 1359. Ἀπέθανεν Ἀμάντις ὁ ἀντάρτης τῆς τρίαδος. We discern here the hidden connection betwixt the plots of political and theological parties. The fear of the infection of Monophysitism was in many districts so great, that in Tyre, for example, the Egyptian dealers in wood were not suffered to remain in the city, lest they might spread the Monophysite heresy beyond Egypt. L. c. 1355.

cian, who took no interest himself in theological disputes, was governed by his two chief ministers, Vitalian and Justinian, who warmly espoused the doctrines of the Chalcedonian council, he would very easily be persuaded to every measure which favored the interests of this party. New negotiations were entered into with the Roman bishop Hormisdas, and men were ready to consent to all the conditions prescribed by that bishop for the restoration of church-fellowship. Among these was the severe one, that the names of all the bishops who, under the preceding reign, had accepted the henoticon, or attached themselves to the Monophysite party, should be expunged from the church records. To anathematize the leaders of the Monophysite party was a point which might be easily secured; nor was there any hesitation at Constantinople even to surrender the patriarch Acacius to the popular will. But, in many districts, ecclesiastics and churches were not at all disposed to sacrifice the memory of their beloved bishops: they would not suffer themselves to be moved to this by arguments or by threats. New schisms and bloody disturbances were to be feared, if they were forced to this. The emperor himself, therefore, requested the Roman bishop to yield a little on this point.[1] The Monophysite clergymen, however, were deposed from their places. Severus, who had managed to make himself patriarch of Antioch, was threatened with a severer fate through the vengeance of the commander Vitalian, who had been injured by him; but he saved himself by fleeing to Egypt, where he met with a friendly reception from his Monophysite fellow-believers. There the party was too strong to be prudently attacked.

Justinian, the successor of this emperor, from the year 527, meant to be considered a zealous champion of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Intermeddling in theological disputes was with him a favorite passion; and he would very willingly have been lawgiver to the church, in the same sense as he was to the state: but the more he acted, or supposed he acted, by his own impulse, the more he served as the tool of others, who knew how to influence him by taking advantage of his weakness. Thus was he often obliged to subserve interests to which he was altogether opposed in his own intentions. In particular, his wife Theodora, who governed him, and who was herself attached to Monophysitism, successfully plotted many a scheme for the advantage of the Monophysite party, which he abhorred. She even went so far as to cause to be formed, under the very eyes of the emperor at Constantinople, a Monophysite society, whose branches extended through all parts of the empire, and to procure that a Monophysite should be elevated to the episcopate of the imperial residence; and every thing was prepared to raise up the Monophysites from their state of oppression to being the dominant party. Her principal agent in accomplishing all this was a person by the name of Anthimus. He had once been bishop over the church at Trapezund in Pontus; but, without waiting to be regularly dismissed from the pastoral relation, he had left his flock for the pur-

[1] See the correspondence between the patriarch of Constantinople, the emperor Justin, and the Roman bishop Hormisdas.

pose, as he pretended, of having it in his power to lead a perfectly Christian life as a monk;[1] but probably, if we may judge from the sequel, he was led to this step, like so many others, by more doubtful motives; and the truth was, that the court life had more charms for him than the administering of a pastoral office distinguished by no outward splendor, in an insignificant town. He betook himself to Constantinople; there his ascetic garb procured for him distinguished consideration; he gained the confidence of the empress Theodora, and the alternate residence at the court and at a pleasant villa near Constantinople[2] suited him better than his former secluded life in the pastoral office. This person now drew around him all the most important men of the Monophysite party, who, under the protection of Theodora, visited Constantinople; and amongst these was Severus. At length, by the management of Theodora, Anthimus, in the year 535, was nominated patriarch of Constantinople.[3] Of a surety, the emperor Justinian, who was so zealously orthodox, entertained no other idea than that his bishop was a staunch adherent of the Chalcedonian council. And perhaps the trick would have lasted still longer, and the cunning Theodora would have succeeded in accomplishing still more, if the whole plan had not been frustrated by an accident quite unforeseen, after the deception had been kept up no longer than a year. It happened, that the Roman bishop Agapetus visited Constantinople as ambassador of the East Gothic king Theodoric. Many dissatisfied ecclesiastics and monks took this opportunity of presenting to the Roman bishop, who had less to fear than others from the anger of the empress, and could therefore act more independently at the court, a formal complaint against the bishop Anthimus, charging him partly with erroneous doctrines, and partly with unjustifiable proceedings to obtain the patriarchate of Constantinople. The Roman bishop required him to prove his orthodoxy by a confession of faith, and (in accordance with the church laws of the West, which forbade the transfer of bishops) to return back from the patriarchate of Constantinople to his earlier bishopric, which he had voluntarily abandoned. As Anthimus could not consent to this, Agapetus excommunicated him from the fellowship of the church, and moreover avoided all intercourse with him. The empress was unable to change the mind of the Roman bishop either by promises or by threats. When, through his influence, Justinian came to see how grossly he had been deceived, his indignation knew no bounds. Anthimus was deposed; and at the recommendation of Agapetus, the presbyter Mennas, superintendant of the great hospital at Constantinople, was nominated patriarch.[4]

The new patriarch, in the year 536, invited the bishops who happened to be then present in Constantinople, to meet in a synod (σύνοδος

[1] In the first action of the council under Mennas, it says: Οὗτος ἐκ πόλλου τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκκλησίαν καταλίπων, καὶ πεπλασμένον βίον ἐγκρατείας ἀναλάβων. F. 1195, l. c.

[2] His προαστείον, act. IV. sub Menna, f. 1243.

[3] Procopius, in his secret history of the court, (hist. arcana,) c. 17, says of Theodora: Αὐτὴ τὰς τὲ ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἱερώσυνας ἐχειροτόνει.

[4] See Concil. sub Menna, act. I. Liberati breviar. c. 21.

ἐδημοῦσα) for the purpose of putting a final seal on the condemnation of Monophysitism, and its defenders. The emperor Justinian accompanied the decrees of this council with a confirmatory law, altogether worthy of his despotic spirit: "The leaders of the Monophysite party should keep away from the residence and from all the more important cities; they should live quietly and without disturbance as private persons, and take good care how they corrupted others, and led them into blasphemy. The writings of Severus should be burned, and none should be permitted either to own or to transcribe them. Every person who dared to transcribe them should suffer the loss of his right hand." [1]

When the empress Theodora saw her plans defeated, she still did not relinquish her object; but, fruitful of intrigues, endeavored to effect it in another way. She cultivated the acquaintance of the deacon Vigilius, who had come to Constantinople in the retinue of the Roman bishop Agapetus. The ambition of this unprincipled man led her to hope, that she might convert him into a suitable instrument for accomplishing her designs. Agapetus having died, either, as some report, before he left Constantinople, or, according to others, while on his journey home, she held out to Vigilius the promise of a large sum of money and of the Roman bishopric, if he would pledge himself to overthrow the authority of the Chalcedonian council, and to testify in writing that he agreed in faith with Anthimus, and likewise with the other leaders of the Monophysite party. Vigilius consented to the conditions, and the whole intrigue was managed and conducted between two women. Antonina, the wife of the Greek general Belisarius, whose successful campaigns had extended the power of the East Roman empire in Italy, was the confidant of the empress and of her plans, and employed to coöperate with her in carrying them into execution. She worked upon her husband.

In the mean time, Silverius had already been appointed the successor of Agapetus. It was now necessary for him either to make the same engagements which Vigilius had made, or else give place for the latter. But, as he would not consent to sacrifice his convictions for any temporal advantage, he was falsely accused of a design to betray Rome to the Goths, the enemies of the Greek empire, which accusation might derive some color of truth from the fact of the friendly relations formerly existing between the bishop and the king of the East Goths, and it was an easy matter for the faithless Greeks to fabricate records and testimonies. Silverius accordingly was banished, and Vigilius appointed bishop in the year 538.

More could be obtained from him, inasmuch as the cause of the faith stood with him in very slight account. In truth, he had but a very imperfect acquaintance with the controversies relating to it, and the interest he took in them was as slight as his knowledge of them. He confided to the hands of Antonina a letter addressed to Anthimus and the other leaders of the Monophysite party, in which he really expressed opinions wholly in accordance with the Monophysite views,

[1] Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 1406.

and signified his agreement in faith with them; but at the same time he craftily requested them, in order that he might keep on good terms with all parties, to be careful not to divulge what he had written, but rather to put on the appearance of being particularly suspicious about his faith, so that he might the more easily accomplish what he had undertaken.

While Vigilius then was thus bent on serving two parties, one secretly, the other openly, it was out of the power of Theodora to execute through him a single one of her projects; for he took good care not to make any public declaration in accordance with her views. She thus found that her money and her intrigues had been expended to no purpose; and, in being deceived herself in attempting to deceive others, she met the deserved punishment of cunning perfidy.

But, notwithstanding this, she did not yet give up her object; and in the irresistible propensity of the emperor Justinian to decide on matters which he did not understand, in the various manifold strifes between the theological parties at court, and in the unprincipled character of Vigilius, she could still find means that flattered her with a more favorable prospect of accomplishing that object, or at least of involving the opponents of Monophysitism in a quarrel among themselves. The opportunity for doing this was as follows: The old Syrian church-teachers, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas of Edessa, had, from the first, been special objects of the fanatical hatred and the heresy-hunting spirit of the Monophysite party. In the secret bargain which had procured for Vigilius the title of Roman bishop, he had pledged himself also to anathematize Theodore and Theodoret.[1]

From what had happened in a different quarter, the Monophysite court-party, who no longer dared to speak loud, found it in their power to unite with another party at court governed by a doctrinal interest entirely different from their own, for the accomplishment of this plan, which, as we see from the engagement entered into by Vigilius, had been long before projected. We must here cast a glance at certain events, which we shall notice more fully in another connection, but here only in a cursory manner.

The doctrines and writings of Origen, with which but few in the Oriental church were then accurately acquainted, and which in the Western church were wholly unknown, had just at this time met with great acceptance in the cloisters of Palestine; and a party of enthusiastic Origenists had there risen up, who were violently opposed by the zealots for the orthodoxy of the church. But this Origenistic party had so managed as to acquire great influence at court through the agency of two of their own abbots, Domitian and particularly Theodore Ascidas. These had taken up their residence at Constantinople; and, by the zeal which they showed in defense of the Chalcedonian council,

[1] In the above-cited letter to the Monophysite bishops, he concludes with the words: Anathematizamus ergo *Theodorum*, *Theodoretum* et omnes qui eorum statuta coluerunt vel colunt. Even Facundus of Hermione knew of this secret bargain of ambition. De ipsius episcopi Romani chirographis ambitionis impulsu, quum fieri arderet episcopus, parti alteri factis. Ep. ad Mocian. Sirmond. II. 593, E.

won the special regard of the emperor Justinian, and hence possessed great influence in the palace.[1] He made Domitian bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, Theodore Ascidas bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; but, notwithstanding these appointments, they resided at court still more than with their communities, and used their whole influence to protect and to advance the party of their fellow-believers in Palestine. The patriarch Peter of Jerusalem, who was opposed to the Origenists, could not sustain himself against the influence of the powerful court party, and was obliged, in spite of himself, to make many concessions, in order to preserve his patriarchal dignity against the court intrigues which under the emperor Justinian carried all before them. But could the eyes of the emperor be once opened to see what a heretic Origen had been, and what heresies were to be found in his writings, the Origenistic party was lost; and how easily might this be brought about! It actually was brought about by a coincidence of events coming from different quarters.

The patriarch Peter of Jerusalem, who longed to be delivered from the yoke of the Origenistic court party, instructed two abbots, who sided with the opponents of Origenism, to bring before him a formal complaint against the Origenists, setting forth the heresies of Origen in detail. This document he sent to the emperor with a letter, describing to him the commotions excited by the Origenistic party.[2] Besides this, Pelagius, the Apocrisiarius of the Roman bishop, had come to Palestine on some particular ecclesiastical business with which he had been entrusted by the emperor. He was then joined by four monks, who accompanied him from Palestine to Constantinople, for the purpose of laying before the emperor extracts from the writings of Origen, in proof of his heresies, and of procuring their condemnation.[3] To a Roman ecclesiastic, the heresies of Origen would appear extremely dangerous; and perhaps Pelagius was governed by motives of policy, even more than by a solicitude for the purity of doctrines: for he had long been jealous of the great power of Theodore Ascidas at the imperial court;[4] and the condemnation of Origen's doctrines, as heretical, would furnish him an opportune means of procuring his downfall. The patriarch Mennas of Constantinople also, who doubtless had often felt annoyed by the dominion of Theodore, readily entered into this plan; and both united their efforts in urging the emperor to condemn Origen's heresies. To the latter a welcome opportunity was here presented for establishing, by a religious edict, his authority as lawgiver also for the church, which indeed was the grand object of his ambition.[5] In the year 541, he issued a document drawn out in detail, and addressed

[1] Πρώτης παῤῥησίας ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ μετάσχοντες. Cyrilli Scythopolitani vita S. Sabæ, § 83. Coteler. monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, T. III.

[2] L. c. vita Sabæ, c. 85.

[3] As the letter which the patriarch Peter of Jerusalem sent to Constantinople was the same in substance with that which these four monks presented to the emperor, it might be that these monks, of whom Liberatus speaks, (c. 33,) and whose names are given by Evagrius, (IV. 38,) were no other than the delegates of the patriarch Peter.

[4] Liberatus, l. c. æmulus existens Theodoro.

[5] Liberatus. Annuit imperator facillime, gaudens se de talibus causis judicium ferre.

to the patriarch Mennas, which was perfectly in character with his despotic temper, and in which he endeavored to show what a detestable heretic Origen was, by enumerating the titles of the several heresies with which he had been furnished in the manner above described. He invited the patriarch to assemble a "home synod," (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*,) and cause Origen and his doctrines to be condemned. A copy of these synodal proceedings should be sent to all bishops and abbots, to receive their respective signatures; and, for the future, no person should be appointed a bishop or an abbot, without first condemning Origen along with the other heretics.[1] Similar letters the emperor caused to be despatched also to the other patriarchs. The execution of this measure would occasion no general disturbance, as the judgment of the church concerning Origen had long since been settled. Mennas held the synod required by the emperor, which decided according to the imperial command.

But the object which it was hoped to accomplish by this condemnation, namely, to effect the ruin of the Origenistic party, was nevertheless defeated; for Theodore and Domitian sacrificed the truth, in order to save their own interests and that of their party; as, indeed, great liberty of accommodating one's self to circumstances was allowed by the principles of this Origenistic party, that the end sanctifies the means, and that the truth is not for all men. *They* likewise subscribed the decrees of the synod, and consequently nothing could be done to them.[2] They preserved their authority at court, and could still secretly work none the less effectually for the interest of the Origenistic party, insomuch that Theodore Ascidas ventured to threaten the patriarch Peter that he would cause him to be deposed, unless he received the Origenistic monks, who had been expelled, back again to their cloisters.[3]

Doubtless, however, notwithstanding their success for the present in defeating the plots of their adversaries, they could feel no security for the future amid circumstances so threatening; for, if their opponents could contrive to expose their hypocritical acquiescence in the condemnation of the Origenistic heresies, and their secret machinations in favor of a party condemned by an imperial command, a heavy disgrace awaited them. They must, therefore, anticipate the blow which might so easily crush them, and endeavor to turn it upon their adversaries. They must seek to draw off the attention of the emperor from the heresies of Origen, by occupying it with something else: thus they could unite with their other object the pleasure of taking revenge on their adversaries, by attacking them on the side of their doctrinal interests. All this was craftily combined in the plan of causing the anathema which had been pronounced on Origen, to fall back on the Syrian church-teachers Theodore, Ibas, and Theodoret. Such a meas-

[1] For according to the *beautiful* custom, introduced under the emperor Justinian, in order to obtain a spiritual office, it was necessary to subscribe such a condemnation of the most famous heretics. *αἱρέτικοι οἱ ἐξ ἐθοῦς ἐν τοῖς γενόμενοις λιβέλλοις ἀναθεματιζόμενοι.*

[2] Vita Sabæ, c. 85, near the end.

[3] Vita Sabæ, c. 86.

ure would not appear to have come directly from Monophysitism; for even by men who would never consent to be called Monophysites, sentence of condemnation had, in fact, been pronounced, in the controversy with Nestorianism, (see p. 496,) upon Theodore, as likewise upon many of the controversial writings belonging to the first period of the theological polemics of Theodoret. The man who was considered a pillar of orthodoxy, Cyrill himself, though to be sure a favorer of Monophysitism, had in fact condemned those Syrian church-teachers as heretics. But as those three church-teachers had ever been special objects of hatred to the Monophysite party; as this party had long been laboring to procure their condemnation; as two of them had been justified by the Chalcedonian council; such an attack would, of course, seem very much like a plot of the Monophysite party. What was known about the influence of the empress Theodora would serve to confirm this suspicion. The Origenistic party secured, then, by this undertaking, an opportunity of vexing their opponents, who, like Mennas, were zealous defenders of the authority of the Chalcedonian council, and violently opposed to Monophysitism. They might expect, that this proposal would create vastly greater commotions than the Origenistic controversies, and thus sink the latter in oblivion. They thus secured an opportunity also of forming an alliance with the court party favored by the empress Theodora, which was still in existence, and of gaining in them an important support. Whether they were also actuated in this case by the particular interest of a theological party, in causing Theodore, an opponent of the Origenistic school, to be condemned as a heretic, may remain doubtful; for this Origenistic party were more particularly interested in the peculiar *doctrinal* opinions of Origen, which, to be sure, were closely connected with his allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures; but Theodore of Mopsuestia had, strictly speaking, attacked only the principles of that method, while, in other respects, he decidedly agreed with Origen in many of his peculiar views of doctrine; as, for example, in the doctrine of restoration, which under Origen's name had been pronounced heretical.[1]

[1] That Theodore Ascidas had it in view, by these new commotions which he was the means of exciting, to bring the cause of Origen into oblivion, is not only asserted by Evagrius, (IV. 38,) ἑτέρωθι τούτους ἐφέλκειν ἐθελων, but declared also by one of the heads of this party, Domitian himself, in a letter to the Roman bishop Vigilius: Hi vero qui proposuerunt hujusmodi (Origenis) dogma defendere, id implere nullo modo voluerunt; sed talem relinquentes conflictum, conversi sunt adversus Theodorum, et moliri cœperunt, quatenus anathematizaretur et ille, ad abolitionem, ut putabant, eorum, quæ contra Origenem mota constiterant. Facund. Hermian. l. IV. c. 4. The same Facundus hints at the connection here with the schemes of the Monophysites: Horum (of the Origenists) satellitio functa gens Eutychianorum perfida, ea quæ per se contra Chalcedonense concilium sæpe tentaverat, per ipsos latentes aggressa est, qui nobis non videbantur hac parte suspecti, l. I. c. 2. Liberatus assigns, as the chief motive, the disparaging of the authority of the Chalcedonian council, and, as a subordinate one, the hostility to Theodore, because he had written against Origen, c. 24: Eo quod Theodorus multa opuscula edidisset contra Origenem, et maxime quod synodus Chalcedonensis laudem ejus susceperit. The former is confirmed also by Facundus of Hermiane, when he says that Theodore, by his work written against Origen, de allegoria et historia, had drawn upon himself the hatred of the Origenists, l. III. c. 6, unde odium Origenianorum incurrit. Still, however, it may have been nothing more than

It would be no difficult matter to point out to the emperor Justinian many passages in the writings of Theodore, which could not fail to appear to him extremely offensive; and, besides this, it was possible here to take advantage not only of his ruling passion generally, which was to set himself up as a lawgiver of the church, but also of another favorite plan, which at that very juncture he was agitating. He was using his efforts to bring back the Monophysites to reunite with the dominant church. For this reason, he was about to bring out under his own name a work in defence of the Chalcedonian council against the objections of the Monophysites. But now Theodore Ascidas and Domitian represented to him, that he would be able to effect his object in a much shorter and more certain way. The Monophysites, said they, particularly object to the council of Chalcedon and its adherents, that they have approved of Theodore, and of many writings of Theodoret and of Ibas of Edessa, which apparently favor Nestorianism. Now, if Theodore and those particular writings were condemned, this charge would be at once refuted. An important obstacle which had hitherto stood in the way of the recognition of the council of Chalcedon among the Monophysites, would thereby be removed at a single stroke; and if the emperor, by bringing about this condemnation, succeeded in restoring peace to the church, he would thereby confer on the church an immense obligation, and secure for himself an enduring renown.[1] Such a plan, so craftily presented, could not be otherwise than agreeable to Justinian; and the more so, as the influential Theodora, who understood the whole affair, gave it her firm support.[2]

The emperor was now urged to issue an edict as soon as possible on this subject; for the party was well aware, that, when he had once done this, he would consider it as a matter involving his own imperial authority and honor, and would never be turned from it. In the year 544, Justinian published the edict, which, from the three repeatedly mentioned points of which it treats, afterwards obtained the name of the edict de tribus capitulis, (*περί τριῶν κεφαλαίων.*) By this edict, which is known to us only from fragments, the anathema was pronounced on the person of Theodore and on his writings, on Theodoret's writings against Cyrill, and on the letter of Ibas,[3] as well as on all the defenders of the three chapters. The emperor was desirous, at the same time, of carefully guarding against everything which might seem like a disparagement of the authority of the Chalcedonian council, extending the anathema to those also who should draw any inference from this document to the prejudice of the council of Chalcedon.

This edict was now, in the first place, sent through the whole empire and laid before the bishops, for the purpose of obtaining their written

a wrong conclusion which led to this conjecture; for it is evident, for the reasons above cited, that this design was not connected, so very closely at least, with the interests of the Origenists; but at the same time it might have been a subordinate motive in the minds of enthusiastic followers of Origen.

[1] Liberat. c. 24. Scribendi laborem eum non debere pati, quando compendio posset acephalos omnes ad suam communionem adducere.

[2] As Liberatus expressly intimates, l. c.

[3] Designedly expressed as follows: Quæ *dicitur* ab Iba esse facta.

assent to it. Had it been possible in this way to secure the individual votes of all or of a majority of the bishops, the matter could be so represented, as if the edict had been received by the whole church. But, in the case of an edict of this sort, the thing was not so easy to be effected as in the case of the edict against Origen; for the new edict appeared at once to be an attack on the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and a favoring of the Monophysites. Very much depended on the votes of the four patriarchs of the East, as these had the greatest weight with the other bishops. The patriarch Mennas of Constantinople expressed himself at first utterly opposed to the substance of the edict, because he saw in it a disparagement of the authority of the council of Chalcedon. He declared next, that he would wait till he could learn what was the decision of the Roman bishop. At length, however, he yielded to the authority of the emperor, and gave in his written acquiescence, but with the proviso that, in case the Roman bishop declared against the condemnation of the three chapters, his own declaration should be withdrawn.[1] So it turned also with the other three patriarchs of the East, who in the first place declared against it, but were induced, on being threatened that they should be deposed, to subscribe their assent.[2] The example thus set was now followed by the other bishops.[3] Those who subscribed, received splendid gifts; the few who declined, were deposed and banished.[4]

But, if the emperor found it easy to carry through his design in the East, which was so accustomed to slavish obedience, he met with a more determined resistance, from the first, among the bishops and clergy in North Africa, which country, just liberated from the despotism of the Vandals, was about to be exposed to that of the Byzantines. Here a more independent and free spirit in church life had been transmitted from the school of the great Augustin. Here, men had learned how to contend for the faith under the persecution of the Vandal kings. Those only who had already become accustomed to change their opinions like a coat, to please the party in power,— who under the Vandals had been Arians, and under Justinian had again exchanged Arianism for a zealous adoption of the Nicene doctrine,— entered now also warmly into the condemnation of the three articles.[5] When the imperial edict with the demand for signatures first arrived in North Africa, the bishop Pontianus replied to the emperor, that those writings to which the edict referred were as yet unknown in those parts. But, even if they were

[1] Facundus Hermianens. l. IV. c. 4. Facundus here very justly reproaches him with being more concerned about the judgment of a man than the judgment of God. In quo satis ostendit, de judicio se potius humano, quam divino esse solicitum.

[2] Facundus, l. c

[3] A characteristic description of the Greek bishops is to be found in a document of this period: Sunt Græci episcopi habentes divites et opulentas ecclesias, et non patiuntur duos menses a rerum ecclesiasticorum dominatione suspendi: pro qua re secundum tempus et secundum voluntatem principum quicquid ab eis quæsitum fuerit, sine alteratione consentiunt. From the letter of the Roman clergy to the Frankish envoys at Constantinople. Mansi Concil. T. IX. f. 153.

[4] Liberatus, towards the end.

[5] As Facundus (lib. contra Mocianum) says of a certain one: Qui Wandalis regnantibus Arianus fuit, deinde imperio succedente Romano cum tempore versus est, ut catholicus videretur, nunc etiam de palatio præjudiciis religionis catholicæ exortis, eadem sequitur.

acquainted with those works, and if they found in them much that was at variance with the doctrines of the faith, they might be on their guard against such passages, but would not hastily condemn their authors, who were already dead. If such writers were still living, and would not themselves condemn the errors objected to them, then with all propriety they might be condemned. But now, they stood before the infallible judge, from whom there was no appeal. He concluded with saying, that the emperor would do well to take heed, lest, in seeking to condemn persons who were already dead, he might fall into the great mistake of condemning many now living to death for their disobedience, and lest he should at last be called to account for this by Him who would come to judge the quick and the dead. As among the Africans, so also among the bishops of Illyria and of Dalmatia, the edict met with determined resistance.

So many tokens of an unfavorable disposition towards the imperial edict having manifested themselves in the Western church, where the arm of Byzantine despotism was not so strong, it seemed the more important to the emperor that the people of the West should be wrought upon through some weighty authority in the church. Hence, above all, he must seek to gain over the voice of the Roman bishop Vigilius, from whom, owing to the fickleness of his character, no very decided resistance was to be apprehended; and who had in truth already pledged himself in favor of the Monophysite party; — a fact of which the emperor, indeed, was not aware, but which was doubtless well remembered by the party which had a hand in all these intrigues. Vigilius, who possessed neither the learning, nor the independent judgment in theology, which qualified him to decide with safety on these disputed matters, was, in all probability, the person who, at the very outset, instructed his two deacons, Anatolius and Pelagius, to get a learned ecclesiastic of Carthage, the deacon Fulgentius Ferrandus,[1] to draw up an opinion on this subject. They directed him to consult with the bishop of Carthage, or with other wise and judicious men; and they themselves expressed a suspicion, from which doubtless we may infer what was the then disposition of Vigilius himself, that this whole business might have originated in a secret plot of the Monophysite party.[2]

Thereupon, Fulgentius Ferrandus, in a free spirited reply, declared decidedly against the reception of the imperial edict, for three several

[1] This Ferrandus is also known to us through his work entitled Christian Rules of Life, (qualis esse debeat dux religiosus in actibus militaribus,) written for the Comes Reginus, who probably filled the post of governor of North Africa. In this production he shows himself to be a man quite zealous and alive for practical Christianity, actuated by a warm philanthropy, and as fearlessly independent as he was prudent and sensible. He warned the count against the tricks whereby the governors of this period contrived to gain the emperor's favor, deceiving him with regard to the lamentable condition of the provinces, and finally bringing the latter to the very verge of ruin. He gives the count the following seven rules, which he goes on to unfold and explain: I. Gratiæ Dei adjutorium tibi necessarium per singulos actus crede. II. Vita tua speculum sit, ubi milites tui videant, quid agere debent. III. Non præesse appetas; sed prodesse. IV. Dilige rempublicam sicut te ipsum. V. Humanis divina præpone. VI. Noli esse multum justus. VII. Memento te esse Christianum.

[2] Facund. Hermian. l. IV. c. 3.

reasons: I. The supreme authority of general councils, particularly of those held with the consent of the Roman church, which, according to the sacred scriptures, held the first rank. Hence what had once been decided by the council of Chalcedon, ought not to be subjected to any new investigation. Let the decisions of the council be attacked, even but in a single article, and its entire authority was immediately unsettled. A distinction between determinations of fact and determinations of doctrine he would not admit to have any force. II. That persons deceased were removed from the jurisdiction of a human tribunal; and, for the sake of the dead, an occasion of offence ought not to be placed in the way of the living. III. No individual man should attempt to procure for his writings, by the subscriptions of many, that authority which the catholic church conceded only to the holy scriptures. No such fetters ought to be imposed on the judgment of church-teachers: it should be left free for each to determine, with regard to the dictum of an individual, what he felt obliged to approve, and what to condemn. Men should not bind themselves by such subscriptions, if they would leave themselves any opportunity of correcting their judgment afterwards on a clearer manifestation of the truth.[1] Vigilius appeared resolved at first to follow the principles here expressed: but the emperor hoped still to overcome his scruples, by means which his absolute sovereignty put within his power; and, as it was so very important to make sure of the voice of the Roman bishop, he sent for him to come to Constantinople. He admonished him, with the patriarchs and other bishops, to study for that peace which Christ loved more than all sacrifices. But Vigilius did not seem inclined to follow this admonition, in the sense in which the emperor intended it; for, while on his journey, he wrote to the patriarch Mennas, that the peace of Christ was a different thing from the peace of the world.[2] After his arrival at Constantinople, A.D. 547, he bore himself at first according to the same spirit. He gave notice to the patriarch Mennas, and all the bishops who had concurred in the condemnation of the three articles, of his intention to withdraw from the fellowship of the church.[3] But his firmness did not last long. He suffered himself to be drawn, in the first place, into a secret written declaration, condemning the three articles.[4] Through Vigilius, the emperor now sought to work upon a synod assembled at Constantinople; and the Roman bishop himself was anxious to give his first public declarations, in this way, a more advantageous appearance, and, by issuing them in fellowship with the large body of bishops, to secure himself from the reproaches which he had reason to apprehend. But owing to the energetic resistance of the North-African bishops, especially of Facundus of Hermiane, this hope was defeated.

[1] A noble protest in favor of freedom of theological inquiry against an effort of this sort to fetter the universal judgment: Patienter ferat pius scriptor sollicitudinem piam requirentium veritatem, nec festinet auditorum tenere manum; sed per suavem sensum paratus meliora sentientibus consentire. L. c. c. 8.

[2] Lib. contra Mocianum, 594, A.

[3] Contra Mocian. 594, D. Theophanes, in the twentieth year of Justinian's reign, but where things which happened at different times are confounded.

[4] Occulta ejus ante judicium pollicitatio tenebatur, in qua se spopondit eadem capitula damnaturum, c. Mocian. 592, D.

Vigilius having failed of his purpose in the *assembly* of bishops, he made the experiment of negotiating with them individually; and in this way he was more successful. He contrived to bring it about, that his first public declaration, his so-called *judicatum*, appeared with the signature of seventy bishops.[1] But this step provoked against himself a serious opposition. Even the two deacons who accompanied him, Rusticus and Sebastian, ventured to stand against him; and they took care that the judicatum of Vigilius should speedily be spread far and wide. They accused him of having detracted from the authority of the Chalcedonian council; they were not afraid even to renounce church-fellowship with him, and a party of the clergy took sides with them. Vigilius, it is true, in a letter describing their conduct, and full of invectives, pronounced on them sentence of deposition;[2] but he had against him the public opinion of the Western church. The free-minded voices of the North-African bishops would here have great influence.

Among these is to be named especially the bishop Facundus of Hermiane. Having first entered into a thorough investigation of the questions in dispute, he came to a decision, and ever afterwards abode with unshaken constancy by the result at which he had arrived with clear conviction. In defence of it, he wrote a treatise eminently characterized by qualities seldom to be met with in this age, — a freedom of spirit unshackled by human fear, and a candid, thorough criticism, superior in many respects to the prejudices of the times.[3] Nobly did he protest against the uncalled-for dogmatism which had ever been the source of so much mischief to the Greek church; these useless disputes having in fact proceeded from no other cause. "While," he said, "in all other arts and occupations, no one presumed to pass judgment on what he had never learned; in matters of theology, on the contrary, they who learned the least were the most arrogant and peremptory in their judgments.[4] When the civil power overstepped its province, it might indeed plunge numbers in ruin, by misleading them to deny the truth with their lips; but still it could never effect its object, for it could not instil into the minds of men other convictions than they had: its power reached only to what was outward, not to the soul."[5] He spoke with scorn of those bishops who accused themselves in pleading, in excuse of their behavior, the constraint under which they were placed; for it was not even the force of torture, but only the fear of the emperor's displeasure, which had brought them to yield.[6] "As if,"

[1] Contra Mocian. 593, c. and the preface to the work of Facundus pro defens. trium capitulor.

[2] See epistola ad Rusticum et Sebastianum. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 176.

[3] Pro defensione trium capitulorum libri XII.

[4] L. XII. c. 4. Nam et suas habent officinas vel artifices omnia quæ ex proposito doceri videmus. Nunquam enim de textrino personare incudes audivimus et ignem illic in fornacibus anhelare. Nunquam comperimus a sutore quæsitum quæ cujusque fabricæ longitudini proportio latitudinis conveniret et quanta utriusque congrueret altitudo, quoniam illi integre scire possunt, qui ab ipsius artis sunt præceptoribus instituti. Solæ in contemptu sunt divinæ literæ, quæ nec suam scholam nec magistros habent, et de quibus peritissime disputare se credat qui nunquam didicit.

[5] Etsi vocem contradictionis abstulerit, animum certe mutare non potuit. Aliquos jus mundanæ potestatis ecclesiæ valet auferre, nullum tamen sibi acquirere.

[6] Against the excuse of Vigilius: Nos

said he, "we had been ordained bishops for no other purpose than to be enriched by the presents of princes, and to sit with them among the high authorities of the state. But if, amidst the many cares of the state, through the deceitful arts of the wicked, of which there is never any lack, any thing has been admitted by them which tended to injure the church or to disturb its peace, as if it were not our duty to set before them the truth for their own benefit, and, if it be necessary, to resist them with the authority of religion, and patiently endure their displeasure if we must incur it.[1] If God should now raise up an Ambrose," said he, "there would not fail to be a Theodosius."[2]

Although Vigilius reprimanded his antagonists with a tone of authority, yet he was not so firm as he wished to appear. The examples of the North-African and Illyrian bishops must have given him some sensations of shame. The North Africans had formally excommunicated him by a synodal decree, reserving to him nothing but the penance of the church.[3] The general voice of the Western church, which accused him of betraying the church out of regard for men, was by no means a matter of indifference to him. He wished to take back with a good grace what he had declared and sworn in so many different ways. To open the way for this, he importuned the emperor that he would cause the decision of the matter to be deferred to a general council, which the Western bishops also should attend. In the midst of a large multitude, the individual, forsooth, would have less to fear. Nor was the emperor by any means disinclined to this measure; for he could not but welcome the opportunity which such an assembly would afford him of putting down, by an overwhelming church authority, the opposition to the condemnation of the three articles; and the more, as religious agitations might bring on a political ferment dangerous to the unsettled state of his newly founded Western empire. Now, as a general council would pass a decision of so much greater weight, Vigilius prevailed on the emperor to give up to him for the present his own judicatum. Justinian was resolved, however, that his edict against the three articles should not fail, and that he would use the council only as an instrument for its confirmation and execution. But, as he had no great confidence perhaps in the fickle-minded Vigilius, he determined to make sure of him by putting him under an oath. And Vigilius was pusillanimous enough to take such an oath as the emperor was pleased to dictate, — an oath by which he bound himself to the degradation of acting as the emperor's blind instrument and secret spy. He

contra respondemus, quod ultro per ambitionem pollicitatione facta peccaverit, nec ulla sustinuerit tormenta, quibus cessisse credatur. Contra Mocian. f. 595.

[1] Quasi vero propter hoc tantum ordinati sumus episcopi, ut ditemur principum donis, et cum eis inter maximas potestates consedeamus, tanquam divini sacerdotii privilegiis fulti: sicubi autem fallaciis malignorum, quæ nullis temporibus defuerunt, aliquid eis inter tantas reipublicæ suæ curas subreptum fuerit, quod ecclesiæ Dei præjudicet vel ecclesiæ pacem turbet, non eis debeamus pro ipsorum salute quæ sunt vera suggerere, et si necesse fuerit, religionis auctoritate resistere, ac patientes offensionem quoque illorum, si acciderit, sustinere. L. IV. c. 4.

[2] Si nunc Deus aliquem Ambrosium suscitaret, etiam Theodosius non deesset. L. XII. f. 584, D.

[3] See the chronicle of the African bishop Victor of Tununum. Canisii lectiones antiquæ ed. Basnage, T. I. f. 332.

promised in it, that, heart and hand with the emperor, he would do all in his power to carry through the condemnation of the three articles. In defence of them he would neither directly nor indirectly do or say anything, nor enter into any secret councils. And should any individual propose to him anything that conflicted with these decisions, anything that concerned the three articles or the faith, or that was contrary to the interests of the state, he would make the individual known to the emperor, as well as all that he said, on condition, however, that the emperor should not attempt the life of any such person, and, out of regard for the honor of his sacred office, that he should not betray the informer. He was quite sensible, then, in what sort of light he must appear, as a Roman bishop, playing such a part.[1] The emperor, having, as he supposed, made sure of Vigilius, summoned, in 551, the bishops from Illyria and from North Africa, to a council to be held at Constantinople. The former did not attend, as they perfectly understood the object in view, and were resolved to have nothing to do with it. A part of the African bishops complied with the summons. The emperor endeavored to move them by bribes, by friendly words, and by threats. Several stood out firmly against his arbitrary will; and these suffered violent persecutions, partly under the false charge of political offences. Among these latter was the bishop Reparatus, of Carthage, who was deposed from his office and condemned to exile; and his chief agent, (Apocrisiarius,) the deacon Primasius, obtained, as his reward for condemning the three articles, the *privilege* of being thrust as their bishop on the unwilling church of Carthage.[2] Not without tumults and bloodshed,[3] the churches in North Africa were deprived of their beloved bishops; while others were substituted in their place, who consented to serve as the slaves of the court. The governor of this province made search for all those bishops, of whom it might be expected that, owing to their character, or to their want of an independent theological judgment of their own, they might be easily led, and sent them to Constantinople to add, by their presence, to the number of those who condemned the three articles.[4]

When Justinian found it impossible to do as he wished with the bishops of Illyria, Dalmatia, and North Africa, he next proceeded to

[1] The words of Vigilius, taken from the form of the oath, published first by Baluz, are: Et si quis mihi aliquid contrarium dixerit aut de istis capitulis, aut de fide aut contra rempublicam, istum sine mortis periculo pietati vestræ manifestabo et quæ mihi locutus est, ita ut propter locum meum personam meam non prodas. Mansi Concil. T. IX. f. 364.

[2] This Primasius should not be confounded with another Primasius, bishop of the city of Adrumetum in Buzazene, who was at first steadfast, but afterwards consented to take a bribe. Perhaps this latter is the same person who is the author of the commentary on the epistles of Paul, and on the Revelation.

[3] Procopius says of the emperor Justinian, of whom, in general, he judges more correctly than the Greek historians of this time: Εἰς μίαν ἀμφι τῷ Χριστῷ δόξαν ἁπάντας ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχων, λόγῳ οὐδένι τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους διεφθείρε, οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐδόκει φόνος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, ἢν γὲ μὴ τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης οἱ τελευτῶντες τυχοίεν ὄντες. Hist. arcan. c. 13.

[4] See the narratives of the bishop Victor of Tununum, who was himself obliged to suffer exile, imprisonment, and bodily ill-treatment, as a defender of the three articles; and the report of the Roman clergy to the Frankish envoys.

urge the bishop Vigilius to unite with the obedient Greeks in condemning the three articles. Disregarding his remonstrances, he issued a new edict still more full in its details, which wore the appearance rather of a doctrinal treatise, than of an imperial decree. This, as it would appear, contained a justification of the sentence against Theodore; and hence a number of pretended blasphemous expressions were cited from his works, and many of the passages chosen for this purpose only betrayed the exceedingly narrow mind of the inquisitorial judge. At the same time, he defended himself against the reproach, that such a sentence tended to impair the authority of the council of Chalcedon; and he now supposed that he had deprived the Monophysites of all reasonable excuse for remaining separated from the dominant church. This edict Vigilius was required to subscribe; but the example of the North-African and Illyrian bishops had given him courage. He sent to demand of the emperor, that he should revoke his edict; he ought to wait for the common decision of the bishops, and either cause the Western bishops who had taken offence at what had hitherto been done, to attend the assembly in person, or else permit them freely to give in their written opinions. He threatened all who should receive the imperial edict, with excommunication. Such downright contradiction was more than the despotic Justinian could bear. Vigilius was obliged, in August, 551, to take refuge from the wrath of the emperor in a church.[1] An imperial officer with an armed force attempting to remove him from that place, he fled to the altar, to which he clung so firmly, that it came near being overturned with himself to the ground.[2]

The emperor having at length promised him safety upon his word and oath, he returned to his usual residence, where, however, he was treated like a prisoner. Disgusted at this confinement, he escaped during the night, two days before the Christmas festival, not without considerable danger, and took refuge in the church of St. Euphema, at Chalcedon. When the emperor invited him once more, by an honorable embassy, to leave this asylum, and promised to give him the most sacred pledges of personal security, Vigilius sent back the reply, that no further sacred pledges were needed, if he would but restore back to the church the peace it enjoyed under his uncle Justinus. But the emperor, who wished and hoped for the coöperation of Vigilius in carrying out his designs on the council, entered into a new train of negotiations with him, and at length succeeded in persuading him to leave the church.

From seven to eight years having now passed amidst these unfruitful controversies, which, destitute of all doctrinal interest, proceeded solely from the intrigues of court-parties and from the arbitrary will of an individual; the Roman bishop having been now detained six years to no purpose at Constantinople; it was finally determined, that a general council for the determination of this dispute should be assembled

[1] Beati Petri basilica in Ormisda.

[2] In his letter of complaint ad universum populum Dei: Et super nos etiam ipsa altaris mensa ceciderat, nisi clericorum nostrorum fuisset manibus sustentata. Theophanes chronograph. Ἐκείθεν ἑλκόμενος κατέσχε τοὺς βασταζόντας τὸ θυσιαστήριον κίονας, καὶ τούτους κατέστρεψε βαρύς ὤν.

at Constantinople, in the year 553, under the patriarch Eutychius[1] — a great undertaking for an object which, measured by its intrinsic importance, was so comparatively insignificant. When Vigilius was invited to take part in this council, he declined; but declared himself ready, within the space of twenty days, to hand in his written judgment on the whole matter; and, in case he did not fulfil his engagement within that term, to accede to all the decrees of the council. The latter accordingly proceeded to their business, independently, and without waiting for the decision of the Roman bishop. Vigilius fulfilled his promise, and published his decision in his *constitutum ad imperatorem.* In this he declared, indeed, that the propositions which had been taken from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were heretical; but immediately subjoined, that it was never allowable to condemn, after his death, a teacher who had died in the communion of the church. The writings, however, of Theodoret and of Ibas, having been approved by the council of Chalcedon, could not be rejected without impairing the authority of that council. Everything which might be done or written against this decision, from whomsoever it might come, he declared to be null and void. The emperor, who regarded himself to be the supreme lawgiver of the church, thereupon sent a letter to the assembled council, in which he declared, that Vigilius had, by his defence of the erroneous doctrines of Nestorius, and Theodore, and their companions, cut himself off from the fellowship of the church; and his name should therefore be expunged from the church records. He made a distinction, however, between the person of the individual Roman bishop, and the apostolic see or the Roman church; the fellowship of the latter should thereby be in nowise affected. The council followed the emperor's orders, and decided according to the imperial edict. The anathema was pronounced on the person and the doctrines of Theodore, as well as on the defenders of them; but with regard to Theodoret and Ibas, only on those particular writings, because both had afterwards recalled their erroneous doctrines, and accordingly had been acknowledged as orthodox by the Chalcedonian council. All who refused to submit to this judgment should, if they were ecclesiastics, be deposed from their places, and, if laymen, be excommunicated. Accordingly, several worthy bishops of Illyria and of North Africa, who did not yield to the ruling power, were deposed from their places and banished.

The strong desire to be released, and permitted to return home to

[1] This Eutychius, general superintendent (Καθολικός) of all the monks in the metropolitan church of Amasea in Pontus, had just at that time been sent to Constantinople by his bishop, as his representative at the council, when the old patriarch Mennas died there. By his zeal (perhaps on his part, with his narrow views, honestly meant) against the heresies of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and for the condemnation of the three articles, he gained the particular favor of the emperor. Among other things, it is said that Justinian — which accords well with his taste — was highly gratified, when Eutychius, in answer to those who would not allow that it was permitted to anathematize the dead, affirmed it as a certain truth, that men were both warranted and in duty bound to pronounce the anathema on heretics even after their death; for king Josiah had caused the very bones of the priests of Baal to be burned after their death. 2 Chron. 34. Justinian rewarded his zeal by bestowing on him the patriarchate. See the account of the life of Eutychius, by the presbyter Eustratius, in the Greek, in actis sanctorum. Appendix to the VI. April, § 22.

his bishopric, caused Vigilius again, and for the last time, to waver. He agreed finally to a new declaration, in which he retracted all he had written in defence of the three articles, and confirmed the decrees of the council of Constantinople. Upon this he obtained permission to return to Rome, but died on the journey, A.D. 555.

Thus, then, the arbitrary will of an emperor, governed by court intrigues, brought it about, that a great church-teacher, whose influence had been of no small weight on the development of theological doctrines, should be denounced as a heretic; while the fickle mind of a Roman bishop, whose instability of character made him the sport of circumstances, must triumph over the better spirit of the Western church.

But what was the result of these disputes? The project that hovered before the imagination of the emperor, of uniting the Monophysites with the dominant church, was not attained; for the authority of the council of Chalcedon, which was held fast by the majority, remained an abiding wall of separation between the two parties. And *in the Western church*, arose a new schism, which continued to exist in the following times, as the effect of the condemnation pronounced by the council of Constantinople, and adopted by the Roman church. The churches of Istria, and all those which stood under the metropolitan of Aquileja, renounced, on this account, the fellowship of the Roman church.

As the emperor Justinian, in the matters of which we have thus far spoken, was made use of sometimes by this and sometimes by the other court-party, as an instrument of their intrigues, while he supposed himself to be zealously contending for the purity of doctrines; so towards the end of his reign, subservient to the same party passions, and legislating on matters which he did not understand,[1] he was upon the eve of calling forth new disastrous controversies in the Oriental church. A party among the Monophosites, who followed the doctrines of Xenayas and of the bishop Julian of Halicarnassus, derived, as a necessary consequence from the union of the deity and humanity in one nature in Christ, the proposition, similar to one which had already been maintained by Clement of Alexandria and Hilary of Poictiers, that the body of Christ, even during his earthly life, was not subjected, by any necessity of nature,[2] to sensuous affections and wants, such as hunger, thirst, and pain; but that, by a free determination of his own will, (*κατ' οἰκονομίαν*,) he subjected himself to all these things, for the salvation of man:—which view went under the name of *Aphthartodocetism*.

It is easy to see, that this theory, seriously as the purely human element in Christ was thereby affected, would be agreeable to many, who were actuated by a misconceived desire of honoring Christ, by depriving him of all human affections. And moreover, the adherents of the doctrine of the two natures might suppose, they could consider this as a consequence flowing from the union of the two natures in one person;—

[1] Περισκόπων μὲν τὰ μετεώρα, περιέργος δὲ ἀμφὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσει. So Procopius describes him, hist. arcana, c. 18.

[2] All that was included in the conception of *φθόρα*, of the *παθήτον εἶναι*, as a consequence of sin.

just as, on several other points, they agreed with the Monophysites, — namely, in approving the expressions, "God was born," "God suffered," and in denying all want of knowledge on the side of Christ's human nature, (or Agnoëtism, as it was called.) Perhaps, at the same time, a secret court-party favoring the Monophysites, although their head, the empress Theodora, had long since died, had a hand in this matter. And certainly the enemies of the patriarch Eutychius of Constantinople could not have devised a better means to involve him in controversy, and perhaps indeed to bring upon him the whole displeasure of the emperor.[1] As the emperor Justinian was strongly inclined to favor the most extravagant expressions which caused the human attributes of Christ to be entirely forgotten in the divine; as he had already, while a minister of state under the preceding reign, and afterwards at the beginning of his own reign, zealously defended the formula, which also was first brought into use by Monophysites,[2] "One of the Trinity suffered," when it was introduced into the church by certain Scythian and Constantinopolitan monks, (the so-called Theopaschites;) as he had, in 533, confirmed this formula by an edict, and given himself no rest till it was adopted also in the Roman church; so now, in his advanced age, he thought he could do no greater work for the honor of Christ and the expurgation of his own sins, than, by a new edict, to make Aphthartodocetism a law. Already was it determined to force obedience to this edict after the usual manner; already had the patriarch Eutychius of Constantinople[3] been deposed and banished for contradicting it; already a similar fate was threatening Anastatius, the patriarch of Antioch; and partly a new disgraceful bondage, partly new inward distractions, were impending over the whole Oriental church, when, by the death of this emperor, which followed soon after, — an emperor whose long reign had been the occasion of the greatest mischiefs in the Greek church, — it was delivered, A.D. 565, from these new evils.

APPENDIX.

The Formation of Separate Church Parties, in consequence of these Disputes, beyond the Limits of the Roman Empire.

While the several church parties which grew up out of these controversies within the Roman empire had to yield to the sovereign power; in other lands, where a different religion from Christianity was the religion of the state, they were at full liberty to express and to propagate themselves; and the hostile relation in which they stood to the ruling church doctrine in the Roman empire contributed, in those countries, to render the government favorably disposed to them.

[1] The biographer of Eutychius accuses the Origenists especially of participating in these plots. This charge may indeed have arisen from the hatred of a heretical party: at the same time, however, Aphthartodocetism might easily be held in connection with the peculiar views of this party.

[2] As an addition to the Trisagion.

[3] Eutychius conducted with firmness and dignity: he persisted, even after a thrice-repeated summons, in protesting against the judgment of an illegal synod.

This was true especially of the Nestorians. The most eminent seat, from which this sect extended itself in Persia, was a flourishing school for the education of Persian divines in the city of Edessa, in Mesopotamia. (See vol. II., p. 319.) This city now became, immediately after the conclusion of the first Ephesian council, the theatre of the most violent disputes which grew out of the opposite views of doctrine which then agitated the church. The bishop of this city, whose name was Rabulas, (see above,) and who, before this, was on friendly terms with the other Syrian church-teachers, had, at a later period, attached himself wholly to the side of the patriarch Cyrill; and he associated himself with the most violent zealots against that which went under the name of Nestorianism, insomuch that he even ventured publicly to pronounce the anathema on those venerated teachers of the Syrian church, Diodorus and Theodore. He met with a determined resistance, however, from many of the clergy, and especially from the presbyter Ibas, a person who stood in high estimation, and to whom the teachers of the above-mentioned Persian school attached themselves. The latter were banished by the tyrannical Rabulas; and, by their means, first a tendency favorable to Nestorianism was introduced into Persia. Still more, however, did the presbyter Ibas himself, by his famous letter to the bishop Mares or Maris, of Hardaschir, in Persia, and by translating the works of Theodore and Diodorus into the Persian church language, which was the Syriac, contribute to diffuse, if not a predilection for Nestorius, yet an aversion to Cyrill, and a tendency of doctrine, with which zeal for the tenets of Nestorius might easily be associated. In this letter to the bishop Maris, he appears by no means as a friend of Nestorius. He says that this latter, as well as Cyrill, had given offence by his controversial writings. He blames him for having drawn down accusations on himself by his attack on the name θεότοκος, applied to Mary; as in truth all the moderate Orientals were agreed on this point with Ibas. But yet he spoke with more rancour against Cyrill, whom he accused of teaching the *one*ness of nature of the deity and humanity, and of falling into Apollinarianism.

When Ibas wrote this letter, the above-mentioned treaty of coalition had been concluded betwixt Cyrill and the Orientals. Ibas announced it with great triumph to his friend: he regarded the confession of faith laid down by the bishop Cyrill as a recantation on his part, — as a token of the victory of pure doctrine, and of the universal restoration of tranquillity.[1]

Very soon, no doubt, he must see that he had been deceived in his expectations, as may be gathered from what has been related above; for he himself had in truth a great deal to suffer for a long time afterwards, until he was justified by the council of Chalcedon, from the enthusiasts for the doctrine of Cyrill. In the meantime, he became, in 435, the successor of Rabulas, as bishop of Edessa. By his means, probably, the seminary for Persian church-teachers was reëstablished, and it regained once more its former influence. The persecutions which

[1] The fragment of this letter is in the Acta Concil. Chalc. act. X. Harduin. II. f. 530.

Ibas afterwards had to suffer from the zealots of the opposite party, and the behavior of this party under the guidance of a Dioscurus, all this would of course be only suited to confirm the Persian Christians in their predilection for the oppressed party, to which they had attached themselves.

But the individual who contributed most to found and establish the Nestorian church in Persia was Barsumas, one of those Persian teachers who had been driven away by the bishop Rabulas. His long and active labors, from 435 to 489, as bishop of the city of Nisibis, gave him the best opportunity for this. Although the accounts of later Jacobite historians, especially such as Abulpharagius and Barhebræus of the 13th century,[1] respecting the artifices he is said to have employed to determine the Persian king, Pherozes, in favor of his own party and against the dominant church of the Roman empire, do not appear to be altogether worthy of credit; yet there can, at least, be no doubt that political reasons must have moved the Persian kings to favor a separation of the Christians of their kingdom from the Christians of the Roman empire, and Barsumas doubtless might skilfully turn these reasons to the advantage of his own party.

When, in the year 496, Babæus, who was one of this party, became, as patriarch of Seleucia, the head of the Persian church, he held a synod, by which the Nestorian church-party was completely organized. It became distinguished also from the rest of the Oriental church, by allowing bishops and presbyters to marry.[2]

The Greek emperor Zeno broke up, it is true, in the year 489, the Persian seminary at Edessa, on account of its Nestorianism. The consequence of this, however, was the transfer of the school to Nisibis, where it could freely develope itself under the Persian government, and only flourished so much the more. From this school arose others among this church party; and through many centuries it contributed to diffuse great enthusiasm for Christian knowledge and theological culture, and particularly for biblical studies, to which the spirit of a Theodore of Mopsuestia had given the incentives; and the Nestorian churches became an important instrument of diffusing Christianity in Eastern Asia.

The same was true also with regard to the propagation of the Monophysite party. In Egypt, the native country and proper home of this sect, it ever continued to exercise an important influence. But, when the emperor Justinian sought to enforce there as elsewhere the recognition of the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and to appoint those as bishops there who were devoted to the doctrinal system of that council, the Monophysites of this country renounced their connection with the dominant church, and maintained themselves as an independent sect, under their own patriarchs. Their party, after all that had transpired before, must have been the most numerous one. As the Egyptian church was the mother of the Ethiopian, this state

[1] See especially the extracts from them, Assemani bibl. oriental. T. III. P. I. f. 391, &c.
[2] Assemani III. 2, f. 79.

of things would naturally have an influence also on the church in Ethiopia.

The Monophysite church developed itself with more freedom in Armenia. The persecutions waged against the Monophysites probably contributed to bring about the insurrection of the province of Greater Armenia, which facilitated the conquest of this country by the Persians. To the Persian ruler Chosroes, the separation of his new Christian subjects from the Christians of the Roman empire would of course be welcome, and he was desirous of confirming it. Under him, Nierses, the first bishop or catholicus of the Armenian church, held a synod at Thiven, in 536, at which the Monophysite system was confirmed, and the anathema pronounced on the Chalcedonian council.

The credit of having done most to preserve, establish, and extend the Monophysite party in Syria and the adjacent countries, belongs to a man distinguished for indefatigable zeal in the cause to which he had devoted himself, for enterprising activity and a courage that despised all dangers. In those regions, owing to the deficiency of clergy, of which the emperor Justinian had found means to deprive them, the Monophysite party was threatened with becoming gradually extinct, when certain imprisoned bishops of this sect united together, and ordained, as the general metropolitan of their church, the monk and presbyter Jacob, from the cloister of Phasitla in the district of Nisibis, a man inured to deprivations and hardships, and of unshaken firmness and constancy. With great rapidity, and not without many dangers, he traversed, under the disguise of a beggar,[1] the Syrian provinces and those adjacent; he confirmed, by his exhortations, the oppressed party, and ordained clergy for them; he gave them a superior in the patriarch of Antioch; and labored for them himself, during a period of thirty-three years, until A.D. 578, as a bishop, probably at Edessa. From him proceeded the name of Jacobites, which was applied sometimes to the whole sect, sometimes to a part of it only.

The peculiar bent of mind, however, in which the Monophysite system had originated, could not fail of soon becoming the source of internal divisions among themselves — that spirit which turned away from living Christianity, and would fain confine the essence of faith to these or the other dogmatic formulas. The doctrine of the one nature of Christ, for the sake of which they had separated from the dominant church, still contained matter enough for dialectical disputes; and the differences which now began to be discussed among themselves, showed how completely, notwithstanding the controversy had originally a deeper foundation, men had finally lost themselves in wilful disputes about terms and phrases, without any disposition to understand one another in respect to the conceptions attached to them. Thus in fact it came about, that, amidst these controversies, many among the Monophysite party agreed in their doctrinal views with the adherents of the Chalcedonian council, except that they always substituted, instead of two

[1] From this circumstance it is said he received the surname Al Baradai — Baradæus, the man in rags.

natures in one person, one nature in one person. Thus the party of Severus at Alexandria maintained, that deity and humanity, although united in one nature, yet retained unaltered the attributes corresponding to their proper essence; and they agreed therefore, in this respect, with the doctrinal conceptions of the Chalcedonian council. Stephanus, surnamed Niobes, (Νιόβης or Νιόβος,) an Alexandrian rhetorician or sophist, found something inconsistent in this view, judged from the position of Monophysitism; and he became the founder of a distinct party, who were called Niobites.

This disputed question was extended to the spiritual and corporeal attributes of Christ's humanity. Severus maintained, conformably to his principles, and agreeing in this respect with the Duophysites, the doctrine of Phthartodocetism in opposition to Julian of Halicarnassus. Themistius, a deacon at Alexandria, who belonged to the party of Severus, in applying this principle to the soul of Christ, fell, in truth, into the same species of *Agnoëtism*, which had already been denounced as heresy in Theodore of Mopsuestia.

By the controversies of the Monophysites with the theologians of the dominant church, the study of dialectics was greatly promoted in their theological schools; and this study found abundant nourishment in the works of Aristotle, who, still earlier than this, had by many been united with, or even preferred before Plato.[1] Dialectical acuteness was thus excited; and it is only to be lamented, that it should have been, for the most part, wasted upon such unprofitable investigations, and could only move within the contracted circle of the church system of doctrine then in vogue. Yet trained in the midst of this sect were two men, eminently distinguished for freedom and originality of mind. One of them, the learned and acute John, surnamed, on account of his literary activity, the laborious, (ὁ φιλόπονος,) lived in the last times of the sixth, and the beginning of the seventh century. He was an Apologist,[2] and a zealous polemical divine.[3] While he was intending to attack, with his Aristotelian dialectics, the adherents of the Chalcedonian council, and was thereby led to employ the conceptual determinations of Aristotle, after a very inadequate manner, in explaining and unfolding the doctrine of the Trinity, as, it is said, had been done already by Ascusnages, a learned Monophysite, at Constantinople, he drew upon himself the charge of heresy from the side of his own party. He was wishing, namely, to show his opponents, that, if they

[1] As early as the end of the fourth century, Libanius, in speaking of such as had come from the schools of Athens, mentions, in connection with the cloak, not the Academy and Plato, but the Lyceum and Aristotle. See Libanius' Discourse Πρὸς τοὺς εἰς τὴν παιδείαν αὐτὸν ἀποσκωψάντας. Vol. III. ed. Reiske, p. 438. So in fact the Armenian David, who was educated at Athens, introduced the study of Aristotle into Armenia, near the close of the fifth century. See Memoires sur la vie et les ouvrages de David, par C. F. Neumann, Paris, 1829.

[2] He wrote against Proclus and Jamblichus. Against the work of the latter, in defence of image-worship. Photius (see Cod. 215) was not entirely satisfied with this work. Did Philoponus perhaps express himself on this occasion against images after the same manner as the Monophysite Xenayas? See vol. II. p. 295.

[3] In his Commentary on the history of the Creation, he attacked with the Aristotelian logic, particularly, Theodore of Mopsuestia.

taught the doctrine of two natures in Christ, they must necessarily suppose also two hypostases. To make this out, he distinguished, as an Aristotelian, the twofold employment of the term *nature* (φύσις.) By this was understood either the universal conception of the kind, (the εἶδος ἐνυπόστατον,) or nature in the concrete, the individual beings in which the universal was expressed and coined into particular existence, (the ἰδιοσύστατος τῆς φύσεως ὕπαρξις, the ἄτομα.) Now, when men spoke of two natures in Christ, they certainly did not understand, by the divine nature, the common divine essence, but the divine Logos, one of the three hypostases, in which the community of the divine nature, as of the divine essence, was contained. Even in speaking of a human nature, the human nature in general was not here meant; else it would be necessary to say, that the Logos united himself with all the men who ever had lived or who ever would live, for all these certainly belonged to the universal conception of the kind; but an altogether determinate human nature was meant, with which alone, among all, the Logos united himself in this manner. It was plain, therefore, that, in this employment of it, the term φύσις was perfectly identical with the term ὑπόστασις, and that accordingly, in supposing two natures, it would be necessary to suppose also two hypostases in Christ.[1] Now, by fixing upon such comparisons as these, which Philoponus employed, his enemies might, not without plausible grounds, accuse him of making the conception of the divine essence a mere conception of the kind, and of thus falling into Tritheism. To the very same result came the schoolman Gilbert of Poictiers, in the twelfth century, by a like employment of Aristotelian formulas.

The second of these men, Stephanus Gobarus, (Στέφανος ὁ γοβαρός,) belongs also to the party founded by Philoponus. We know, it is true, of but one book under his name, from the list of its contents by Photius;[2] but this suffices to signalize him as a man of rare freedom of spirit for these times. While others aimed, for the most part, simply to point out the common church tradition in the teachings of the ancient church, and while the differences among them were willingly kept out of view; this man, on the contrary, ventured to bring together the opposite affirmative and negative decisions of the ancient church-teachers on doctrinal and exegetical questions, in some cases on important points, under twenty-five heads; and among these were to be found several expressions of venerated fathers of the church, which at that time might well appear offensive. Certain it could not have been his object in this, to exalt the authority of the church tradition.

As it was frequently the case, that in opposition to, or along-side of, the dialectic bent, a mystical tendency developed itself in theology, so it happened also among the Monophysites. A cloister at Edessa,[3] in Mesopotamia, had for his head, in the last times of the fifth century, an

[1] See the interesting fragment from the polemical work which Philoponus wrote, entitled ὁ διαιτήτης, *the arbitrator*, in Johannes Damascenus de hæresibus.

[2] Cod. 232.

[3] From these districts came also the Euchites, (see vol. II. page 000,) in whose mysticism a good deal of a kindred character may be found.

abbot by the name of Bar Sudaili, who had busied himself in various ways with that mystic theology which always formed one of the ground-tendencies of the Oriental Monachism, and from which had proceeded the writings fabricated in the name of Dionysius the Areopagite; as in fact he appeals to the writings of a certain Hierotheos, whom the Pseudo-Dionysius calls his teacher.[1] He stood at first on intimate terms with the most eminent Monophysite teachers, and was very highly esteemed by them. But, as his mystic theology came into conflict with the church doctrine, he drew upon himself the most violent attacks. Espousing the peculiar views of Monophysitism, and more particularly as they were apprehended by the party of Xenayas, he maintained that, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are one divine essence, and as the humanity formed one nature with the godhead in Christ, and his body became of like essence to the divinity, (was deified,) so through him all fallen beings should also be exalted to unity with God, in this way would become one with God; so that God, as Paul expresses it, should be all in all.

If it is true, as it is related,[2] that on the walls of his cell were found written the words, "All creatures are of the same essence with God;" we must suppose that he extended this assertion so as to include not only all rational beings, but all creatures of every kind, and that his theory was — as all existence proceeded by an original emanation from God, so by redemption all existence, once more refined and ennobled, would return back to him. But the question then arises, whether he understood this, after the pantheistic manner, as a return to the divine essence with the loss of all self-subsistent, individual existence; (as it has often been observed, that mysticism runs into pantheism;) or whether he supposed that, with the coming into existence of finite beings, sin also necessarily made its appearance, but that by the redemption this contrariety was removed, and now at length the individual existence of the creature should continue to subsist, as such, in union with God. Our information is too scanty to enable us to decide this question.[3] As a transition-point to that universal restoration, he supposed a millennial kingdom of exalted happiness on earth at the close of the earthly course of the world. That he entertained the same sensual notions respecting

[1] In the Pseudo-Dionysian writings cited by him, there were θεολόγικαι στοιχειώσεις, (ground-works of theology,) and ἐρωτικοὶ ὕμνοι, (alluding to love in the sense of the mystics.) Abulpharagius (in Assemani B. O. T. II. f. 291) says that Bar Sudaili fabricated a book under the name of this Hierotheus, in confirmation of his own peculiar opinions; but he adds himself, that by many it was held to be a work of Hierotheus. It is probably therefore a mere conjecture of this Monophysite author, that Bar Sudaili was the writer of that book. It might possibly be, that Bar Sudaili found an older apocryphal book, under this name, among the monks, and used it in support of his doctrines.

[2] This, however, may perhaps have been an invention of his enemies; since in fact they also affirmed, as the inscription was no longer to be found in his cell, he had erased it, when the thing began to be noised abroad. The same opinion is said to have been expressed in his books, only in a more concealed manner; but it may be a question, whether men did not *imply* in these writings a sense foreign to their true contents, from hostile feelings or from misconception.

[3] See the letter of the Monophysite bishop Xenayas to Abraham and Orestes, prebyters of Edessa, in Assemani. T. II. f. 30.

this millennial reign as the older Chiliasts, we cannot assume to be proved by the accusations of his opponents without the addition of more decisive testimony. This would not be consistent, at least, with his mystic theology; and his mystical expressions might easily be misconstrued by those who considered them in a hostile spirit. But neither are we warranted to pronounce the charge utterly false; for combinations of a mystical and a sensuous tendency admit of being psychologically explained, and are not without example. Like the older Chiliasts, Bar Sudaili taught that the Sabbath of that millennial period of rest, the Sunday, answered to the commencement of a new, higher, eternal order of world, after the universal restoration. By means of a mystical interpretation of the Bible, he sought to introduce his doctrines into the sacred scriptures, and for this purpose wrote commentaries on the Psalms. He boasted of higher revelations, whereby the more profound sense of scripture had been laid open to him. He called the sacred scriptures dreams, and his own expositions the interpretation of dreams. It was assuredly not his intention by this to disparage the authority of the Bible, but only, after the usual manner of the Theosophists, to mark their obscurity for ordinary men. The Bible contained nothing but hints, intimations of higher mysteries, and hence could be understood only by those to whom the Spirit communicated the intuitions of these mysteries. But when this person was accused of having declared all sacraments to be superfluous, as well as all moral discipline; of having taught that each individual might live according to his own sinful lusts; it is evident, from the way in which these charges are laid, that they proceeded solely from an unjust fabrication of consequences. Because Bar Sudaili taught the destiny of all would at length be the same by reason of the universal restoration, it was inferred that, according to this doctrine, then, nothing at all depended on the different conduct of men, and each individual who continued to live in his sins would nevertheless share at last in the same blessedness with all the others. But Bar Sudaili would certainly have been far from admitting the correctness of these inferences.

c. Anthropology.

From that part of the Christian system of faith which, as we remarked in the introduction to this section, received its first shaping in the Oriental church, conformably to its predominant speculative tendency, from theology in the more restricted sense of the term, we pass next to Anthropology, with the development of which, amid the contrariety of views there appearing, the Western church particularly busied itself. We noticed already, in the preceding period, the germs of opposite tendencies in the mode of apprehending the doctrines connected with this subject: from these germs, unfolded to more decided and strongly marked opposition to one another, the controversies of this period proceeded. As the central doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of the redemption, in opposing itself to the delusive notion of a moral self-sufficiency, presupposes, on the one hand, the sense of moral insufficiency,

of an inward schism, and the feeling thence resulting of the need of redemption; on the other hand, the sense of moral freedom, which imputes to itself guilt, and appropriates the offered redemption; — as Christianity announces itself, on the one hand, as a new transforming moral creation, as a new element of life changing and ennobling the entire human nature, and, on the other, attaches itself to the kindred moral nature of man, purifies this from all that is foreign, and takes it up into itself, in order to a free, harmonious development of its inviduality of character; so the relation of Christianity to human nature could make its appearance in the dogmatic consciousness sometimes more on one of these sides, and sometimes more on the other. *One* of these particular modes of apprehension made its appearance in North Africa, through Tertullian; the other, in the Alexandrian church, particularly through Clement and Origen; while yet the two modes of apprehension were still preserved in union with each other by the Christian consciousness lying at their root. One of these tendencies, then, continued, generally speaking, to be the predominant one in the Oriental, the other the predominant one in the Occidental church. The sense of corruption, the consequent feeling of the need of redemption in man's nature, of grace as a power for the moral transformation of the corrupt nature, this was particularly unfolded in the Western church; while, at the same time, however, the church still persisted in regarding the free moral self-determination as the condition presupposed by the inworking of this higher, divine principle. In the Oriental church, on the other hand, Christianity was also acknowledged, it is true, as a divine communication of life, transcending the limits of man's original nature: in Christianity there was acknowledged to be a higher divine creation; and, proceeding from the first sin, there was acknowledged to be a corruption of human nature, which must be cured by the redemption. It was regarded in particular as a consequence of the first sin, that human nature had become subjected to mortality, to sensuous defects and excitement, and to the manifold temptations of sin.[1] (See vol. I. sect. 3, p. 614.) But although this view of the redemption as a remedy for existing evil was not repelled, yet the view of the redemption as a new glorious creation was made still more prominent. These two different modes of apprehension corresponded, in fact, to two different courses of culture pursued by the individual, according as the case was, that, either from a strongly pronounced consciousness of guilt, he came to the gospel out of a sudden great crisis of the inner life, or had unfolded himself by a more gradual and regulated progress within Christianity itself, appropriating human nature from the first stages of its development. In the Oriental church, it was simply held to be essential to affirm grace and free-will at the same time, without attempting exactly to define the relation of the two to each other; it was only sought carefully to avoid everything that might seem to favor arbitrary will on the part of God in the election of men, — an unconditioned predetermination, which might seem to impair the doctrine of

[1] The *σῶμα θνήτον* and *ἔμπαθες*, as contradistinguished from the earlier *ἀπαθεία*.

the divine love and justice, and of man's free-will. To the mode of treating these doctrines in the Oriental church, we shall return again hereafter.

As examples to show how these doctrines were apprehended in the Western church, previous to the breaking-out of these disputes, we will lay open the systems of Hilary of Poictiers, and of Ambrose of Milan.

In considering the scheme of doctrine which prevailed among the Latins, it is important to notice, that, in their ancient translation of the New Testament, the words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον (Rom. 5 : 12) were rendered, "in quo omnes peccaverunt." This furnished some apparent ground for the representation, that all mankind sinned in Adam; though we by no means intend to say, that the above erroneous translation was the only ground on which such a doctrine reposed. The ground of it doubtless lay still deeper than that, in facts and enigmas of the moral self-consciousness — in the same which also presented a foothold for the various schemes of doctrine concerning the soul's pre-existence. At all events, however, this erroneous translation was the means of bringing it about, that the above representation of all mankind having sinned in Adam should be universally received as an undeniable foundation of doctrine. This proposition, Hilary of Poictiers makes his starting point, when, in commenting on Matth. 18 : 13, he understands by the ninety and nine sheep which went not astray, the angels, and by the one lost sheep, mankind; inasmuch as all humanity partook in the one sin of Adam.[1] As to the way in which this connection of the sin of Adam with the sin of mankind is to be conceived, it is a point which he explains no farther. But thus much is clear, that from this he derived a sinful inclination cleaving to all men; as, for example, where he speaks of sins to which men are led by the bent of their nature.[2] Accordingly he says, that by baptism we are delivered from the sins of our birth, are separated from the propensities of our progenitors, and lay aside the old man with his sins and his unbelief.[3] *All* moral evil, however, Hilary seems to refer to the sensuous nature; while in the soul he recognizes the indestructible image of God.[4] Thus the contrariety betwixt the inner and the outer man is to him no other than that betwixt spirit and sense.[5] To him all men appear standing in need of the forgiveness of sin, by reason of the moral defects which cleave to them. "The works of righteousness," says he, "would not be sufficient to deserve perfect blessedness, unless the mercy of God,

[1] Commentar. in Matth. XVIII. § 6. Ovis una homo intelligendus est, et sub homine uno universitas sentienda est. Sed in unius Adæ errore omne hominum genus aberravit.

[2] Ad hæc nos vitia naturæ nostræ propellit instinctus. Tract. in Ps. I. § 4.

[3] In Matth. X. § 24. Ab originis nostræ peccatis atque auctoribus separamur, a patris et matris affectionibus dissidemus, veterem cum peccatis atque infidelitate sua hominem exuentes.

[4] Thus he says of Job: Formatus intra matris vulvam et per virtutem Creatoris in substantia animæ ad Dei sui imaginem figuratus, eum qui ex incremento accessit profectum editi corporis congemiscit, in quo sibi in malis seculi et infirmitatibus carnis vitiisque vivendum sit. In Ps. CXIX. § 12.

[5] Cum interior homo spiritus opera desiderat, exterior voluptates corporis concupiscit. In. Ps. CXXIX. § 6.

in those cases where the will was bent on righteousness, also forbore to impute those faults which proceed from the fluctuation and inconstancy of the human passions."[1] Human mutability, dependence on the inconstancy of the affections, preclude, according to Hilary, the possibility of perfect virtue. In comparison with God, no man can be called good. There is no perfect virtue but that which remains unchangeably the same. In man we can speak only of relative goodness: in single moments a man may be called good, either with reference to his intentions or to his actions; but this is not an abiding state with him — a view of the matter, we must allow, which proceeds from a somewhat superficial way of considering it, since in moral life the individual moments do not admit of being thus insulated from their connection with the whole. "Human passions," says he, "vary by alternation: thus, for example, by injuries, man is irritated; by fear, he is disturbed; by love, he is differently affected; by hatred, he is impelled, etc. But still, in the moments when our will or our act is a good one, it cannot be otherwise than that we should be what we are."[2] The words of Christ, that he was not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance, he explains as follows: Our Saviour would thereby have us to understand, that as he was come in behalf of all, so all must see themselves to be sinners, in order to partake of the salvation which is through him.[3] So he says, "By faith, that is obtained which the law could not bring to pass; faith alone justifies."[4] But justification is manifestly to be understood here in the objective sense. According to this, then, we might suppose Hilary would have been unwilling to admit the possibility of a righteousness consisting in the fulfilment of the law. This, however, is not his opinion. We find here a want of clearness in respect to the conception of the law, which afterwards, as we shall see, presented a foothold for Pelagianism. Failing to distinguish the two different modes of apprehending the law, first according to its eternal, divine matter, its spirit and essence; and secondly, the law in its particular, Mosaic form, in the outward statutes of this politico-theocratical constitution, the law expressed in commandments having reference to outward actions, — failing to distinguish and hold apart these two different applications of the conception, and having his mind fixed on the last-mentioned reference, he was enabled to distinguish the standing ground of a righteousness consisting in the fulfilment of the law, by which one might, even without any knowledge of Christ, attain to a certain stage of blessedness, and the standing ground of the higher

[1] Non enim ipsa illa justitiæ opera sufficient ad perfectæ beatitudinis meritum, nisi misericordia Dei etiam in hoc justitiæ voluntate humanarum demutationum et motuum vitia non reputet. In Ps. LI. § 23.

[2] Idcirco perfecta bonitas in nullo est, quia eam naturalium perturbationum incentiva demutant. Sed tamen, cum in bonitatis sumus vel voluntate vel gestis, non possumus vel tunc non hoc esse quod sumus. Et quamvis imperfecti ad id simus, nec semper id simus, quod tamen sumus in tempore, licet per naturæ infirmitatem demutationi bonitatis obnoxiis, non adimitur nobis bonos nos vel tum esse, cum sumus. In Ps. LII. § 11.

[3] Omnibus venerat. Quomodo ergo non se justis venisse dicit? Erant ergo, quibus necesse non erat, ut veniret? Sed nemo justus ex lege est. Ostendit ergo, inanem justitiæ esse jactantiam. In Matth. IX. § 2.

[4] Remissum est a Christo, quod lex laxare non poterat; fides enim sola justificat. In Matth. VIII. § 6.

righteousness by faith, which could be communicated only through Christ.[1] In proof of such a standing ground of righteousness by the law, he refers to the words of Paul, (Rom. 10 : 5,) in which, we must allow, he applies a meaning altogether opposed to the thought of the apostle ;[2] as if he intended to say, that, on the standing ground of law, it would have been possible for man to really fulfil it by works, and thus attain to life. But this mistake grew out of his neglecting to distinguish the sense of the word according to the original connection in which it is employed in the Old Testament, and according to the application given to it by the apostle Paul. Over against the laborious and painful righteousness of the law, and the sin-burdened life of the world, he places the gentle yoke of Christ, under which the practice of goodness is made easy by love ; though in this case he fails rightly to explain how this is connected with, and grounded in, the peculiar principle of the new Christian life. " Those who painfully struggle along," says he, " under the difficulties of the law, and those who are burdened with the sins of the world, Christ calls to himself ; and he promises to make their way easy and their burden light, if they will but take his yoke upon them, that is, subject themselves to his commands, and come to him under the holy sacrament of the cross ; because he is meek and lowly of heart, and they shall therein (by submitting to his commands) find rest to their souls : holding out the allurement of an easy yoke and a light burden, that he may bestow on those who believe on him the knowledge of the true good. And what easier, what lighter burden is there than this ; to take delight in abstaining from sin, in willing what is good, in loving all men, in hating none, in attaining to things eternal, in not being carried away by things present and temporal, in being unwilling to do to others what you would not choose to suffer yourself ?[3]" Now the only thing made prominent here is the standing ground of a new and higher moral knowledge ; yet, in addition to this, we must take from other passages the sense of the forgiveness of sin imparted by Christ ; nor should we neglect to notice the sacramentum crucis, of which mention is here made. Moreover, he undoubtedly presupposes the communication through Christ of a new principle of divine life — which belongs to the essence of the justitia fidei, — to justification in the subjective sense ; since he constantly admits the necessity of a cooperation of grace and free-will, in order to the vigorous growth of the Christian life.

[1] Nec ambiguum est, eos in viventium libro esse, qui antea sine ullo Christi cognitione pie in lege versati omnia præscripta legis impleverint. Scribuntur autem in libro justorum, quibus justitia Christus est factus. In Ps. LXVIII. § 24.

[2] In the passage just cited : De quibus secundum legem apostolus Paulus ita docuit : quia qui fecerit ea, vivet in illis.

[3] In Matth. XI. § 13. Legis deinde difficultatibus laborantes et peccatis seculi oneratos ad se advocat, demturumque se laborem onusque promittit, si modo ejus jugum tollant, mandatorum scilicet suorum præcepta suscipiant, eumque sacramento crucis adeant, qui corde humilis et mitis sit, et in his animabus suis requiem inveniant; jugi suavis et levis oneris blandimenta proponens, ut credentibus ejus boni scientiam præstet, quod solus ipse novit in Patre. Et quid jugo ipsius suavius, quid onere levius, probabilem fieri, scelere abstinere, bonum velle, malum nolle, amare omnes, odisse nullum, æterna consequi, præsentibus non capi, nolle inferre alteri, quod ipsi sibi perpeti sit molestum ?

Thus he says,[1] "As the organs of man's body cannot exercise their activity unless certain other causes supervene, as, for example, the eye cannot see if there be no light; so the human soul ever possesses indeed the capacity of knowing God; but, unless it receives by faith the gift of the Holy Ghost, it will not attain to the light of that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ is free for each man's acceptance, and that which is denied to none is bestowed on each, just so far as he will receive it. The Holy Spirit is the light of the soul; but we must long after it, we must labor to participate in it, and then preserve it within us, by faithful obedience to the divine commands."[2] "It is the extreme of folly and of impiety," says he in another place,[3] "not to see clearly that we live in dependence on God, and derive everything from God, and, in whatever we undertake or expect, to rely chiefly on our own ability, when the truth is, that whoever has anything in himself can have it only from God. To God, then, must all our hopes be directed." He considers it very important to set forth distinctly, that all the operations of divine grace are conditioned on man's free-will,— to repel everything which might serve to favor the notion of a natural necessity, or of an unconditional divine predestination. He quotes Ps. 58 : 5, to prove that sin cannot be considered as any thing innate, but must be referred to a guilty hardening of the will;[4] for the godless man is here compared to a serpent that stops its ear to the voice of the charmer. Every day is the word of God held forth in opposition to the power of sin in man, to ward off and overcome it. They who hearken not to the voice of the gospel are therefore the generation of vipers.[5] Expounding the scriptures conformably with his doctrinal interest, he could find even in the passage, Rom. 9 : 13, which is altogether at variance with his fundamental position, nothing else than a divine predestination conditioned on the foreknowledge of the bent of the human will.[6] For the rest, it may be gathered from what has been said, how much remained still vague and self-contradictory in the doctrine of Hilary. There was a necessity for new developments, and a more distinct presentation of oppositions hitherto concealed.

Ambrose may well be regarded as forming the intermediate link between the course of doctrinal development which had till now prevailed in the Western church, and the great man from whom a new epoch commences; — namely, Augustin. Ambrose expresses himself still more strongly than Hilary on the moral corruption of man, and its connection with the first sin. Thus he says:[7] "We all have sinned in

[1] De trinitate, l. II. § 35.

[2] Expetendus est, promerendus est, et deinceps præceptorum fide atque observatione retinendus. To the term *promereri*, according to the Latin usus loquendi of this period, the conception of merit, in the strict sense of the term, is not to be attached.

[3] In ψ. 51, § 20.

[4] In Ps. LVII. § 3. Ne vitium referri posset ad originem, præduratæ in his ad obediendum voluntatis crimen exprobrat.

[5] L. c. Cum ei (antiquo serpenti) quotidie ne fallat, ne subrepat, ne mordeat, etiam sub divini nominis denuntiatione mandetur, et tamen obstructo desævit auditu: ex quo non obedientes evangelio natio viperarum sunt.

[6] L. c. Sic Esau alienatus ab utero est, cum major minori serviturus, etiam antequam existeret, nuntiatur, Deo futuræ non nescio voluntatis, ipso potius hoc sciente, quam aliquo ad necessitatem genito naturamque peccati.

[7] Apologia David altera, § 71.

the first man; and, with the propagation of the *nature*, the propagation of the *guilt* also has passed from one to all. In him, *human nature* sinned." In one aspect, the corruption which passed from the first parent to all his posterity seems to be derived from the law of natural propagation; in another, a certain inherent connection seems to be supposed between the first member of the human race, as one in whom the whole kind was already contained in the germ, and all the later members of the race; as indeed Ambrose was already led to this view by the phrase "in quo" in the Latin version of Romans, 5 : 12; which expression was referred to Adam.[1] This idea was afterwards more fully developed by the philosophical realism of Augustin. Yet Ambrose speaks, in other places, only of the personal guilt which each individual man has to bear,[2] and derives from the first sin nothing but the excitement to sin.[3] Concerning grace also, as the exciting and efficacious cause of all conversion, he declares himself still more strongly than Hilary; but he too supposes the operations of this grace are conditioned by human recipiency. "Redemption," he says, "is given gratuitously, not according to the merit of works, but according to the free will of the giver, according to the election of the Redeemer. Why did some of the Israelites attain thereunto, others not? The latter did not, because they were for justifying themselves; because they were proud of their works; because they did not believe, and would not acknowledge grace. The elect attained unto it, because they heard Him who called them, received Him who came unto them. Since all do not desire to be healed, but the greatest number avoid it, he heals those who will suffer themselves to be healed, and forces no man against his will. The Lord calls the indolent, and awakens those who sleep. He who comes to the door and knocks, is willing only to enter. But it is our fault, if he does not always enter, if he does not always abide with us. That true light shineth to all; but he who shuts to his windows, robs himself of the light eternal."[4] It is true, however, that, in two passages, Ambrose expresses himself in such a way as to refer all that is good in man, solely to the agency of God as the operative cause, without mentioning the human self-determination as a necessary condition. When he says: "Christ brings it about, that that which is in and of itself good, appears to be good also to us; for he calls him on whom he has mercy. Accordingly, he who follows Christ, and is asked, why he will be a Christian, may reply: It so *appears* to me, that I must be one. And by so saying, he does not deny that God's good pleasure has so ordered it; for it is by God the will of man is first excited, for that God is loved and adored by the saints is the effect of God's grace."[5]

[1] Exposit. Evang. Lucæ, l. VII. p. 234. Potest et hic in uno accipi species .generis humani. Fuit Adam, et in illo fuimus omnes. Periit Adam, et in illo omnes perierunt.

[2] ψ. 48, § 9. In Die judicii nostra in nobis, non alienæ iniquitatis flagitia punientur.

[3] The lubricum delinquendi.

[4] See in ψ. 43, § 47, in ψ. 118, § 13. De interpellat. David. l. IV. § 4.

[5] In Lucam, l. I. § 10. Christus, ut id quod bonum est, nobis quoque videri bonum possit, operatur; quem enim miseratur, et vocat. Et ideo, qui Christum sequitur, potest interrogatus, cur esse voluerit Christianus, respondere: visum est mihi. Quod

This passage might, perhaps, be understood to mean that the human self-determination, the *mihi videtur*, is something free merely in appearance, but properly grounded in the determining act of the divine will, which determines all things.

This thought comes out still more strongly in the following words of Ambrose in the same work: "God calls those whom he deigns to call; whom he will, he makes religious."[1] Now if we understand these passages as meaning that a grace determining man's will with irresistible necessity is here supposed, then, inasmuch as this supposition contradicts the assertions of Ambrose above quoted, we must admit that conflicting elements entered into his view of the faith; as in fact such appearances sometimes manifest themselves at the point of transition from one stage of development to another; and as we might very naturally expect it would happen in the case of a man who was not an original and systematic divine, but spoke rather according to the momentary impulse of his feelings. But although the freedom of the divine election and the creative agency of grace are made particularly prominent in these passages, still they do not imply any necessary exclusion of the state of recipiency in the individual as a condition; and, accordingly, this assertion of Ambrose admits of being easily reconciled with the assertions first quoted.[2] In another place, at least, he expressly supposes that predestination is conditioned by foreknowledge.[3]

Thus, it is evident then, if we call to mind the relation of Ambrose to the Oriental church-teachers, the way, indeed, was already prepared for the appearance of the opposite moments in the mode of treating these doctrines. Yet the two churches, separated by difference of language, stood too remotely distant from each other to come to any mutual consciousness of this existing opposition, and to be led by it into a relation of mutual hostility. The opposition was destined to make its appearance in the Western church itself, and there to be evolved and presented in lines so well defined and strongly marked, that an open contest between the two opposite tendencies would be inevitable. This first took place when these tendencies, in such representatives of them respectively as Augustin and Pelagius, had unfolded themselves to such a degree of sharpness as mutually to exclude each other.

We must speak in the first place, therefore, of these two men; and we will begin with Augustin, because the development of his theological views on the points now under consideration was guided and determined by causes wholly within himself, and depended on no impulse

cum dicit, non negat, Deo visum, a Deo enim præparatur voluntas hominum. Ut enim Deus honorificetur a sancto, Dei gratia est.

[1] In Lucam VII. § 27. Deus quos dignat, vocat, quos vult, religiosos facit.

[2] Augustin, in his work "de dono perseverantiæ" cites both these passages of Ambrose as testimonies in favor of the doctrine of grace working all. It may be, perhaps, that the mode of teaching pursued by Ambrose was not without its influence on him: but he was certainly not led by it to the doctrine of absolute predestination; for this doctrine did not unfold itself in his mind till a much later period. Besides, in the case of a man possessed of the intellect of Augustin, the power of such influence from abroad ought not to be overrated.

[3] De fide, l. V. § 83.

derived from outward opposition; while, on the development of the system of Pelagius, a man possessed of a less original, a less speculative and systematizing spirit, the practical opposition to those doctrinal views which were akin to, or proceeded from, the mind of Augustin, had a great influence.

To the tendency which we have designated as the one peculiar to the Western church, and which we saw expressed particularly by Ambrose, Augustin was inclined by the peculiar course of education in which his whole life had been trained, and which we have already described.[1]

We have seen how it was only after a long and violent conflict with a fiery nature, but which struggled against the godlike in a wild feeling of power, that he attained to inward peace. Through many years tossed one side and the other, between the ideals which attracted the cravings of his spirit, and the desires and passions which held him chained to the pleasures of the world, he experienced in himself the conflict betwixt the spirit and the flesh. From his own inward experience he learned how to understand the fundamental ideas of the Christian, more particularly of the Pauline, doctrine concerning man; and with the study of St. Paul's writings he was, in fact, particularly occupied at the time when that great crisis occurred in his inner life. As he found those two great divisions in his own life, — the nature which, after all the efforts in his power, still remained impotent, and struggled in vain for holiness, and the nature subordinated to faith, and victorious over sin through the power of redemption, — so he found once more the same two main divisions in the development of human nature as a whole. The opposition between that which proceeded from the nature left to itself and estranged from God, and that which came from the new and divine principle of life imparted to humanity by redemption and regeneration, this opposition, which he had learned from his own inward experience, came, from his life, to be the central point of his system of faith. As the opposites of good and evil in human nature presented themselves to the notice of Augustin from the first, it must have struck him as being the most difficult of all questions — Whence, in *that* human nature which feels itself attracted by the good, which is conscious of it as its original essence, whence the *evil* in it? This question occupied him the moment his thoughts were awakened on higher subjects. The meditation of this question conducted him to Manicheism, and with it was connected his renunciation of Manicheism. To Pelagius, on the other hand, this question would be attended with no difficulty at all. This became the central point for his thoughts, which strove after systematic connection and logical consistency. His systematizing mind, when it had once seized hold of a principle, was impelled to unfold and to apply it with the most rigid severity, not shrinking from any of the consequences to which it might lead.

But then we must distinguish different epochs and periods in Augustin's doctrinal progress, departing from which, and passing through which, he first attained to the last consistent development of the doc-

[1] See page 354 ff.

trinal principles which had flowed from that great crisis in his inner life.

The first period embraces the works which he wrote after his baptism until the first years of his entering upon the duties of a presbyter, — that is, until about the year 394,— his works, de moribus ecclesiæ Catholicæ et Manichæorum, de vera religione, and de libero arbitrio. In this period of his life, his Christian experience of the need man feels of help and of redemption when he has become conscious of his moral evil, and the consciousness that the communion of man with God once more restored by the redemption — that grace — was the spring of everything truly good in man —this experience and consciousness was united with the idea he had derived from Platonism, of the relation of all good with the primeval good, of all being with the Supreme and Absolute Being. The principle of grace and of resignation to God, as the original source of all good, was the common element between the first period and all the succeeding periods of his doctrinal progress; the groundwork from which everything in his case proceeded, and on which he framed his system with an ever-increasing consistency. But along with this tendency, there were at that time still other tendencies in his mind, which at a later period were, in part, suppressed by the entire and one-sided predominance of the main tendency above described. Very unjustly have Augustin's anthropological views been attributed to the influence of Manicheism. His doctrine concerning the moral corruption of human nature was something entirely different from the dualism of Mani's philosophy of nature: it grew not (as in the case of Mani) out of a confusion of the moral element with the intuition of nature, but out of a simple fact of the moral consciousness. Rather it might be said that the consciousness, early awakened in his profound soul, of the irreconcilable opposition between good and evil, led him, while endeavoring to account to himself for this opposition in a speculative way, to Manicheism; but that the moral apprehension of this opposition, which forced itself with ever-increasing strength upon his mind, drew him away again from Manicheism. Again, from Platonism, and directly in opposition to Manicheism, his theory unfolded itself, that sin had not, as Manicheism taught, a self-subsistent existence of its own; but that, as all existence, all true being, sprung from the highest, the absolute, and is grounded in that, so evil is nothing other than just the subjective aberration of the created being from the law of the Supreme and only true Being; is, in and of itself, nothing, not being, the μη ὀν, — but which, nevertheless, the moment it begins to act, must subject itself to the law of the highest being;[1] and to this point Augustin always firmly adhered. Nor did he find any difficulty in bringing it into harmony with his later doctrine of absolute predestination. On the other hand, he united with it, in this period, another principle, by which this earlier period is essentially distinguished from the later.

He attached great importance, in this period, to the principle, that

[1] A defectus ab ordine, which yet must be subservient to the summus ordo. See especially the books de ordine.

the above-mentioned subjective aberration from the supreme good could not be explained on any ground of natural necessity, but could only be derived from the free-will; and that the self-determining power of the free-will continued ever to be the ground of this aberration; that the cause of the diverse relations of men to the supreme good was ever to be traced only to the diverse bents of their free-will, which admitted of no farther explanation. The firm and steadfast adherence to the free-will as contradistinguished from natural necessity was, in this period, considered by him of the utmost importance. Beyond question, he also held fast to this point, at least in theory, in the later period; but it was only by a dialectic self-deception that he was enabled still to unite it, in reference to practical conduct, with the results of his later system.

The principles of Augustin, as they present themselves at this point of view, were as follows: In the condition in which man now finds himself, it is not in his power to be good; because he either does not know what he ought to be by his destination, or, if he knows it, is not able to live conformably to his known destination. Ignorance of the good, and the difficulty in practising it, these are the moral evils of human nature; and this would be inconsistent with God's justice, were it not a righteous punishment. Sin is its own punishment; so that, when man had the knowledge of good, and made no use of it, he thereby lost the knowledge; and when, possessing the faculty for good, he did not practise it, he lost thereby the faculty itself. If the question now presented itself, how does this hindrance to goodness, found cleaving to the moral nature of all men, admit of being reconciled with God's righteous judgment? He answered: Man could rightly complain, if no one had ever yet got the victory over the force of error and of passion; but the truth is, on the other hand, the means are supplied by which man may obtain the victory. God is everywhere present; and in manifold ways, by the creatures who execute his will, calls after man who has revolted from him, instructs the believing, strengthens and supports those who do what they can. Inculpable ignorance is not imputed to man as a sin; but this, that he does not strive after better knowledge: his moral imperfections are not reckoned to him as a crime; but he is justly culpable for the neglect of the means lying in his power. Augustin here supposed, then, the influences of divine grace, without which man could not be freed from his moral evil, to be invariably conditioned by the subjective bent of the free-will.

In a work composed about the year 394, entitled, "An Exposition of difficult passages in the Epistle to the Romans,"[1] the exposition of the difficult passage in the ninth chapter, which, at a later period, was especially employed by him to prove the doctrine of absolute predestination, afforded him an occasion for distinctly unfolding the connection of his ideas on this whole subject. He proceeds on the principle, that all men find themselves in a state of alienation from God, in which they can perfectly bring to pass nothing that is truly

[1] Explicatio propositionum quarundam de epistola ad Romanos.

good. The love of God is the spring and fountain of all that is truly good; and to this, man can attain only by the communication of the Holy Spirit. As, then, he can accomplish nothing good before this renewal of his inner life by the Holy Spirit, so neither can he merit, by any kind of good works, the grace by which he is cured of his moral maladies: grace precedes all desert. But on this account, however, there is nothing like arbitrary will on the part of God, when he gives to some, and withholds from others, the grace by which men obtain salvation. Men obtain this grace by faith; and faith is wholly the work of man.[1] In the passage relating to the choice of Jacob and the rejection of Esau, he believed, therefore, that he found the contrary position to an election conditioned on good works, but not to an election conditioned on faith.[2] The apostle Paul says —he remarks — God *works* all in all, but by no means, God *believes* all in all. The hardening of Pharaoh, he explains as the fruit of his own guilt; the punishment of his previous unbelief, whereby his sin punished itself.

It is worth while to notice the way in which Augustin expressed himself respecting these matters on another occasion, namely, at the time when he was slowly progressing onward towards this last conclusion. In the collection of answers given by him to various questions proposed to him from the time of his return to North Africa, in the year 388, and onward,[3] (his work de diversis questionibus octoginta tribus,) the answer to the question relating to Rom. 9 : 20, and what follows (Quest. 68,) probably belongs, as we may infer from the contents of the answer, to a somewhat later period.

Starting on the principle, that divine things can be understood only from the experience of faith and in connection with a sanctified temper, he asserts that the apostle here by no means intends to restrain *the pious* from inquiring into these things, but only those who are not as yet sufficiently well grounded in love, the earthly-minded, those who are for understanding God's counsels without being the children and friends of God. "Cleanse thyself from the old leaven," says he, "that thou mayst be a new dough; and that, in so being, thou mayst be no longer in the childhood of Christianity, so as to need milk to drink, but mayst reach the perfect age of manhood, and be one of those to whom it is said, We speak wisdom among those that are perfect. Then wilt thou discern, in the right way and in the right order, the secrets of the Almighty concerning the most hidden deserts of souls[4] — concerning grace or justice." As it respects Pharaoh, he then remarks, the question may be easily answered. Through his earlier criminality, in oppressing the strangers in his kingdom, he deserved that his heart should be hardened,

[1] § 60. Quod credimus, nostrum est. Quod autem bonum operamur, illius, qui credentibus in se dat Spiritum Sanctum.

[2] Non quidem Deus eligit opera, quæ ipse largitur cum dat Spiritum Sanctum, ut per caritatem bona operemur; sed tamen eligit fidem.

[3] So the terminus a quo is fixed by himself. Retract. lib. I. c. 26.

[4] De animarum occultissimis meritis; which doubtless refers to the hidden inward character, ere it manifests itself in appearance — something which is known only to the divine foreknowledge, and hence conditions God's providential dealings with men.

so that he could not be moved to believe, even by the most evident miracles of the commanding God. Beyond question, he has mercy on whom he will have mercy; and whom he will, he hardens. But this will cannot be an unjust one, since it proceeds on the most hidden relations of desert, (is conditioned by them;) for though sinners, on the ground of the universal sin, constitute one mass, yet there is a difference among them. There is in sinners, therefore, something that precedes, whereby, although not yet justified, (that is, made just, sanctified,) they are yet made worthy of justification.[1] That still remains true, which was spoken by the apostle, (Rom. 9 : 16,) "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." For although one who is oppressed with the lighter sins, or indeed with sins however great in magnitude and number, may, by bitter sighs and many pains of repentance, become worthy of God's compassion, yet it is not his own work, since, left to himself, he would perish; but it must be ascribed to the mercy of God, who comes to the help of his prayers and his sorrows.[2] It is little to will, if God does not have mercy; but God does not have mercy, unless the will has preceded. And since none can will, unless exhorted and called, (whether in the secret recesses of the soul, and in a way not seen by man, or from without by the word, or visible signs,) it follows from this, that the willing disposition itself is wrought in us by God.[3] Next he says: "But the calling which is made to individuals, or to single nations, or to the whole race in the right point of time, belongs to a high and profound order of things." To this he reckoned the passages in Jer. 1 : 5; Malachi, 1 : 2 and 3. "And this can be comprehended perhaps by those only who love God with all the heart, and their neighbors as themselves. Yet this must be held fast with an unwavering faith, that God does nothing in the way of injustice, and that there is no being who is not indebted to God for all that he is." These words might, indeed, be understood as referring to the mystery of absolute predestination; so that Augustin was at that time still reluctant to express himself more openly; as indeed he seems to have explained this passage in his *Retractations*. Yet, when we take the words in connection with what has been said before, we certainly cannot doubt, that, at the time he wrote this, he did not so understand it, but rather had in his thoughts a foreknowledge conditioned on a foreknowledge of those *occultissima merita*.

In this scheme of Augustin, however, there was a great deal which, after a more full examination of all that was contained in his Christian consciousness, and a longer study of the sacred scriptures, must event-

[1] § 4. Venit enim de occultissimis meritis, quia et ipsi peccatores, cum propter generale peccatum unam massam fecerint, non tamen nulla est inter illos diversitas. Præcedit ergo aliquid in peccatoribus, quo, quamvis nondum sit justificati, digni efficiantur justificatione, et item præcedit in aliis peccatoribus quo digni sunt obtusione.

[2] § 5. Quia etiamsi levioribus quisque peccatis, aut certe quamvis gravioribus et multis, tamen magno gemitu et dolore pœnitendi, misericordia Dei dignus fuerit, non ipsius est, qui si relinqueretur, interiret, sed miserentis Dei, qui ejus precibus doloribusque subvenit.

[3] Et quoniam nec velle quisquam potest, nisi admonitus et vocatus, sive intrinsecus, ubi nullus hominum videt, sive extrinsecus per sermonem sonantem, aut per aliqua signa visibilia efficitur, ut etiam ipsum velle Deus operetur in nobis. L. c.

ually appear untenable to a mind which so constantly strove after consistency and unity. For in proportion as he learned to place a higher value on the essence and dignity of faith,[1] in proportion as the one-sided idea of faith, which was first apprehended by him as a faith on authority, came to be gradually refined and transfigured into the idea of a living faith; in the same proportion it must become clear to him, that faith already presupposed the entrance of the divine life into the soul of man, that the divine and human elements had here already commingled, and that the two could not be set off from one another by any such strict line of demarkation. But, in perceiving this, he might easily run into the other extreme, of referring faith, like all the rest, solely to the divine agency, and wholly repressing the self-determining activity of the man. Add to this, that the Theodicee which he had earlier attempted to construct on the groundwork of a predestination conditioned by foreknowledge,[2] could not satisfy his acute and sagacious mind, in its application to the calling of nations and the election of individuals, and the explanation, grounded thereupon, of the difficulties in the epistle to the Romans. To such a mind, it would seem preferable to cut the Gordian knot, which could be resolved by no human explanation.

And so it appears in fact, that Augustin, within the space of three or four years, had, from the point above described, changed his way of thinking on these matters; since he came to perceive that the divine and human elements did not admit of being so severed from each other; that a divine element was, in fact, contained already in faith. When, in 397, he wrote his work addressed to Simplician, bishop of Milan, in answer to various questions relating to the epistle to the Romans,[3] this turning point of his dogmatic bent first clearly unfolded itself to the light.[4] He combated in this performance the very theory which he had earlier maintained; and it is easy to perceive, in the way in which he seeks to show its untenable character, that the time had not been long since he came to this view, and was seized with the first zeal in behalf of the new light which he supposed he had found.

Here also Augustin busies himself with the explanation of those difficult passages in the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans;[5] but his previous mode of explanation no longer satisfied him. But whence came it, that he now explains these passages in *that* sense which be-

[1] See vol. II. sect. I. pp. 434, 435.

[2] As, for example, that God's election of individuals and calling of nations was conditioned on his foreknowledge of the way in which they would be disposed towards his gospel, if it should be announced to them. See ep. 102 to Deogratias: Quibus omnino anuntiata non est, (salus,) non crediturі præsciebantur. Yet when Augustin wrote this, in the year 408, he had long since brought to a completion his doctrine of predestination; and this answer, therefore, could no longer have satisfied him; and he had already in reserve, from the standing ground of this doctrine, another answer, which he hinted at: Excepta illa altitudine sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei, ubi fortassis *aliud divinum consilium longe secretius latet.*

[3] De diversis quæstionibus, ad Simplicianum libri duo.

[4] As he himself expresses it, de prædestinatione sanctorum, c. 20, in reference to the work above mentioned: Plenius sapere cœpi in mei episcopatus exordio, quando et initium fidei donum Dei esse cognovi et asserui.

[5] L. I. Quæst. II.

yond question must first offer itself when no regard is had to the connection and aim of the epistle, and made them the groundwork of his system, although, at an earlier period, he had explained the same passages according to the system which he supposed he had derived from the whole doctrine of scripture? Assuredly, we must look for the cause of the different impression which these passages now made on his mind, to the change in his whole mode of thinking, that grew out of his inner life. It is now clear to him, that Paul supposes neither an election of God conditioned on the foreknowledge of faith, nor an election conditioned on the foreknowledge of the works growing out of faith; for Paul in fact lays stress on the assertion, that God's election made a difference before the children were born, before they could believe, as well as before they could do anything.[1] Moreover, the desert of faith does not precede God's mercy; but it presupposes this mercy; and faith itself is one of the gifts of God's grace. Paul, in Rom. 9 : 11, certainly does not set the works of man over against faith, as the ground of the calling; but he sets the calling over against works. The calling of God, therefore, is here the first cause. Faith presupposes the calling. But whence comes it, then, that the call by the preaching of the gospel and by outward circumstances, which pave the way for this, comes to some and not to others; and that the same influences from without, make a different impression on different men, nay, a different impression on the same men at different times? The almighty and all-wise God could find, in reference to the different states of men, those means of influencing them, which must make an impression on them with inward necessity, so that awakened, drawn, touched, and enlightened, they would follow, without being conscious of any resistance against the grace operating upon their will.[2] We must say, doubtless, man's willing is nothing without the divine mercy; but in nowise can we say, God's mercy and grace are nothing without man's willing; since God would find means of moulding every human will, in the way precisely suited to the character of each. On whomsoever he actually has mercy, whomsoever he actually chooses, him he calls in the way which is so befitting, that the subject is irresistibly drawn by him who calls, though he follows with freedom.[3] Neither is Augustin satisfied any longer to explain the hardening and the consequent rejection of one as opposed to the election of another, as a judgment specially drawn down upon the individual by his own sin; for God's almighty power, he supposes, could assuredly find the means to operate upon every degree of hardness, and the same insensibility exists everywhere alike, till God moves the heart of man by his grace.

Thus, then, Augustin comes to the result, that all men are found in the same state of condemnation; the reason — not why God plunges

[1] Si non de operibus, quæ non erant in nondum natis, nec de fide, quia nec ipsa erat.

[2] Posset ita vocare, quomodo illis aptum esset, ut et moverentur et intelligerent et sequerentur.

[3] Cujus autem miseretur, sic eum vocat, quomodo scit ei congruere, ut vocantem non respuat.

some to destruction, which is altogether alien from God's holiness and love — but why he does not rescue some from the destruction into which all, by the guilt of the first sin, have fallen according to God's righteous judgment; but out of his free love has mercy on others, and calls them by his grace to everlasting life — the reason of this lies in the secret and by us incomprehensible counsels of the Almighty. But to this we must ever hold fast, namely, that God's justice cannot be impeached, although the exercise and range of it may surpass the measure of our knowledge. Yet, even according to the analogy of human relations, he cannot be accused of injustice, who according to his pleasure remits the debts of one man, while he requires payment from another.

Since, as appears from what has now been said, Augustin had completed his doctrinal system on this particular side, more than ten years before the opinions of Pelagius excited any public controversy, it is clear that opposition to Pelagius could not have influenced him in forming it. With more propriety may it be said, that opposition to such doctrines as those of Augustin, or to the practical consequences which through misconstruction or abuse were derived from such doctrines, had no small share in leading Pelagius to form such a system as he did. The Pelagian tendency is to be traced, in the first place, to certain latent germs which were the undetected source of many views and opinions prevailing in the church; and next it was called forth by the struggle to oppose various errors of practical life which had become widely spread. And then it sometimes happened that the tendency of Pelagius, and the errors to which it was opposed, proceeded from the same principle, and were but different branches springing from the same root. To explain the first of these remarks, we discern, in that tendency which separated the Christian life from its connection with the one centre which should sustain the whole of it, from the single reference to Christ as its source; in the isolation and undue exaltation of what belongs to the human side, the over-valuation of human doing; the separation of the moral element from its connection with the common root of all Christian life; in the fond fancy of a perfection going beyond what the law demands, transcending ordinary Christianity; — in a word, we discern in all that which called forth the reäction of the Christian consciousness as it appeared in Jovinian, the incipient germs of, or point of attachment for, the Pelagian element. But history allows nothing to remain covered up and concealed. False elements, which have imperceptibly attached themselves to Christianity in its process of unfolding what it contains, must cast off their envelope, expand to the open day, and fully express themselves, that they may be overcome by the pure Christian principle. Such is the significance of the tendency of Pelagius in the course of the church development.

Pelagius was a monk of Britain.[1] The fact of his being trained and

[1] He bore the surname Pelagius Brito, to distinguish him from another individual of the same name, (see Augustin. ep. 186 ad Paulinum.) Moreover, the concurrent accounts of Marius Mercator, Prosper, and Orasius, mention this as his native country; and the fact that Jerome (præfat. commentar. in Jeremiam) calls him Scotorum pulti-

educated, both in that particular country and also in Monachism, had an important influence on the development of his doctrinal views. As the British church was derived originally from the Oriental, it is probable that in various ways the connection between them continued to be maintained. Pelagius was a diligent student of the Oriental church-teachers; and the form in which he found Christian anthropology exhibited in these writers, corresponded with the peculiar development of his own inner life.

Pelagius differed from Augustin, as in the whole stamp and character of his mind, so by virtue of the peculiar course of his early education and training. He did not possess, like Augustin, that mighty nature which could not otherwise attain to peace but by passing through many devious wanderings and hard conflicts. His was a feebler, more limited nature; but one, too, which could more easily develope itself in a smooth and gentle course — could more easily be controlled and conducted to its destined end. He was not possessed of the profound, speculative spirit which we find in Augustin: his predominant faculty was a sober, discreet understanding, joined with moral earnestness. In learning, he was Augustin's superior. An earnest striving after moral excellence had inspired him from the first;[1] and his improvement had been quietly progressive. It was not from some great crisis of the inner life, not through a violent conflict, that he had attained to the faith, or to the determination of consecrating his whole life to God; but, without his being conscious of any opposition to its influences, Christianity acted as an inward principle on his moral development. He did not have to contend with a wild and fiery natural temperament, nor with desires and passions peculiarly predominant.[2] Nor was he thrown into any of those storms of outward life, in which he might have been called to engage in a special struggle with himself; for he led a silent life in the midst of studies and monastic ascetism. While it was the case, as we have already remarked, that among the monks belonging to a certain class of human natures, the striving after moral ideals, by which they sought to mould and fashion their inner life, excited a more profound self-contemplation and led to a deeper self-knowledge; and while these, struck with the feeling of opposition between what they saw in their own inner life and those ideals which inspired them, sought from God manifest in Christ the removal of this opposition, and the satisfaction of their deep-felt need; others, on the contrary, by the intuition of these ideals, which seemed to them only a reflex of

bus prægravatum does not invalidate this testimony; for the North Britons and the Scots were not always very carefully distinguished. His name might also be a mark of his country, even though the English legend, that he bore among his own countrymen the name of *Morgan*, were without foundation.

[1] Augustin, the warm but candid opponent of Pelagius, is assuredly the witness most worthy of confidence for the fact, that Pelagius, by his rigid life as a monk, had acquired universal respect. He says of him, (de peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. III. c. 3,) Istum, sicut eum qui noverunt, loquuntur, bonum ac prædicandum virum. Ille tam egregie Christianus, — and in ep. 186 he writes concerning him: Non solum dileximus, verum etiam diligimus eum.

[2] For this description, indeed, we can cite no historical authorities, so very little is known by us respecting the life of this man; but we take the impression of him from his doctrines and writings.

their own moral nature, by the successful results of their ascetic discipline, by the consciousness of a power of will to overcome the allurements of sense, were only led to feel their own moral strength, and to confide in their own moral efforts. It easily came to be the predominant thought with them, how far the man might advance towards perfection by a self-active development of the germs of goodness lying in his own moral nature, by the superior energy of the will, by self-control. It easily happened, too, that in the outward ascetism of the monastic life, in its efforts to subdue the sensual impulses, the true nature of inward holiness, of the disposition which has its root in love, was overlooked; that, in watching against the individual outbreaks of sin, monks neglected to pay any attention to its secret springs, and so failed in respect to the words of our Lord, Matth. 12: 29. Thus they might be led to believe they had produced great outward results by human efforts, while the radical evil was as far from being cured as ever. As it regards Pelagius, it cannot be asserted, at least without qualification, that such was the effect produced on him. On the contrary, in this respect he is an example of the better moral spirit of Monachism. His letter to Demetrias,[1] a virgin who had been consecrated as a nun, testifies how important he felt it to be to warn men against the aberrations of the ascetic spirit, involved, though unconsciously to itself, in hypocrisy, and concealing spiritual pride under the mask of humility; to warn them against a tendency which, while it combated particular sins, thought it might indulge in others with the less reserve.[2] He well knew how to distinguish the mock humility which covers spiritual pride, from the true humility taught by Christ. Very justly he says of his contemporaries in this regard: "Many pursue the shadow of this virtue, few its real substance;" and he then proceeds to draw a picture, taken doubtless from the life, of the mock holiness of those who assumed the outward guise of humility. "It is very easy to wear miserable clothing; to salute one's acquaintance in a lowly manner; to put on the show of humility and meekness by a drooping head and downcast eyes; to speak in a low and feeble voice, so that one's words can scarcely be heard; to sigh frequently, and with every breath call one's self a sinner and a miserable wretch;[3] and if offended but by a trifling word, suddenly to lift one's brow, throw back the neck, and change those submissive tones into a frantic shout.[4] A different sort of humility is that which Christ teaches, who exhorts us (Matth. 11: 29) to follow

[1] Written in the year 415, when he was in Palestine, and with reference to the controversies which were then going on, although they are not here expressly mentioned.

[2] See e. g. p. 67, ed. Semler. Nos (proh pudor) quadam dilectione peccati, cum in quibusdam ostendimus quandam vim naturæ nostræ, in aliis omnino torpescimus. p. 69. That abstinentia and jejunium were, with many, nothing else than umbracula vitiorum. On p. 74 he says respecting humility: Præcipue tamen, fictam humilitatem fugiens, illam sectare quæ vera est, quam Christus docuit humilitatem, in qua non sit superbia inclusa.

[3] Perfacile est enim, aliquam vestem habere contemptam, salutare submissius, inclinato in terram capite oculisque dejectis, humilitatem ac mansuetudinem polliceri, lenta voce tenuique sermones infringere, suspirare crebrius, et ad omne verbum peccatorem et miserum se clamare.

[4] Et si vel levi sermone offensus sit, continuo attollere supercilium, levare cervicem, et delicatum illum oris sonum insano repente clamore mutare.

his example — that pattern of true humility, under which, as he tells us, no pride lies concealed." [1]

And now if the sense of sinfulness, which is an essential element of the Christian consciousness, frequently offered itself to him under this hypocritical form and in this lying caricature, it is easy to understand how he might be misled, by his disgust at it, to overlook the profound truth which also lay at the bottom.

But still Pelagius was not free from the errors of the monkish morality, by which the system of morals was divorced from its intimate connection with the system of faith. He was entrammeled in the notion, which was so common among the monks, being connected with their vague and obscure notions respecting the moral law, that man can advance still farther in Christian perfection than the law requires, by practising the consilia evangelica (so called) — the *quantitative* method of estimating moral worth.[2] Neglecting to consider that the Christian principle embraces the whole alike, and leaves room for nothing else to be admitted as a determining principle, he distinguished what was commanded from what was forbidden, what was permitted from what was recommended as an object of higher perfection — which latter consisted precisely in abstaining from what was permitted, and so entitling one's self to a higher reward.[3] Starting from this position, he, too, became a zealous opponent of Jovinian, defending against *him* the doctrine that there are different grades of merit and of Christian perfection,[4] on the ground of the distinction between precepts and counsels (præcepta and consilia.) He controverted the position maintained by Jovinian, that there is but one way of renouncing the world, which is the common duty of all Christians — but one precept in relation to the giving-up of temporal things for the sake of the kingdom of God, which, circumstances allowing, was the duty of all alike.[5] Ardently zealous for what he considered to be the peculiar essence of Christianity in ethics, the "precepts" and "counsels," he was led to recommend in a particular manner the study of the Bible, pointing to it as the only source from which it is possible to learn perfectly the will of God.[6] But though he examined with the strictest conscientiousness

[1] Præcipue fictam humilitatem fugiens, illam sectare, quæ vera est, in qua non sit superbia inclusa.

[2] See ep. ad Demetriad. c. 9. Supra legem facere, amore perfectionis supra mandata conscendere.

[3] Prohiberi quædam, præcipi quædam, concedi aliqua, nonnulla suaderi. Prohibentur mala, præcipiuntur bona, conceduntur media, perfecta suadentur. And respecting the two latter points: Duo vero reliqua, quorum unum conceditur et suadetur aliud, in nostra potestate dimissa sunt, ut aut cum minori gloria concessis utamur, aut ob majus præmium etiam ea quæ nobis permissa sunt, respuamus. Cap. 9.

[4] On 2 Corinth. 9: 6. Contra Jovinianum etiam hic locus facit, ubi meritorum gradus esse monstrantur; and on Philipp. 3: 18, 19. Potest et de Joviniani studiis accipi, qui jejuniorum afflictiones et omnem corporis cruciatum in luxuriam et epulas converterit.

[5] On 1 Corinth. 13: 3. Quod illorum sententiam destruit, qui renuntiandum rebus seculi certo tempore, persecutione cogente, volunt esse præceptum, ut et apostolis gloriam tollant, quod non voluntarie fecerint, sed inviti, et nostri ævi perfectos vanos constituant, qui rem alterius temporis frustra nunc voluerunt exercere. Item aliter: Notandum quod contemptus mundi martyrio comparetur, contra eos, qui illud de evangelio variis argumentis nituntur exsolvere, ubi dicitur ad divitem: Vade, vende omnia quæ habes et, da pauperibus.

[6] Thus he writes to Demetrias: In scripturis divinis, per quas solas potes plenam Dei intelligere voluntatem. Cap. 9.

every individual passage in the New Testament relating to morals; though he recommended the exact and literal observance of all Christ's commands, and inveighed against the allegorizing shifts by which it was attempted to bring the words of Christ into a forced accommodation with the ruling manners of the world;[1] yet he could not penetrate below the surface into the more profound depths of the Christian system of ethics, into its peculiar essence, its internal connection and unity; because he seized the parts in too insulated a manner, without grasping the whole new principle for shaping the world and human life, which lies in Christianity. He failed of seeing the connection between faith and life as it is presented in the New Testament. Hence, there was this difference betwixt Augustin and Pelagius, that while the one could rightly understand, in the sermon on the mount, every single precept in its unity with the whole, according to the spirit of it, and found therein no separate, positive commands;[2] Pelagius, on the other hand, everywhere held fast to the letter of the individual precepts, and so took in its literal sense the prohibition of the oath.[3]

In order to explain the peculiar doctrinal tendency of Pelagius, we must take particular notice also of the opposite tendencies against which he contended. This is the more necessary in his case, inasmuch as he was not led by any creative, speculative, or dogmatizing spirit of his own to form a new system; but his efforts were determined and shaped by a present, practical interest, to guard against certain errors which seemed to him injurious to morality. Thus he was led to elaborate his peculiar scheme of doctrine. He contended against the doctrinal tendencies of his time, only so far as certain practical consequences of a hurtful kind seemed to him necessarily to flow from them: by this he was induced to enter upon his doctrinal investigations and distinctions; and, in mainly following this practical interest, he did not even go so far as to unfold in their whole extent, and to trace to their ultimate grounds, the principles lying at the root of his doctrinal tenets. Next, by virtue of his truly earnest moral zeal, he was led to regard it as specially incumbent on him to combat the worldly Christianity of his times. We everywhere see in him a man filled with pain and indignation at the moral depravation of the great masses of nominal Christians in his day. Thus, in his remarks on 2 Corinth. 12: 20, he exclaims: "What would the apostle do, if he happened on our times, when, in comparison with other vices, such things are not considered to be sins at all?"[4] He sought to remove the grounds of excuse which served as props of their immorality to those who called themselves Christians, without considering themselves bound to pursue a Christian course of conduct. Among these belonged that distinction of spiritual and secular, respecting the injurious influence of which we have

[1] On 2 Corinth. 3: 6. Si præcepta velis allegorice intelligere, omnem virtutem eorum evacuans, omnibus aperuisti viam delinquendi.

[2] See above, vol. II. p. 194.

[3] Christus jussit non jurare. Ep. ad Demetriad. c. 19; Hilar. ad Augustin. ep. 156.

[4] Quid faceret, si nostris temporibus adinveniret, quibus ad comparationem aliorum criminum ista ne putantur quidem esse peccata!

already spoken; though in one sense Pelagius himself supported it by his doctrine of a perfection transcending ordinary Christianity. In combating this distinction, when employed as an excuse for immorality by those who were engaged in the business of the world, he says, in expounding Ephesians 4: 4, 5: "It would be well for those persons to study what is here said, who, tied to the business of the world, suppose they may be allowed to sin, though others may not; when the truth is, all are baptized into the same body, have received the same spirit, and are called to the same hope."[1] He felt constrained to dissent from such as seemed to imagine that by a mere outward participation in the sacraments they were already sure of salvation, as well as from those who reposed on the opus operatum of faith — that outward and superficial notion of faith, which, as we have seen, was already so widely spread in the church. So in remarking on 1 Cor. 10: 1, he says, that no one might so rely on the fact of his having been baptized, or having partaken of the Holy Supper, as to imagine that God would indulge him in committing sin, the apostle brings forward this example from the fathers, to show by it that these rites will indeed then be truly profitable, when the commandments are obeyed.[2] And the words in Ephes. 5: 5, 6, he applies to those who imagined faith alone to be sufficient; that he who possessed faith and had been baptized could not perish, however he might sin.[3] Next, as there were those who comforted themselves in their vicious life with the doctrine of a purgatory, flattering themselves that, in virtue of their orthodox creed, they would finally, at least, be saved, after having passed through that painful process of purification after death, Pelagius, in explaining 1 Corinth. 3: 13, a passage often referred to in proof of this doctrine, sought to deprive them of this support, by demonstrating the groundlessness of that exposition, and proving that, even in this passage, the fire of hell is meant, which the vicious should not escape.[4] And hence he deemed it so important to maintain the eternity of punishments, in opposition to those who explained all such declarations of scripture as being nothing more than intimidating threats against sin.[5] Furthermore, as these persons excused themselves by pleading the corruption and weakness of human nature, and affirmed that living up to the divine commands was something too difficult for feeble man, Pelagius, to deprive them of these supports of moral indolence, endeavored to show

[1] Unde diligentius legere debent hunc locum hi qui, in seculi occupationibus ligati, putant sibi licere peccare et aliis non licere, cum omnes in unum corpus baptizati, eundem spiritum acceperint, et in una spe vocati sunt Dei.

[2] Ne quis confidens in eo solum, quod baptizatus est, aut in esca spirituali vel potu, putet sibi Deum parcere si peccaverit, tale patrum proponit exemplum, quo ostendat, tunc ista merito profutura, si præcepta serventur.

[3] Contra illos agit, qui solam fidem dicunt sufficere. "Nemo vos seducat" dicendo; hoc solummodo opus est, ut fides sit et homo Christi baptisma consequatur, quamvis peccet, perire non potest. Comp. what he says on 1 Corinth. 6: 9.

[4] Non hic, ut quidam putant, in igne flammæ arsura sunt opera, sed homines, qui ita operati sunt ut mereantur incendio deputari. Si autem opera, id est, crimina, punientur, salvo eo qui perpetraverat, non erit ei damnum, sed lucrum.

[5] On 2 Corinth. 11: 3. Jam nunc serpens similiter quosdam seducit, gehennam propter solum terrorem asserentes nominari, quam aut penitus non esse aut æternam non esse affirmant, contra auctoritatem omnium scripturarum.

that they unjustly loaded human nature with charges which fell back on the Creator himself, instead of laying the fault, as they should do, on their own will. The divine commands, he maintained, the commands of Christ, certainly required an exact fulfilment, as in fact they were, in spite of their contrary assertions, taught by the example of those who *had* fulfilled them, while still they partook of the same human nature with themselves.[1]

By these oppositions and these practical interests, then, the tendency of Pelagius, in respect to the doctrine of man's nature and the character and work of Christ, was modified and determined. Hence he was of the opinion, that in all moral exhortations the great point to be aimed at was, to make men clearly see that they were in want of none of the faculties necessary for fulfilling the divine commands; to bring them to a conscious sense of the power bestowed on them by the Creator for accomplishing all good ends, as he says that he himself was accustomed to pursue this method in his exhortatory writings.[2] Hence he appealed to the examples of virtue exhibited among the Pagans, in proof of how much nature, left to itself, could effect even among the heathen; and argued that, with the new aids and advantages possessed by Christians, the same nature would be able to do still more. On this principle, and from this point of view, he denied that there was any such thing as a corruption of human nature, which had grown out of the fall. Such a doctrine appeared to him but a means of encouraging moral indolence — a means of excuse supplied to the hands of vicious men. The question which from the first had so occupied the profound mind of Augustin — the question concerning the origin of sin in man — could not be attended with so much difficulty to the more superficial mind of Pelagius. This was no enigma for him; it seemed to him a thing perfectly natural that there should be moral evil. The necessary condition to the existence of moral good is the possibility of evil. Evil and good are to be derived alike from the free-will, which either yields to the seductions of sense, or overcomes them.

With these views of man's nature, Pelagius unquestionably still held fast to all the tenets taught in the Western church respecting the character and work of Christ. But although this was by no means a mere hypocritical accommodation — though he was not conscious in this case of any self-contradiction, yet everything must necessarily have been so modified as to tally with his peculiar views of human nature. Augustin, as well as Pelagius, contended against those who represented a mere outward faith to be all that was necessary to secure salvation; but Augus-

[1] In the letter to Demetrias: Dicimus: durum est, arduum est, non possumus, homines sumus, fragili carne circumdati — c. 3: Improbissimi hominum dum dissimulant, id ipsum bene administrare, quod facti sunt, aliter se factos fuisse malunt, ut qui vitam suam emendare nolunt, videantur emendare velle naturam. And on Coloss. 1: 22: Vide si sciebat, se impossibilia præcepisse.

[2] Thus in his letter to Demetrias, c. 2, he says: Quem ego exhortationis ordinem, cum in aliis quoque opusculis tenuerim, tunc hic maxime observandum puto, ubi eo plenius naturæ bonum declarari debet, quo instituenda est vita perfectior, ne tanto remissior sit ad virtutem animus ac tardior, quanto minus se posse credat, et dum quod inesse sibi ignorat, id se existimat non habere.

tin and Pelagius differed from each other in their mode of attacking this error. Augustin opposed to this notion of faith, another and different one: Pelagius sought to show that there must be, in addition to faith, the fulfilment of the divine commands. Augustin described an active life of good works, as something which flowed of itself from the essence of genuine faith:[1] Pelagius required it as something which must be added to faith, by employing those moral faculties which had been bestowed on human nature, and which was still further strengthened and enlarged by Christianity. And, in addition to this, Pelagius, who regarded it as a thing of the utmost importance to point men to the free-will by which they were able to do all things, was the more provoked to opposition, by the form under which the unfolded doctrine of Augustin concerning grace and predetermination, which was really revolting to the free-will, presented itself to his notice. But with the dogmatic prejudices and partial interest in behalf of the doctrine of free-will which he possessed, any form wherein the Christian consciousness expressed itself, with sincerity and fulness, as indebted for all things to the divine grace, would easily appear offensive, as detracting from the freedom of the will. Hence the great offence he took when he heard a bishop utter, as expressing his own feelings, the words of the prayer in Augustin's confessions:[2] "My God, bestow on me what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt."[3]

At Rome, Pelagius composed his commentaries on the epistles of Paul, in which he clearly manifests his peculiar doctrinal tendency; and among these, his commentary on the epistle to the Romans especially, although Cassiodorus sought to expurgate it, still betrays the Pelagian doctrine concerning man, which continually gleams through the surface. At that time, however, the matter made no farther stir. The public outbreak of the controversy proceeded from another defender of the same doctrine.

This was Celestius, with whom Pelagius first became acquainted while the former was an advocate at Rome. Through the influence, probably, of Pelagius, this person became zealously resolved to live a more earnest and devoted Christian life in a strict observance of all the precepts and counsels of Christ. He exchanged his profession as an advocate for the monastic life, and composed an exhortatory Christian treatise, in the form of three letters addressed to his parents, in which he probably explained the reasons which had induced him to change his plans of life. It would appear, then, that he followed the whole peculiar practico-dogmatical tendency of the individual who had been the means of awakening him to a more serious Christian life; and he sought to turn the skill in dialectics which he had acquired as an advocate, to the purpose of defending his scheme of doctrine.[4] Pelagius,

[1] As for example in his work de fide et operibus, which is aimed against the above-mentioned error. See vol. II. p. 101.

[2] Confess. l. X. c. 29.

[3] Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis.

[4] Respecting the native country of this individual, nothing certain can be said. That he was a native of Ireland or Scotland has been inferred, on no very safe grounds, from an enigmatical passage of Jerome, in the preface to the III. book of his commentary on Jeremiah. Marius Mercator says

owing to his peculiar temperament and advanced age, was little inclined to controversy, where he was not drawn into it by the interest he felt in behalf of his practical principles. He willingly made concessions, even against his own convictions, where those principles which alone seemed important to him, seemed not to be endangered. But Cœlestius, who was in the full vigor of manhood, and formed as an advocate for polemical controversy, stood forth more openly and recklessly in defense of the doctrinal principles connected with that practical system.[1]

In the year 411, Pelagius and Cœlestius went in company to Carthage, where the former, indeed, made but a short stay; but Cœlestius tarried longer. His ascetic zeal and his gifts procured for him friends, and he was encouraged to propose himself as a candidate for the office of presbyter in this church; but meanwhile various reports had followed him concerning his Pelagian errors, which here, where the opposite tendency of the dogmatic spirit chiefly prevailed, and where the mind of Augustin had the most decided influence, could not do otherwise than injure him.[2] The deacon Paulinus, of Milan, stood forth as his accuser, before a synod assembled at Carthage, A.D. 412. Six heretical propositions were asserted to be held by Cœlestius, which collectively were derived from the following: That the sin of Adam had injured only himself, not the whole human family; whence was drawn the conclusion, that children still came into the world in the same state in which Adam found himself before the fall. From these two propositions others were deduced, none of which probably had ever been

of him, in his commonitorium adversus hæresin Pelagii et Cœlestii: Pelagio adhæsit Cœlestius, nobilis natu quidem, et illius temporis auditorialis scholasticus. Augustin says, de gestis Pelagii, § 61, that these erroneous doctrines had not originated with the clergy, but with quibusdam veluti monachis. He meant here, probably, Cœlestius along with Pelagius. He styled them not regular monks, doubtless because they lived rather after the older and freer manner of the ascetics, than according to the more recent order of the Cœnobites. With all this is to be compared what Gennadius says, in his work de viris illustribus, c. 44, that Cœlestius, when a young man, before he fell into the Pelagian doctrines, wrote those three letters mentioned in the text, which Gennadius highly applauds, making the remark, important for us: Moralis siquidem in eis dictio nil vitii postmodum proditi; sed totum ad virtutis incitamentum tenuit. The tendency of which he speaks in this last clause, might very well be also a Pelagian one; but Gennadius, himself a semi-Pelagian, had not the sagacity to discern this Pelagian element lying at the root of the practical tendency, but not so clearly expressed. Hence he supposed Cœlestius must have composed this treatise when a young man, and before he went over to Pelagianism. Whether the statement, that he wrote these letters from a cloister, is correct, may also remain a question.

[1] Augustinus, de peccato originali, § 13, calls Cœlestius apertior, Pelagius occultior. Whether the account given by Prædestinatus is correct, (p. 88,) that Cœlestius had also written a work against the doctrine of the traduction of souls, before Pelagius appeared openly as a polemic, is questionable.

[2] Pelagius, who did not find Augustin at home at Hippo, had written him a very respectful letter. Augustin answered him in a few friendly lines, which at bottom, however, might already intimate some suspicion about the doctrine of Pelagius concerning grace, as Augustin afterwards (de gestis Pelagii, c. 26) actually explained the words, but putting into them more, perhaps, then, than they really meant. At all events, there was a very delicate allusion to the importance of the right doctrine concerning grace. He wrote to him, for example: Retribuat tibi Dominus bona, quibus semper sis bonus — ores pro me, quo talis a Domino fiam, qualem me jam esse arbitraris. Ep. 146. But without doubt, Augustin, who, on account of the peculiar tone of his mind, was habituated to such forms of expression, might thus express himself, without having in his mind any particular allusion to the views of Pelagius.

asserted by Cœlestius in the form alleged, while several of them were ascribed to him only by inference. He sought to turn off the whole matter by maintaining that the dispute related to a merely speculative question, and had nothing to do with the essential doctrines of faith. He said the only point in dispute here related in fact to the question concerning the propagation of a sinful nature;[1] which question, however, was closely connected with the more general one concerning the way in which souls are propagated. As on the last of these questions, so also on the first, various opinions had been held in the church. On these points, nothing had been decided by the church system of doctrine. On account of his own particular views, then, on such a disputed matter, no one could be regarded as a teacher of false doctrine.[2] Had he denied the necessity of infant baptism, (now universally acknowledged to be an apostolical tradition,) that charge might seriously affect him. But, in truth, *he* also affirmed the necessity of this rite, although he entered into no farther explanation of the grounds of its necessity. With these evasive answers, however, men were in nowise satisfied; and as he could not be induced to condemn the opinions which he was accused of maintaining, he was excluded from the fellowship of the church.[3]

But more favorable for the cause of Pelagius were the circumstances under which the controversy was renewed in another country. Pelagius, in the year 415, made a journey to Palestine, and in this way the controversy was spread to that part of the world; for Jerome was then living at Bethlehem, and he maintained a close correspondence with the Western church, and was moreover a man whose interest in theological polemics could easily be set in movement. He agreed with Augustin in opposing the Pelagian doctrine concerning the free-will, and concerning the freedom from corruption of human nature; and, owing to the connection in which this controversy seemed to him to stand with another, which at an earlier period had passionately interested him, he was led to attach to it much the greater weight. We refer to its connection with the Origenistic disputes. Jerome was inclined to trace the Pelagian doctrine concerning free-will and the moral powers of man's nature, to the influence of Origen and of Rufinus, whom he now so thoroughly hated, and to look upon Pelagius as a disciple of Rufinus. In addition to this, it happened that Jerome, who was so sensitive to all personal attacks, and so slow to forget them, was told that Pelagius had, on various points, attacked his commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians and his letter against Jovinian;[4] and for these reasons he was already much excited against him.[5] A young Spanish ecclesiastic, Paulus Orosius, was then on a visit to Jerome at Bethlehem. This person was a disciple and an enthusiastic and servile follower of Augustin. His professed object was to prosecute his studies under the

[1] De traduce peccati.
[2] Quæstionis res ista, non hæresis.
[3] See Marius Mercator, commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii. Augustin. de peccato originis, c. II.
[4] See vol. II. p. 269 ff.
[5] See his bitter taunts against Pelagius, whose person he describes, without naming him, in the preface to his commentary on Jeremiah.

direction of Jerome; and he gave the latter a more distinct account of this recent controversy, and proposed to him many questions relative to the whole matter in dispute. Jerome came out as a writer against Pelagius, in the first place, without mentioning his name.[1] But Pelagius without difficulty found many friends in the Oriental church, to which he stood in a very different relation, as it concerned his system of faith, from that which he held to the church of the West.[2] To such nice distinctions on the relation of free-will to grace, the members of the Oriental church were, in fact, as a general thing, not accustomed. Moreover, it had in nowise occurred to any one there, to give such prominence to the antithesis between grace and free-will, as has been done in the Western church. Many of the assertions of Augustin would in this church have given great offence. The less men were acquainted here with the disputed questions of the Western church, and the less interest they felt in them, the more easily could they be made easy by the general declarations of Pelagius; and the latter was, besides, much more at home in the Oriental system of doctrine, than were his opponents.

When, in the year 415, Paul Orosius appeared before a synod assembled under the presidency of the bishop John, (who had long been suspected by the friends of Jerome,) and composed of presbyters connected with his church, he supposed he should easily be able to supplant the monk and layman, by means of the authority of the great bishop whose mind ruled the North-African church.[3] But the worthy bishop John, of Jerusalem, who had already distinguished himself by many conflicts with blind zealots, was not disposed to lend his hand to any such measures of oppression. When it was objected to Pelagius, that he taught doctrines controverted by Augustin, the former, who would do homage to no human authority, replied, as he might safely do in the Oriental church, where Augustin's name hardly stood at this time in so high authority as in the church of the West — "And what matter is it to me what Augustin says?"[4] This remark was sufficient to stir up the indignation of Augustin's enthusiastic friends. They exclaimed that he who ventured to calumniate the bishop to whom the whole North-African church owed its restoration,[5] deserved to be excluded not only from that assembly, but from the fellowship of the whole church. But, without paying any attention to this outcry, the bishop John rather took the part of the man who was to be put down by dogmatic assertions. Dispensing with all hierarchical prejudices, he allowed him, though but a monk and layman, to take his seat among the pres-

[1] In his letter to Ctesiphon, and in his dialogues.

[2] This Jerome himself intimates, in his letter to Ctesiphon, where he speaks of the question brought into discussion by Pelagius: Quæ ante literas tuas plerosque in Oriente decepit, ut per *simulatam* humilitatem superbiam discerent.

[3] Although we become acquainted with these proceedings only through the passionate report of Orosius himself, yet the latter is so confused as to testify against himself.

[4] Et quis est mihi Augustinus? Perhaps, however, Pelagius may not have originally expressed the answer in precisely the form in which the hostile and embittered Orosius here repeats it.

[5] Doubtless referring to his efforts in healing the schism of the Donatists.

byters; a proceeding for which he is highly censured by Orosius, who complains that he should permit a person accused of manifest heresy — though to be sure that person had never as yet been heard before any ecclesiastical body — to sit among Catholics; a layman, to sit among presbyters.[1] The bishop John said, he would now like to be Augustin, that he might pardon Pelagius in Augustin's name.

Pelagius was accused of maintaining, that man is without sin, and can easily obey the divine commands if he pleases. As the bishop John, like the Orientals generally, had no very strict or profound conception of what constitutes the fulfilment of the law, he believed examples could be found in the sacred scriptures, of a perfect fulfilment of the law.[2] All that appeared to him as false was the assertion, that it was possible for any man to accomplish this without the divine assistance. But when Pelagius acknowledged the divine assistance to be necessary here, the bishop was perfectly satisfied. It was quite foreign from him to propose to the former such questions as would have been proposed to him in the Western church, with a view to draw from him an explanation of what he understood by the divine assistance. He was satisfied with the explanation expressed in those general terms; and any one who, after this, was still bent on detecting heresy in the doctrine of Pelagius, seemed to him to detract himself from the power of divine grace. Finally, the accusers of Pelagius repeatedly affirmed, that both the parties belonged to the Latin church; and hence the question was one which only in the Latin church could be rightly understood. The bishop John conceded this, and agreed that the subject should be referred to the Roman bishop Innocent, and meanwhile both parties should cease all further attacks on each other.

This attack on Pelagius having issued in a manner so little favorable to their views, the hostile party, consisting for the most part of ecclesiastics from the West, who probably held their consultations at Bethlehem,[3] determined to renew the assault before another bishop, and a still more numerous assembly. In the same year, the two deposed Western bishops, Heros of Arles, and Lazarus of Aix, (Aquæ,) appeared as the accusers of Pelagius, before a synod assembled at Diospolis in Palestine, under the presidency of Eulogius, bishop of Cæsarea. The propositions laid to his charge on this occasion were

[1] The words of Orosius are: Videlicet laicum in consessu presbyterorum, reum hæreseos manifestæ in medio Catholicorum, sedere præcepit.

[2] He appealed to what had been said of Zechariah and of Elizabeth, Luke 1; to God's command given to Abraham that he should walk before him, and be perfect; which presupposed the possibility of the thing required.

[3] A significant hint on this point is contained in a letter of Pelagius to a presbyter who was his friend, written after the conclusion of the second council, and giving an account of the decision of this assembly: Quæ sententia omnem in malum conspirantem societatem ab invicem separavit. Augustin. de gestis Pelagii, § 54. And, in fact, Heros and Lazarus did actually return to the West. He might, then, have had good grounds for considering all these undertakings as the concerted plan of a party, which had associated for the purpose of bringing about his condemnation in the Oriental church. Yet if the whole thing had in this case been previously concocted, the points of complaint would, in all probability, not have been so unskilfully arranged.

partly statements in which, as they expressed it, the heretical element could not be easily detected, and on which, by means of superadded explanations, Pelagius might easily come to an understanding with his judges.[1] The members of this council were also disposed to ask no further questions, provided only that grace and free-will were both equally maintained; and accordingly Pelagius found it not difficult to satisfy his judges. He was charged with holding the doctrine, "that man, if he pleases, can be perfectly free from sin; that there was such a thing as perfect purity from sin among mankind." This he explained by saying, that he who is converted from sin may live without sin by his own efforts and God's grace; but that he is not, for this reason, placed also beyond the reach of all temptations. Understood with these limitations, the synod were likewise all of the same opinion. It was now required of him, that he should pronounce sentence of condemnation against all who taught the contrary. He consented; yet on the singular condition, that he might condemn them as fools, not as heretics.[2] Furthermore, some of the propositions which had come from Cœlestius were read to him; but for these, he maintained that he was not to be held accountable, since they were none of his. He was even

[1] Thus it was objected to him that he had asserted: "In die judicii iniquis et peccatoribus non esse parcendum; sed æternis eos ignibus esse exurendos." It is most probable — which is also confirmed by Augustin's remark on this passage in his book de gestis Pelagii, — that Pelagius had combated those who held out the promise of final salvation to a dead church-faith, not connected with a change of heart, but subsisting along with a vicious life, at least after suffering disciplinary punishment in the ignis purgatorius. See above, p. 577. His sincere zeal for morality may perhaps have moved him to deny altogether the doctrine of such an ignis purgatorius. When this proposition was brought before him, he appealed in defense of his assertion to the word of Christ himself, Matth. 25:46; and whoever believed otherwise, he added, was an Origenist. With this the synod was satisfied; for the Origenistic doctrine concerning the ἀποκατάστασις had always had, though not all, yet the majority of the most influential voices in the church against it. But had Pelagius unfolded his views more fully, and also represented the doctrine of that purgatorial fire as an Origenistic heresy, the members of the council would perhaps not have been so easily satisfied. Another assertion was: Quoniam plus facimus quam in lege et evangelio jussum est, in conformity with the doctrine of the consilia evangelica, which was so intimately connected with the monastic system of morals, and in which Pelagius (see above, p. 577) might certainly find some support for his system. Pelagius cites in defence of this proposition the remark of Paul, 1 Cor. 7: 25, in recommendation, as it was generally supposed, of celibacy. Furthermore, the proposition: "The kingdom of heaven is promised even in the Old Testament." In this proposition, the sense corresponding to the orthodox faith admits, of course, of being more easily found than the heretical. The heretical sense, it may be conjectured, lay in the assertion, that men could obtain salvation by observance of the law; that there was a justitia legis. See below.

[2] Anathematizo tanquam stultos, non tanquam hæreticos. It is evident that the synod here proceeded in a very superficial way, with little regard for rigid and precise dogmatic notions. It is not clear, indeed, what it was that Pelagius really condemned. If he meant to condemn those who taught that there were sinless men, the purport of his declaration may have been, that the question did not relate to a doctrine, but to a fact. A false doctrine — he must have meant, in this case, to say — could only arise when it was asserted that such persons had so lived *without* grace. Otherwise, to affirm, as a matter of fact, this which was contrary to experience, ought not to be called false doctrine, but foolishness. But if we suppose this, Pelagius could not be exonerated from the charge of surrendering his own convictions, or of contradicting himself. Or perhaps he meant to condemn those who taught that men could lead sinless lives without the help of divine grace. But when we consider what a broad conception Pelagius connected with the term grace, it may easily be explained that he meant to say: Those who declared grace could be dispensed with in order to a sinless life, deserved to be styled fools and madmen for teaching a doctrine so perfectly absurd.

ready to condemn them, although it would seem as if he could not do it, without also condemning many of his own doctrines. But perhaps the matter was made easy to him, by hastily reading over the propositions, and forbearing to enter into any minute inquiries.[1] As the result of the whole business, Pelagius was recognized as a member of the Catholic church. From the relation of Pelagius to the Oriental church, we may infer that he found many friends there, especially among the monks; and this passionate class of men may have resorted to many measures in support of the party of Pelagius, of which the latter himself wholly disapproved. Moreover, Jerome, by his passionate and overbearing temper,[2] by his reproachful abuse of the bishops of this country, may have rendered himself hateful to many, who now sought to take their revenge on him. But whatever the truth may be with regard to those violent proceedings said to have taken place in the cloisters at Bethlehem after the triumph obtained by Pelagius at the council of Diospolis, yet certainly the accounts of them, all of which may in the end be traced to the testimony of Jerome, which deserves but little confidence in matters so nearly concerning himself and his personal enemies,[3] are not sufficiently distinct and well authenticated, to enable us correctly to judge to what extent Jerome was to blame in this affair, and whether any party of Pelagius had a hand in it, and, if so, what they did. One thing we may confidently assert, that it was quite foreign from the disposition of the latter to intermeddle with such business. Had it been possible really to bring any such accusation against him, his enemies assuredly would not have long delayed to produce the more definite testimony which the Roman bishop Innocent demanded.

The verdicts of these two councils were now made the most of by the party of Pelagius, to justify their own orthodoxy. Their opponents, it is true, did not allow themselves to falter at these decisions; yet they took different measures according to their different turns of mind. The violent Jerome did not hesitate to fix a suspicion of Pelagian heresy on the synod itself.[4] Augustin, on the other hand, endeavored to show, in his work de gestis Pelagii, that the synod had only suffered itself to be deceived by the ambiguous explanations of Pelagius, but that, by the anathemas which it prescribed to him, it had in reality condemned his peculiar doctrines. Here, we must admit, he went on the erroneous supposition, that as Christian truth is but one, and the doctrine of the church but one, therefore the doctrine of grace held by this synod must have been the same with that of the whole Oriental church.

[1] It is very possible that, as Augustin remarks, (de gestis Pelagii, § 57,) in a brief transcript of those proceedings, he may, not without good reasons, have left out the express condemnation of those propositions of Coelestius.

[2] Palladius, who to be sure belonged to a party hostilely disposed to Jerome, represents another as saying of him (hist. lausiaca, c. 78): Τοσαύτην ἔσχεν βασκανίαν, ὡς ὑπὸ ταυτῆς καλύπτεσθαι τῶν λόγων τὴν ἀρετὴν· χάριν δὲ τουτοῦ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐ μὴ ἅγιος ἀνὴρ εἰς τοὺς τόπους οἰκήσει, ἀλλα φθάσει αὐτοῦ ὁ φθόνος καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἰδιωῦ ἀδελφοῦ.

[3] See the conclusion in Augustin's book de gestis Pelagii, and three letters of the Roman bishop Innocent.

[4] He styles it (ep. 81) synodus miserabilis.

As a counterpoise to the authority of these Oriental church assemblies, it was sought, moreover, to gain the acquiescence of the Roman bishop Innocent. Three letters were therefore addressed to him from the North-African church, in the year 416; — one from a synod held at Carthage; the second, from one held at Mileve in Numidia; the third, from five North-African bishops, of whom Augustin was one. In these letters, they accused Pelagius and Cœlestius of maintaining free-will in a way that excluded grace, and of denying grace in the peculiar Christian sense, since they did not place it in an inward actuation and communication of the divine Spirit; but only understood thereby, either the gifts and powers bestowed on man by creation, or the outward revelation by the law, or the forgiveness of sin. They were also accused of denying the necessity of baptism in order to the salvation of infants. At the same time these bishops sent him a book of Pelagius, in which they had marked several passages, which he was requested to notice.

In the mean time, Pelagius and Cœlestius also sought to justify themselves before the Roman bishop. Pelagius wrote him a letter, in which he defended himself against both the charges; namely, that he asserted a free-will standing in no need of grace,[1] and that he denied the necessity of baptism in order to the salvation of infants.[2] With this letter, he sent a confession of faith, in which he fully unfolded his orthodoxy on those points which had no connection with this controversy. On the matters in dispute, he declared himself with less distinctness, and also indulged himself a good deal in special pleading, for the purpose of setting the doctrine of his opponents in an unfavorable light; attacking, though without naming him, Jerome in particular, who, indeed, by his exaggerations in controversy, and his arguments, which were often spun out and lost in mere play and sophistry, exposed many a weak point to his adversaries.[3] Pelagius, on this occasion also,

[1] Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus, nos indigere Dei semper auxilio.

[2] Respecting his doctrine concerning the baptism of infants, see below. The fragments of this letter may be found in Augustin. de gratia Christi, c. 30, 32, et 33, and de peccato originali, c. 17 et 21.

[3] Pelagius says accordingly, he abhorred the blasphemies of those who taught that God had commanded men to do impossibilities, and that God's commands could not be fulfilled by individuals, but only by all, collectively and in common. This remark is aimed against the doctrine held alike by Augustin and Jerome, that human nature, in its present state, is not able to fulfil the divine law — especially in the form in which it had been expressed by Jerome, when he said, that as at present everything good among men was in some respect or other defective or partial, so they mutually supplied each other's deficiencies by means of the predominant virtues in individuals. See Hieronym. l. I. adv. Pelag. f. 496–97, T. IV. ed. Martianay. Again, Pelagius said, we condemn those who affirm that the Son of God was necessitated to utter what was false by the power of the flesh; and that, on account of his assumption of human nature, he could not do all which he willed. In one respect, so far as it regards the last proposition, this charge was unjust. Jerome, for instance, had asserted — citing as his authority the passages in Matth. 26: 39; John 5: 30 — that Jesus, in speaking as a man, had not made himself independent of God, nor ascribed to himself any self-sufficiency grounded in human nature; while, on the contrary, the Pelagians would fain claim for themselves an independence and self-sufficiency, which Christ himself had never thought of asserting. But the objection was just with reference to the first of those propositions; for, citing the passage in John 7: 10, which Porphyry had seized upon as a ground for accusing Christ of fickleness of purpose, he said in justification of Christ: Omnia scandala ad carnem esse

asserted a free-will constantly standing in need of the divine assistance; and he charged his opponents with maintaining partly the Manichean doctrine, that certain men (those who do not participate of grace) cannot avoid sin, partly the Jovinian, that certain men (the predestinate) are by nature incapable of sin. He himself taught, on the contrary, that man is always capable both of sinning and of not sinning.

The Roman bishop, Innocent, received those letters from the North-African church, before the letter and confession of faith sent by Pelagius could reach him. Innocent, as may be gathered from his letters, was, on the doctrine concerning the relation of nature to grace, a decided opponent of the Pelagian system: it would seem also, that he penetrated more deeply than others into the original grounds of this whole matter of dispute.[1] Still, it cannot be inferred, however, from any declarations of his, that he entirely agreed in his system with Augustin. On the contrary, an intimation is given, that, inasmuch as he held the communications of divine grace to be dependent on the worth of individuals, he accordingly differed from Augustin in an important point.[2] Yet, at all events, the heretical matter in the Pelagian doctrines first attracted his notice; and of any difference between his own views and those of the North Africans, he may, perhaps, not have been conscious. Moreover, the North-African church had already conciliated his favorable regard by appealing to his decision on such a matter of dispute. After having bestowed praise, then, on the North-African bishops, because as in duty bound they had betaken themselves to the church of Peter, to which all the great concerns of entire Christendom should be ultimately referred, he assured them of his full acquiescence in their condemnation of the Pelagian doctrines.

But soon after, in the year 416, Innocent died; and his successor Zosimus had already been invested with the episcopal dignity, when the letter of Pelagius arrived at Rome. Zosimus, in all probability, had not the same doctrinal system as his predecessor. Perhaps, as his name might indicate, he was of Oriental descent; and his dogmatic tendency on the controverted points may have been akin to that of the East; all which seems, in fact, to be shown in his first letter on this subject to the North-African church. Hence his sentence would turn out to be a very different one from the former. Neither were there wanting in Rome individuals who were friendly to the Pelagian doctrines, and who contributed to dispose his mind to look upon them with

referenda, which were either, like many of the sayings of Jerome, sounding words without any reasonable meaning, or must have been intended to mean that the weakness of the sensuous nature even in Christ rendered it necessary to deviate from the strict law of veracity. L. c. f. 519, 20, 21.

[1] He perceived (see below) that this dispute was connected with a different way of regarding the relation of God's providence to creation, § 3. Epistola ad Concil. Carthag. Ergo eris tibi in providendo præstantior, quam potest in eo esse, qui te ut esses effecit? Et cui putas debere, quod vivis, quomodo non putas illi debere quod quotidianam ejus consequendo gratiam taliter vivis?

[2] Innocent. ep. ad Concil. Carthag. § 7. Of the Pelagians: Quis tantus illorum pectora error obcœcat, ut si ipsi nullam Dei gratiam sentiunt, *quia nec digni sunt nec merentur*. To be sure, Augustin would have no difficulty in explaining this according to his own sense, by simply supposing the *dignitas* and the *mereri* to be qualities depending on the communication of grace.

favor. While Innocent was living, such individuals would, of course, keep their opinions to themselves.[1] At present, they could more openly avow themselves.

Under these more favorable circumstances, Cœlestius himself appeared in Rome. He handed over to the Roman bishop a confession of faith, which was well suited doubtless to make a favorable impression on one who was not aware of the more profound connection and coherence of individual doctrines with the whole system of Christian faith, and hence was in no condition to form a correct judgment concerning the importance of the controverted points. He, too, first unfolded at large the pure doctrines on matters which had no connection whatever with the dispute, and then, as before, sought to reduce the disputed matters to mere questions of speculative controversy, such as related to the propagation of sin, which was connected with the question concerning the origin of souls. "If some questions have been started which do not concern the faith, and respecting which multitudes have differed, it had never entered his thoughts to establish anything, as the founder of a new doctrine; but he would very cheerfully allow himself to be corrected, where he had erred as a man, by the judgment of the Roman bishop."[2] At the same time, he maintained anew, that the acknowledgment of the necessity of infant baptism, which by the rule of the universal church must be imparted for the forgiveness of sin, was altogether independent of those questions, because our Lord had resolved that the kingdom of heaven may be bestowed only on the baptized; and because the powers of nature did not suffice for this, it must be imparted by grace. But, by so doing, he meant in nowise to approve the doctrine of a natural propagation of sin; for sin, as it consisted in a determination of the will, could not be derived from nature.[3] The point of view in which Cœlestius placed this matter, certainly appeared very clear in the outset to Zosimus; for it seemed sufficient to him that free-will and grace should be equally maintained, and all the rest pertaining to the relation of these two to each other seemed to him to belong among the idle questions of the schools. Cœlestius had several audiences with the Roman bishop himself, and always explained himself to the satisfaction of the latter. Add to this, that the two bishops, Heros and Lazarus, by whom the complaints had been brought against Pelagius at the council of Diospolis, were well known to him as turbulent, mischievous men; and accordingly the whole affair would the more readily appear to him as a mere ebullition of passion, the less he understood of its real nature. Besides, Pelagius had accompanied his letter to Rome with a letter from the bishop Praylus of Jerusalem, by whom he was completely justified.

Accordingly Zosimus wrote to the North-African bishops on the affair of Pelagius and Cœlestius two letters, which must have struck these bishops with some surprise, expressing as they did a judgment so

[1] Innocentii epistola ad quinque episcopos, § 2.

[2] Præter fidem quæstiones. Si forte ut hominibus quispiam ignorantiæ error obrepsit, vestra sententia corrigatur.

[3] See Augustin. de peccato originali, c. 5, 6, et 23.

entirely different from that of his predecessor. He reproaches them for not having entered into a careful examination of this matter, and for having so easily given credit to the charges of trifling and mischievous men. He gave the most decided testimony to the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Cœlestius. Of Pelagius' letter he said, it agreed wholly with the oral declarations of Cœlestius. "Would that some one of you," he writes to the bishops, "had been present when the letter was read! How rejoiced and surprised were all the pious men who heard it! Scarcely could some refrain from tears to find that men so thoroughly orthodox[1] could yet be made objects of suspicion. Was there a single passage in the letter, where grace or the divine assistance was not mentioned?"[2] It would appear, then, that Zosimus, when he heard the words grace and divine assistance so often repeated, had never even thought of any different determination of the conceptions associated with those words, and that it seemed to him in the highest degree unjust that those who expressed themselves after this manner should be accused of denying grace. He gave the North-African bishops to understand, that they had gone over the limits which should be assigned to the doctrines of faith, and raised a controversy on questions which had no connection whatever with the faith. He had reminded Cœlestius, he wrote, and the priests from various countries who were present, that such knotty and moot points and such foolish disputes had sprung from that pestilent contagion of an idle curiosity, then spreading on all sides, which led each man to misemploy his mind and his uncontrolled power of speech in affecting to know more than holy scripture revealed. He entreated them, in the name and authority of the apostolic see, that they would submit their reason to the Bible, as it was explained according to the tradition of the fathers. In his first letter, relating only to Cœlestius, he decided that either an accuser must appear in person at Rome, within the space of two months, who could show that Cœlestius thought differently from what he had expressed in his own declarations, or that for the future no one should presume to call in question his orthodoxy after such manifest proofs of it.

It may be easily understood, that a man who could so express himself must have differed widely from the doctrines of Augustin, although he did not precisely agree in all respects with the Pelagian system, nor perhaps accurately understand it; and, in fact, may not have had any exact knowledge of doctrinal matters at all. Nothing is easier than to suppose that Zosimus was one of those Roman ecclesiastics who sought to make themselves familiar only with the liturgical forms and practical business of the church, but took no interest in theological studies. And in this case it would admit of being readily explained, how, without any independent theological judgment of his own, he was liable to be governed by the influence of others, as at present by the influence of the Pelagian party existing in Rome.[3]

[1] Tales etiam absolutæ fidei.

[2] Estne ullus locus, in quo Dei gratia vel adjutorium prætermissum sit?

[3] See the edict of the emperor Honorius, hereafter to be cited.

The North-African bishops, accustomed already, in less important matters, to assert their independence in opposition to the arrogant claims of the Roman bishops to a supreme judicial authority, had no inclination to sacrifice a doctrinal conviction of so much weight to themselves, to the arbitrary decision of a man in whom the inherited authority of a successor of the apostle Peter was to supply the place of a theological judgment resting on its own independent grounds. Accordingly they addressed to the Roman bishop, in the name of a council assembled at Carthage, a letter, in which, probably with all professions of respect, they protested against his decision.[1] They gave Zosimus to understand, that he had too easily allowed himself to be deceived by the vague declarations of Cœlestius. The decided language of these bishops, combined with many other powerful influences from without, had already produced such an effect, that Zosimus began to assume another tone, although he was quite careful not to recede in the least from his claims to supreme judicial authority. In a second letter, he praised, indeed, anew the decisive authority of the apostolic chair, and defended himself against the reproach of lightness and overhaste in his investigations and decisions; yet he already ceases to make further mention of what he had said in his earlier letters in favor of Pelagius and of Cœlestius; and, in compliance with the request of the Africans, he suspended the final decision of the matter until after further examination. The North-African bishops, however, were not at all inclined to wait for a foreign decision. They anticipated this by a decision on their own part. At an assembly held at Carthage, in the year 418, they drew up nine canons, in which the doctrines relating to the moral condition of human nature, concerning grace and free-will, and concerning baptism, were defined and settled in a way opposed to the system of Pelagius. In this document were expressed the doctrines of the corruption of human nature by the sin of the first man; of death, as the punishment of sin; of grace, as an inward communication of the divine life, from which alone all truly good actions could spring. The fourth canon asserts: "Let him be accursed who says, the grace of God, by virtue of which we are justified through Christ, refers merely to the forgiveness of past sins, and not to assistance to secure us against falling under sin for the future." V.: "Who teaches that this grace helps us to keep from sinning, only so far as it opens our minds to a knowledge of the divine commands, so that we are made acquainted with what we must strive after and what we must avoid; but that it does not bestow on us a disposition to love, and a faculty to practise, such commands. For whereas the apostle says, 'Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth,' it would be very impious to believe, that we have the grace of Christ in order to that which puffeth up, but not in order to

[1] It is to be lamented that this letter has not reached us; and we can only surmise its contents from the answer given to it by Zosimus. Zosimus mentions in his letter an *obtestatio*, which the North-African bishops had sent to Rome. Many learned men have supposed, that by this was meant the letter sent at an earlier period by the bishops to Innocent; but it is much more probable that the *obtestatio* contained in the later letter of the Africans, which is lost, ought here to be understood.

that which edifieth; while, in truth, both are the gift of God, not only that we know what we must do, but also that we love it in order to do it; that so where love edifieth, knowledge may not puff up." Furthermore, in the sixth canon the tenet was condemned, that grace merely renders more easy the fulfilment of that which could also be fulfilled without it. In opposition to this view, it was alleged that Christ had not said, "Without me ye would find it more difficult to do anything; but without me ye can do nothing." John 15: 5.

But as the Roman bishop had so preponderant an influence in the Western church, and as his influence could effect so much even at the imperial court, it became necessary for the Africans to secure betimes their ground in that quarter, and to endeavor to gain over the supreme civil power against Zosimus. According to Augustin's principles, — as we have already explained them in the history of the Donatist controversy, — no hesitation ought to be felt, but it should rather be considered a duty, to call upon the civil power to repress unchristian errors. The connection of Augustin with the count Valerius may doubtless have contributed to procure the interposition of the civil power in this present case; as, in fact, Augustin himself, in a controversial tract relating to these matters, which he dedicated to Valerius, intimates that the latter had deserved well of the truth for his exertions in this cause.[1]

Accordingly, from the year 418 and onward, there appeared several edicts, couched in a style more theological than imperial, against Pelagius and Cœlestius, and their adherents.[2]

The bishop Zosimus was not decided enough in his theological views and character to be able to maintain his ground against such authorities; and besides this, he was, no doubt, closely pressed at home by a powerful anti-Pelagian party, which had long maintained itself in the conflict with the other side. Constantius, a man of some rank, who had left the post of Vicar of Rome, (*vicarius urbis*,) and become a monk, stood at the head of the former party.[3] Cœlestius was now to

[1] De nuptiis et concupiscentia, l. I. c. I. § 3. Profanis istis novitatibus, quibus hic disputando resistimus, tu potestate curando et instando efficaciter restitisti. By this Augustin drew upon himself from the Pelagian Julian the deserved reproach, that, as his party could not maintain their cause by reasons, they sought to supply this defect by a resort to outward force. Quam nihil habeant, quod vi qua proteruntur rationis opponant, ut alia eorum scripta, ita hi testantur libelli, qui directi ad militarem virum (quod etiam ipse profiteri potest) aliis magis negotiis quam literis occupatum, impotentiæ contra nos precantur auxilium. Augustin, however, does not deny that he had applied to the civil power in aid of this object; he only thought he had no reason to be ashamed for so doing. He speaks of it with confidence and assurance, as if conscious of having done nothing but what was right: "Non impotentiæ contra vos precamur auxilium; sed pro vobis potius, ut ab ausu sacrilego cohibeamini, Christianæ potentiæ laudamus officium."

[2] Two of these edicts, one of them addressed to the bishop Aurelius of Carthage, seem to have been issued at the request of the North-African bishops. Moreover, the remarks of the Pelagian Julian presuppose that such a law had been enacted in answer to the petition of the North Africans: but he imagines he can interpret it to the advantage of his party; as may be gathered from the words of Augustin l. III. c. Julian. c. I. § 3. Sane, ut dicis, si pro vobis potius ab imperatore responsum est. But then, it cannot possibly be conceived, how Julian could have given any such interpretation to one of the laws which has come down to us. It is very probable, therefore, that the law intended is one which has not reached our times.

[3] Prosper, in his chronicle, under the twelfth consulate of Honorius, says: Constantius servus Christi ex vicario Romæ

appear before the Roman bishop, and sustain a new examination; but he doubtless foresaw the result, and hastily left Rome. Upon this, Zosimus issued a circular letter, (tractoria,) in which he pronounced sentence of condemnation on Cœlestius and Pelagius; adopted the decisions of the council of Carthage against the Pelagian doctrines, and declared himself on the doctrines of the corruption of human nature, of grace, and of baptism, in accordance with the views of the North-African church. Not without reason might the Pelagians accuse Zosimus and the Roman clergy, who had before shown themselves so favorable to the cause of Pelagius, of denying the convictions they had previously avowed, no matter whether it was ignorance, the force of authority, or the fear of man, which had chiefly contributed to produce this change.[1]

When thus, through the authority of the Western emperor and of a Roman bishop wanting in independence, Pelagianism had been condemned, the circular letter of Zosimus was sent to the whole church of the West, and all bishops were required to subscribe it, in its condemnation both of the doctrine, and also of the persons of Pelagius and Cœlestius.[2] Those bishops who declined were to be deprived of their places, and banished from their churches;[3] a sentence which was rigorously executed, particularly in Italy, where Pelagianism had many adherents, and in North Africa.

Eighteen bishops of Italy who met this fate complain, not without reason, in a letter composed by the bishop Julian, of Eclanum, and addressed to the bishop Rufus, of Thessalonica, that, without the convocation of a synod, subscriptions were extorted, separately and individually, from the ignorant bishops, of whom there were so many at that time in the Western church.[4] Several bishops in the department of Aquileja, from whom their metropolitan Augustin, the bishop of this town, demanded their subscriptions, sent to him a covertly Pelagian

habitans, et pro gratia Dei devotissime Pelagianis resistens, factione eorundem multa pertulit. Julian says to his opponents, (opus imperfect. l. III. c. 35:) Cur tantis totam Italiam factionibus commovistis? Cur seditiones Romæ conductis populis excitastis? And even though this must be considered as the accusation of a passionate opponent, yet there must be some truth lying at the bottom here.

[1] Julian accuses Zosimus of prevarication. Augustin. c. Julian. Pelagian. l. VI. § 37. He says of the Roman clergy: Eos jussionis terrore percussos non erubuisse prævaricationis crimen admittere, ut *contra priorem sententiam* suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati adfuerant, (since they were present at that assembly held under Zosimus, which had declared so favorably to the cause of Pelagius and Cœlestius,) pronuntiarent. Augustin. contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, l. II. § 5.

[2] Marius Mercator, in his commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii, says of this circular: Per totum orbem missa subscriptionibus sanctorum patrum est roborata.

[3] See the letter of the bishop Aurelius of Carthage to the bishops of two North-African provinces, in which letter he calls upon those who had not given their signatures at the council of Carthage, to do it now, so that no room might be left for suspicion against any one: Quo cum in supradictorum hæreticorum damnatione omnium vestrum fuerit integra subscriptio, nihil omnino sit unde ullius vel dissimulationis vel negligentiæ vel occultæ forsitan pravitatis aliqua videatur merito remansisse suspicio.

[4] In *toto penitus occidente* non minus stultum quam impium dogma esse susceptum et simplicibus episcopis sine congregatione synodi in locis suis sedentibus ad hoc confirmandum subscriptionem extortam. The words cited in Augustin's letter of refutation, addressed to the Roman bishop Boniface, contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, l. IV. § 20.

confession of faith,[1] drawn out in detail, declaring that their conscience did not allow them to condemn Pelagius and Cœlestius, persons who were absent, and whom they had not heard in their own defence;[2] and they appealed to a general council. But many, who had resigned their places for the sake of their convictions, afterwards testified repentance, and were accordingly restored again to their spiritual charges;[3] though the sincerity of their repentance may well be questioned. On the other hand, the bishop Julian, of Eclanum in Apulia, a man whose scientific attainments and pious life had acquired for him universal respect, distinguished himself by his zeal and courage in standing up for the defence of what he deemed to be Christian truth. In predominantly leaning to the side of the practical understanding, his intellectual bent resembled that of Pelagius and Cœlestius. He unfolded their doctrines in the most systematic form. He appears to have been a more passionate man than his predecessors; but we should not forget the oppressed condition of his party.[4] In spite of the imposing authority which the superiority of his intellect had procured for Augustin in the Western church; in spite of the authority which the bishops of Rome derived from their outward position; in spite of the imperial verdict of condemnation, Julian, the banished bishop, in various writings defended his principles with a freedom reckless of consequences, and in a spirit and style of language which would have well befitted the leader of a dominant party. By his zeal, his scientific gifts, and his exemplary life, he was enabled to secure adherents to his principles. A person who belonged to the party of his adversaries reports that in a time of famine he devoted his entire property to deeds of benevolence. To be sure, in the judgment of his opponents, there could be no honest intention in this act of a heretic: it was only a means to gain himself followers.[5]

With deserved indignation, showing the sentiments of a noble mind, Julian rebukes the cowardice of those of his own faith who supposed, as he expresses it, that true discretion consisted in purchasing, by the servility of a degenerate soul, the insecure repose of a moment.[6] He says of them, that, in the worldliness of their own spirit, they accused of contention and obstinacy those who preferred to suffer any evil, rather than to give up their convictions. Had there been a frank and manly bearing among the bishops, he thinks public opinion would as certainly have declared against the delusion of the Traductionists, as invincible reason destroyed it. In order to the defence of truth, science and

[1] To be found, along with some others, in the appendix to the tenth volume of the Benedictine edition of Augustin.

[2] Metuimus in absentem et nobis inauditorum capita dictare sententiam, nisi cum præsentes fuerint confutati.

[3] Marius Mercator commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii, c. V.

[4] Even Augustin esteemed him highly when a young man. See his ep. 101 to Julian's father, the Apulian bishop Memorius.

[5] See Gennadius de V. I. c. 45. That Julian acted as the organ of a party, is seen from opus imperfect. l. I. c. 51, where he says, it had been entrusted to him by sanctis viris nostri temporis confessoribus (these of course were the confessors of Pelagianism) to write against Augustin.

[6] Nihil magis cautis convenire consiliis, quam degeneris animi famulatu emere vel infidam momento-um quietem.

courage (scientia et fortitudo) must be united; neither is of any avail without the other.[1]

Not without reason might Julian complain of the oppressive measures against the adherents of the Pelagian doctrines; not without reason might he complain that Pelagian and Cœlestian had been coined into heretical names wherewith to terrify the ignorant multitude, and that the latter were constituted judges on points which they were not competent to understand.[2] He demanded, on the contrary, that wise and judicious men should be chosen out of all ranks and professions, whether ecclesiastics or civilians, to investigate the question; such as, though few in number, might yet be distinguished for reason, scientific cultivation, and freedom of spirit.[3] He complained that the guidance of the church had been wrested from reason, in order that a doctrine which recommended itself to the people might have liberty to spread everywhere without check or hindrance.[4] He objects to his opponents, that they used every means to prevent freedom of inquiry, by calling in the secular power; for they felt themselves obliged to resort to force, because they were deserted by reason.[5] Augustin, on the other hand, proceeding on his own principles of ecclesiastical law, which we have already explained, and his idea of the church, appealed to the authority of the church, which had already decided the question, and to the legitimate power of the magistracy, which is bound to punish the propagators of error in the same manner as other evil-doers. "Wouldst thou have no fear of the magistracy," says he to him, "then do what is right. But there is nothing right in maintaining a heretical, in opposition to the apostolic doctrine. The heresy which the bishops have already condemned needs no longer to be examined, but should be checked by the power of a Christian magistracy."[6] Julian constantly made his appeal to "reason," which alone should examine and decide on all questions. But this reason assuredly had to do only with universal conceptions. From mere reason it was impossible to understand what was meant by original sin, the need of redemption, and redemption itself. The subject-matter of these conceptions could be understood only from the actual experience of the soul. Had Julian consistently followed out his "reason," he must have gone a great deal farther in his negations. Augustin could oppose to him the consciousness of the Christian church, which was not first made to be such by this or that bishop, but which was found already present by all as the one which existed from the beginning. And the objection that the

[1] Opus imperfect. c. Julian. at the beginning.

[2] Quod Cœlestianorum vel Pelagianorum nomine homines terreamus, l. II. c. Julianum, § 34. That it was endeavored to stir up against them homines de plebeiia fæce sellulariorum, milites, scholasticos auditoriales, nautas, tabernarios, etc.

[3] Paucitas quam ratio, eruditio libertasque sublimat, c. Julian. l. II. § 36.

[4] Eripiuntur ecclesiæ gubernacula rationis, ut erecto cornu velificet dogma populare, c. Julian. opus imperfectum, l. II. c. 2.

[5] Quod omnibus opibus negationem examinis a mundi potestatibus comparatis; intelligitis enim, agendum vobis vi esse, cum descrimini rationis auxilio. L. c. c. 103.

[6] Vis non timere potestatem? bonum fac. Non est autem bonum, contra apostolicum sensum exserere et asserere hæreticum sensum. Damnata ergo hæresis ab episcopis non adhuc examinanda, sed coërcenda est a potestatibus Christianis. L. c.

doctrine was a *popular* one, and agreeable to the people, he does not repel, but admits the statement to be true; contending that it is not so much an objection as a commendation, that the doctrine which responds to the consciousness of the Christian church should be distinctly marked. "Such a people," says he, "Ambrose did not *make*, but he *found*. We admit our doctrine is a doctrine of the people; for we are the people of Him who was for this reason called Jesus, because he redeemed his people from their sins." [1] And Julian himself, on another occasion, agrees with Augustin in attaching importance to the popular consciousness, when he appeals from the authority of the church, and from what appeared to him to be an arbitrary imposition of doctrinal subtileties, to the same consciousness; though not indeed to the peculiar subject-matter of the Christian consciousness, but to the foundation of the universal sense of God; which itself, however, without the influence of Christianity, could not have been so clearly developed. He who on other occasions was so used to refer to the learned and to the more cultivated minds, referred also to the simple, who, being occupied with the cares of business, had received nothing from the schools, yet by faith alone had sought to attain to the church of Christ. He advised them not to allow themselves to be disturbed by dark questions; but, while they believed God to be the true Creator of men, to believe without wavering also, that he is a good, a true, and a just being; and while they held fast their conviction of this Trinity, they might admit and approve every thing which they heard agreeing with this idea, while they should let no force of argument deprive them of this, but might repudiate every authority and every party which sought to convince them of the contrary.[2]

The principles of Pelagianism rigidly carried out, would have gone to the extreme of denying altogether man's need of redemption; consequently, of making Christ wholly superfluous; hence, of giving an entirely new shape to the church doctrine concerning Christ. Yet, though these principles were not unfolded with this rigid consistency, they could not fail, if but applied, so far as they were unfolded, with a clear consciousness of their import and with logical closeness, to beget a theory of the person of Christ of a peculiar stamp, and corresponding to the principles themselves. This connection, however, never betrayed itself in the way in which Pelagius and Cœlestius were accustomed to present their scheme; for only the disputed questions respecting the character of man were deemed of importance by them: on all other points they adopted the common doctrines, receiving them without alteration, and without examining how far they harmonized with their fundamental positions. Yet we have seen already, in the

[1] Tales populos non *fecit*, sed invenit Ambrosius; fatemur dogma nostrum esse populare, quia populus ejus sumus, qui propterea est appellatus Jesus, quia salvum fecit populum suum a peccatis eorum. L. c. c. 2.

[2] Simplices, qui aliis occupati negotiis nihil de eruditione ceperunt, sola tamen fide ad ecclesiam Christi pervenire curarunt, ne facile obscuris quæstionibus terreantur, sed credentes, etc. Nec hoc eis ulla vis argumentationis evellat, sed detestentur omnem auctoritatem atque omnem societatem contraria persuadere nitentem. C. Julian. l. V. § 4.

case of Theodore of Mopsuestia, how closely his peculiar views of man, the relation of which to the (in many respects) kindred Pelagian views we shall consider more at large hereafter,—how closely his doctrine of human freedom was connected with his peculiar notions respecting the character and work of Christ. A trace of this connection we perceive in Julian of Eclanum, who objects to his opponents, that, if they did not suppose a human nature in Christ subjected to the seductions of sense and to temptation, as in other men, but derived every thing of a moral nature in him only from a natural necessity, they could not suppose in him any true human virtue, nor recognize him as a moral example for mankind.[1] The same connection also would be very apparent in a man who, near the commencement of the fifth century, was called a follower of the Pelagian doctrines, if indeed he was rightly so named. We mean Leporius, a monk and presbyter in the south of France.[2]

Leporius is said to have been condemned in his native country, on account of his Pelagian tenets, and, in consequence of this, to have emigrated with several of his followers, in 426, to North Africa. But at Carthage he was convinced by several bishops, chiefly perhaps by Augustin, that he was in an error. The bishops by whom he had been convinced, commended him to the paternal gentleness of their Gallic colleagues, in a letter accompanying the recantation of Leporius. In this recantation, he calls God to witness, that he had supposed his error to be the truth; that a well-meant zeal, though without knowledge, had deceived him. This introduction is suited to inspire confidence in the sincerity of his recantation; but, from many things which he says in this document, it is difficult to believe, that a man who, in his earlier doctrine concerning the person of Christ, discovers a tendency of mind so near akin to that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, would now pass to a mode of expression so opposite, and pushed even to the extreme of crassness, as exhibits itself in many passages of this recantation. But perfectly ignorant as we are of what, in the meanwhile, had been working within the breast of this individual, we can come to no further determination on this subject.

In the above-mentioned recantation drawn up by Leporius, no traces are to be found of Pelagian doctrines; but the heretical matter in his doctrines would seem, according to this, to have consisted simply in a view of Christ's person agreeing, in all respects, with the principles of the Antiochian school. Like Theodore, he opposed the confounding of the predicates of the two natures. "It was not God himself who was born as man, but a perfect man was born with God." On the other hand, he now said, in his recantation: "I believe thoroughly that God is unable to do only what he does not will to do. If God willed to be born, as he assuredly did, I firmly believe also that he

[1] Ut omnis virtutum pulchritudo, quam in se Christus expresserat, indebitis naturæ ejus laudibus vacuata flaccesceret, cunctoque veritatis suæ splendore nudata sacrum magisterium mediatoris offeret irrisui. Opus imperfect. l. IV. c. 50.

[2] He is called a Pelagian by Cassian, de incarnatione Christi, lib. I. c. 4; and Gennadius, de V. J. c. 59.

could be born; since God's essence is subject to no limitation." Like Theodore, he had distinguished from each other the different senses in which Christ is called Son of God according to the two natures, the proper Son of God according to his divine, and the adopted Son of God according to his human nature.[1] He likewise supposed, as did Theodore, a progressive revelation of the deity, in the human nature associated with it, up to the time of Christ's resurrection.[2] He conceived of Christ, in his temptations and sufferings, as a man left to himself, so that by his efforts, his obedience, his merits, his constancy, he achieved for himself that higher state which began with his resurrection.[3] He also maintained with Theodore, that omniscience was not to be ascribed to our Saviour as man, and that the ignorance which he professed with respect to the time of the final judgment was to be understood in the literal sense.

If we might believe, then, that account which represents Leporius to have been a Pelagian, it might very easily be explained how he must have evolved his doctrine concerning the nature of Christ out of his doctrine concerning man. But the singularity in this case would be, that the bishops of Carthage, who looked upon the opposition to everything Pelagian as so important, should have required no recantation from Leporius on these points. We might from this circumstance be led to conjecture, that the Pelagianism with which he was charged had been imputed to him only by inference. Or we must suppose that two epochs are to be assumed in the history of the progress of Leporius in forming his doctrinal system, which Cassian and Gennadius have neglected to notice; — the first, when he was a Pelagian; next, when he was induced to subscribe the circular letter of Zosimus, and no longer appeared as so open an advocate of Pelagianism. But his Pelagianism, which had been merely suppressed, had subsequently led him to the peculiar doctrines which he maintained concerning the person of Christ, which he supposed he might teach, without infringing on the doctrines of the church, since, in fact, previous to the outbreak of the Nestorian controversies, a great deal on this subject was still vague and undefined.

Among the zealous defenders of the Pelagian doctrines, deserves to be particularly mentioned, Annianus, deacon of the church at Celeda, (perhaps in Italy.[4]) By the decision of Zosimus, already mentioned, he was most probably obliged to resign his spiritual charge; but he continued to exert an active influence in favor of the principles of the persecuted party, to which he gloried in belonging.[5] He believed that he was contending for the cause of morality, which, by the doctrines of the Traducianists, was exposed to the utmost peril,[6] — and

[1] Filius Dei proprius — et adoptivus.

[2] As may be gathered from the antithesis in the recantation: Nec quasi per gradus et tempora proficientem in Deum, alterius status ante resurrectionem, alterius post resurrectionem fuisse credamus.

[3] Laborem, devotionem, meritum, fidem.

[4] See Hieronym. ep. 81 ad Alypium et Augustinum, where he is cited as a friend of Pelagius and author of a violent controversial tract.

[5] In the dedication to Orontius, one of the deposed Pelagian bishops: Inter has, quas pro fidei vobiscum amore perpetimur tentationum procellas.

[6] Per occasionem quarundam nimis diffi-

for the cause of moral freedom, the recognition of which distinguished Christianity from Paganism, where sin was palliated by charging it on natural necessity and fate.[1] Believing that he found in the prevailingly moral interest evinced by Chrysostom, in the manner in which he attacked the excuses plead by moral remissness, in the manner in which he stood up in defence of free-will along with grace,[2] a great deal which, being akin to his own views, admitted also of being opposed to the principles of the Traducianists and the new Manicheans,[3] he translated the Homilies of Chrysostom on the gospel of Matthew,[4] and his Homilies in praise of the apostle Paul, into Latin; and accompanied these translations with dedications to his Pelagian friends, in which he very plainly avowed his own principles.[5]

Various offshoots from the Pelagian party continued to propagate themselves in Italy, down to the middle of the fifth century; and the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, had occasion once more to remind the bishops, that no ecclesiastic belonging to the Pelagian party could be reädmitted to the communion of the church without a very distinct recantation, and without expressly subscribing all the decisions of the church in opposition to its doctrines. As late as the close of the fifth century, an aged bishop named Seneca appeared in Italy, who ventured publicly to defend doctrines akin to Pelagianism, and, in fact, to excommunicate a presbyter, who contradicted them. It is impossible, however, from the letter, written in passion, which the Roman bishop Gelasius issued against him, to determine with certainty whether he really stood in any outward connection with the Pelagian party, or whether perhaps, as an unlearned man, and (if what Gelasius says is true) without knowing anything about Pelagius, while supposing himself to be perfectly orthodox, he had been forced, in opposing the doctrine of original sin in its stiffest form, and the doctrine of the damnation of infants, so revolting to all sound feelings, to hazard many assertions closely bordering on Pelagianism.[6]

If now we glance back at the result of these disputes in the Western church, it certainly cannot be denied, that as well here as in the doctrinal controversies of the Oriental church, it was no free development of the opposite sides which had brought about that result; but Pelagianism had succumbed to an outward force, which hindered it from freely expressing itself. At the same time, however, a great difference is manifest between the course of these disputes, and of those in the Oriental church. It was not the shifts and intrigues of a theological party, which, mixing up secular and spiritual interests, contrived to connect

cilium quæstionum ædificationi morum atque ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ satis insolenter obstrepitur.

[1] Ingenitæ nobis a Deo libertatis decus, cujus confessio præcipuum inter nos gentilesque discrimen est.

[2] See below, the development of his system.

[3] Non enim est in alterutro (doctrine concerning grace or free-will) aut incautus aut nimius; sed in utroque moderatus. Pro evangelica perfectione nobiscum pugnare videtur. Videtur non tam præsentes informasse discipulos, quam nobis contra veræ fidei oppugnationem auxilia præparasse.

[4] Only his translation of eight homilies has come down to our times.

[5] See opp. Chysostomi ed. Montfaucon. T. II. et T. VII.

[6] See the documents in the appendix to the tenth volume of the Benedictine edition of Augustin.

itself with the court; but it was the superior intellect of an individual, actuated solely by zeal for what he considered to be sacred truth, which, controlling the minds around it, succeeded by their means to make the civil power subservient to his own convictions. And although a few men of independent minds were obliged to yield to force and to numbers, yet the doctrine, which in this case gained the victory, was not, as so frequently happened in the Oriental church, a doctrine forced upon the natural development of the church by the secular power, and therefore to be followed at some subsequent period by a violent reäction; but that doctrine conquered which had on its side the voice of the universal Christian consciousness, since this declared itself against the Pelagian tendency; — the doctrine conquered which found a ready point of union in the whole life and experience of the church, as expressed in its prayers and in all its liturgical forms. Hence also it followed, that although Pelagianism had been conquered, rather by suppression than by free evolution, yet there was no violent reäction on this side. But, for this very reason, the system of Augustin, as will hereafter appear, could not so easily succeed in establishing its claims to validity on another side of it, where this system itself came in collision with a higher inward power, with a conviction hitherto dominant in the great majority of minds, and which in fact struck its roots in the depths of the Christian life and consciousness.

We will, then, in the first place, before proceeding farther to develope the history, bring more distinctly to view what has just been stated, by contemplating more nearly the inner relation to each other of the conflicting views which here present themselves, and the manner in which the conflict was carried on between them. And first, in respect to the importance of the disputed questions of which we here speak, in their bearing on the Christian system of faith; Pelagius, it is true, and especially Cœlestius,[1] sought to lower the importance of the points in dispute, as if all differences here might be reduced to mere diversities of speculative opinion, which had nothing to do with faith. But to this course they were led by their relation to the dominant party in the church; since for the present their only anxiety was that they might be allowed freely to express their own peculiar principles, as others were allowed to express the opposite ones. For a different course was pursued by the ardent and untrammelled bishop Julian of Eclanum, who, after being spurned from the dominant church, had no further cause to seek after a reconciliation of differences. He denounces[2] in the strongest terms, those of his party who, in yielding from outward motives to the party in power, consoled themselves with the reflection,[3] that this dispute had nothing to do with the essentials of faith, but related merely to obscure questions in which faith was but slightly concerned. He maintained, on the contrary, that the highest object of Christian faith itself, the doctrine concerning God, was essentially con-

[1] See above, his trial at Carthage, and his letter to the Roman bishop. Pp. 581, 588.

[2] Opus imperfectum Augustini contra Julianum, l. V. c. 2 et seq. and l. VI. c. 1.

[3] Ejusmodi opinionem hactenus super nostro fuisse certamine, ut ad quæstionem involutam magis quam ad summam spectare fidei crederetur.

cerned here ; for the Traducianists[1] and the Catholics did not agree even in their doctrine concerning God. The God of the Traducianists was not the God of the gospel ; for since they taught that human nature is, from the birth upwards, tainted with sin, and since they declared concupiscence itself to be sin, they denied either that God is the creator of man's nature, and made Satan its author, and consequently fell into Manicheism, or they made God himself to be the author of sin ; and in teaching that God was a being who punished unavoidable sin, and who arbitrarily assigned the destinies of woe or of bliss, they impinged upon his moral attributes of holiness and justice. On the other side, Augustin did not concede to Cœlestius, that this dispute was so unimportant in its bearing on doctrines ; for as the acknowledgment of the doctrine of a Redeemer and a redemption, in which consisted the essence of Christianity, presupposed the acknowledgment of a need of redemption, hence this doctrine was closely connected with the doctrine of the corruption of man's nature, and accordingly with the doctrine of the first sin and its consequences ; and the former fundamental doctrine, without this presupposition, lost its significance. On the contrast, therefore, between Adam and Christ, rested the essence of Christianity.[2] Among the Pelagians, accordingly, the predominant polemical interest was the interest in behalf of the universal idea of a religious moral sense, in a form, however, in which it could not have developed itself without Christianity ; while, with Augustin, the predominant interest was in behalf of that which constitutes the more peculiar essence of the Christian consciousness.

As, in this controversy, several matters, standing closely connected together in the Christian system of faith, were brought into the discussion, the question now forces itself upon us, whether perhaps all the individual differences which here presented themselves to view might not be reduced to one fundamental difference in the mode of religious apprehension, from which, as the original source, all the others proceeded. But if, in examining doctrinal controversies generally, we should ourselves distinguish what is set forth with clear consciousness by the contending parties as the fundamental point of difference, and the still more general and more recondite opposition, to which this fundamental difference admits of being reduced, though the contending parties, who have not traced the opposition to its ultimate grounds, are not conscious of any such thing, — it is of the more importance to make a distinction in the present case, because the convictions of those who defended the Pelagian doctrines had grown out of a practical interest, while they stood on the common ground of a system which had been handed down to them, and against which they had no intention whatever to contend. Furthermore, we must distinguish what is original and what derived in the genetic development out of the life within, out of the Christian

[1] As he denominated the defenders of the doctrine of original sin, accusing them of maintaining that sin was propagated by generation, the propagatio peccati per traducem.

[2] In causa duorum hominum, quorum per unum venumdati sumus sub peccato, per alterum redimimur a peccatis, proprie fides Christiana consistit. Augustin. de peccato originali, § 28.

consciousness, and what stands in the same relation of original and derived in the speculative conceptions of the understanding.

If we are contented to receive as true what was constantly expressed with clear consciousness by both the parties themselves, it must seem that the dispute properly started from the different modes of contemplating human nature in its present condition, or more particularly, from different notions with regard to the relation in which the moral condition of the later race stands to the sin of the first man; for everything else that came into the discussion, the different notions respecting man's need of help, respecting the nature of the redemption, respecting the work of Christ and the operation of Christianity, respecting the object and the effects of baptism,— all this was closely connected with the fundamental difference above mentioned. Augustin, in fact, was continually falling back upon the position, that man found himself in a state of corruption; and, on the other hand, this was the point to which the denial of the Pelagians particularly referred. Moreover, in the development of the religious consciousness, this will constitute the most original and the most important difference of all, namely, in what relation man places himself to God and Christ, whether in the relation of one who needs help and redemption, or not; and in what degree of strength this consciousness manifests itself.

At the same time, however, we meet with many disputed points which do not admit of being thus traced back to this fundamental difference. On the contrary, differences of the two systems in individual points are to be be met with, from which *that very disputed point itself* which was prominently set forth by the *disputants* as the most *universal of all*, admits of being derived.

Accordingly we find here, in the first place, a different mode of apprehending *one conception* of great importance on account of its bearing on the system of religion and morals, which did not proceed from the different modes of apprehending the present state of human nature, but rather lay at the foundation of these different views themselves. We mean the different ways of apprehending the doctrine concerning the freedom of the human will. In the Pelagian system, moral freedom is apprehended as a freedom of choice; as the faculty of deciding at each moment alike between good and evil; of choosing one of the two for its determinations. This is the fruitful root, which, according to the different bent of the will, produces good or evil.[1] On the other hand, Augustin says, such an indifference, such an equipendency between evil and good, from whence man is able at each moment alike to decide in favor of the one or the other,[2] is a thing utterly inconceivable. Man

[1] The words of Pelagius in the first book of his work de libero arbitrio: Habemus possibilitatem utriusque partis a Deo insitam, velut quandam, ut ita dicam, radicem fructiferam, quæ ex voluntate hominis diversa gignat, et quæ possit ad proprii cultoris arbitrium vel nitere flore virtutum vel sentibus horrere vitiorum. Augustin. de gratia Christi contra Pelagium et Cœlestium, § 19. With this, Julian agrees in several passages cited by Augustin. Opus imperfectum, l. V. et VI.

[2] As Augustin aptly describes it in his work against Julian: Libra tua, quam conaris ex utraque parte per æqualia momenta suspendere, ut voluntas quantum est ad malum, tantum etiam sit ad bonum libera. Opus imperfectum, c. Julian. l. III. c. 117.

is already determined within himself by his disposition, before he proceeds to act. Evil and good cannot spring from the same root. The good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor the evil tree good fruit. The root from which all good proceeds is love to God; the root of all evil is love to self. According as man is predominantly actuated by love to God, or love to himself, he brings to pass that which is good or that which is evil.[1] That definition of free-will, he maintains, cannot apply to God nor to holy beings.[2] It, in fact, presupposes a corruption of the moral powers, and loses its applicability the more in proportion as man advances farther in moral development, in proportion as he approaches to true freedom. At the highest point of moral advancement, freedom and necessity meet together;[3] the rational being acts with freedom, in determining himself according to the inward law of his moral nature. Since evil is that which is at variance with the original essence of the rational creature; that which is not grounded in nature, but which contradicts nature; it follows that that which, in the Pelagian definition, is regarded as the characteristic mark of moral freedom, already presupposes a corruption of the moral nature, as sin exercises over it a power of attraction which it ought not to exercise.

With this difference was connected still other important differences. Proceeding on the above-stated more ideal and material[4] conception of freedom, Augustin must believe that he found in the actual appearance of human nature an opposition to the freedom which was so apprehended, inasmuch as this true conception of freedom is in this case nowhere applicable. Man uniformly finds himself in a state contradicting this freedom, in a condition of bondage to sin. Thus this determinate conception of freedom leads Augustin to the presupposition of a corruption of human nature, and of an original moral condition which preceded it. And cohering also with this is the thought, that, when once this original freedom had been disturbed by the first freely chosen aberration from the law of the original nature, a state of bondage followed after the state of freedom. As human nature, evolving itself in conformity with its condition by nature, surrendering itself to the godlike, becomes continually more confirmed and established in true freedom; so, in surrendering itself to sin, it becomes continually more involved in the bondage of sin, to which Augustin frequently applies the words of Christ: "He who commits sin is the servant of sin." Evil is its own punishment, as goodness is its own reward. On the other hand, Pelagius and his adherents found no cause, inasmuch as they proceeded on that more formal and empirical conception of freedom, to suppose any corruption of the moral nature, and any different original condition of it. With the essence of freedom, the possibility of evil as well as of good is for them, in and of itself, already supposed. This possibility belongs to the essence of human nature, and is hence something inalienable. The question, Whence comes sin? is therefore not to be entertained. That man who, having it at each moment

[1] Comp. Augustin. l. c. de gratia Christi. Aliud est caritas, radix bonorum, aliud cupiditas, radix malorum; tantumque inter se differunt, quantum virtus et vitium.

[2] C. Julian. imperfect. l. VI. c. 10.

[3] The beata necessitas boni, as opposed to the misera necessitas mali.

[4] As distinguished from "formal."

in his power to choose the good as well as the evil, chooses the evil, has no other cause for this than his momentary self-determination, else he would not be free. When, therefore, even the Pelagians were constrained by an outward authority to adopt the opinion of an original moral state, of a first man and of a first sin as a fact, yet it is clear that this opinion could stand in no inner connection with their anthropological system as a whole; that they, on the contrary, remained indifferent to it; for, according to their presupposition of moral freedom apprehended as above described, the moral condition of human nature could suffer no essential change: the same faculty of choice between good and evil continued still to exist.

In connection with this stands another doctrinal conclusion. Pelagius places human nature, furnished by God as its creator with the moral faculty, in the middle between good and evil; but Augustin considers human nature either as existing in its original state, in communion with the original source of goodness, freely serving it as its natural organ; or estranged from the higher power of goodness, whose organ human nature was destined to be, and enslaved by the foreign power of evil. The moral faculties of man point, according to Augustin, to the original fountain of good, from which alone all goodness can flow — to God, communion with whom is the supreme good of beings endowed with reason, and without whose communion nothing exists but evil. The following antithesis, therefore, presents itself: Life in communion with God, the divine life, the supremacy of goodness, nature subordinated to grace; and, on the other side, estrangement from God by a bent of will fallen from the supreme good, self-love, sin. The Pelagian idea of freedom, on the contrary, admits of no such divine principle of life, transforming and ennobling man's nature, nor of any systematically grounded opposition between nature and grace. God has provided human nature with all the capacities and powers requisite to the fulfilment of its destination, and so also with moral powers for the practical exercise of all goodness. This unchangeable faculty is the work of God alone. It belongs only to man, that he should by his will apply these powers bestowed on him by his Creator, and thereby become what God has destined him to be. The ability is from God; the act of willing and being, from man.[1]

But Augustin does not suppose, like Pelagius, that man, after having been once endowed by the Creator with reason and free-will, the capacities for the knowledge and practical exercise of goodness, was then wholly left to himself in the application of them; but he supposes man also, in this latter respect, to be still in absolute and constant dependence on God as the sole original source of all being, all truth and goodness. The capacities of the rational creature are not anything complete and self-sufficient by themselves, but only organs to receive, to appropriate, and to reveal what is communicated to them by fellowship with that absolute source of truth and goodness. Just as the eye

[1] Pelagius, quoted by Augustin de gratia Christi, c. IV. Primum illud, id esse posse, ad Deum proprie pertinet, qui illud creaturæ suæ contulit; duo vero reliqua, hoc est, velle et esse, ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt.

stands in a certain correlation to the sun, so reason stands in correlation to God.[1] By this principle he was necessarily led to conceive that *all* rational beings, and not man alone, are dependent on grace, (gratia, the inward revelation and communication of God, the community of the divine life,) in order to the attainment of their destined end. And it follows from this, that, according to Augustin, this dependence does not first proceed from the vitiation of man's moral nature, but was originally implanted in this, in like manner as in the nature of all the rational creatures of God. God is the absolute spirit, whose will is law — without whose fellowship, without whose support and assistance, no creaturely spirit, whether angel or man, can persevere in goodness, in the sound and healthful development of his essential being, which is akin to the divine. Had not such support and aid been bestowed on the angels and on the first man, their apostacy from God would have involved no guilt. They would have wanted the requisite means for persevering in the original state.[2] It was first to be made manifest, in the development of rational creatures, what the free-will was capable of doing by itself; in order that, if it should show itself worthy of such a reward, the higher power of grace might supervene, to ennoble rational creatures, and conduct them onward to their perfection. Thus the angels, forasmuch as they remained faithful by their free-will to the divine grace, attained to that higher measure of grace, by virtue of which they were made secure against ever falling — to the immutability of the divine life — to that fulness of love which admits no intrusion of the selfish principle. To the same dignity the first man would also have attained, had he fulfilled that condition, and remained true to God by the bent of his free-will.[3]

Thus we arrive here at a difference which is not to be traced to different notions respecting the present condition of human nature, but which precedes it; although this difference was made more prominent by the more speculative and systematic mind of Augustin, than it was by the Pelagians, who did not lay so deep the foundations of their theory; — a different view of man's relation to God in the original state itself, inasmuch as man, even in this state, was dependant on God's grace, which he could appropriate with his own free-will, and through

[1] E. g. Augustin's words: Sicut corporis oculus non adjuvatur a luce, ut ab eadem luce clausus aversusque discedat, ut autem videat, adjuvatur ab ea, neque hoc omnino, nisi illa adjuverit, potest; ita Deus, qui lux est hominis interioris, adjuvat nostræ mentis obtutum, ut non secundum nostram sed secundum ejus justitiam boni aliquid operemur. De peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. II. § 5.

[2] Si hoc adjutorium vel angelo vel homini, cum primum facti sunt, defuisset, quoniam non talis natura facta erat, ut sine divino adjutorio posset manere si vellet, non utique sua culpa cecedissent, adjutorium quippe defuisset, sine quo manere non possent. Augustin. de correptione et gratia, § 32.

[3] Deum sic ordinasse angelorum et hominum vitam, ut in ea prius ostenderet, quid posset eorum liberum arbitrium, deinde quid posset suæ gratiæ beneficium. The end which the good angels attained by the persevering bent of their will — donec istam summæ beatitudinis plenitudinem tanquam præmium ipsius permansionis acciperent, id est, ut magna per Spiritum Sanctum data abundantia caritatis Dei, cadere ulterius omnino non possent, et hoc de se certissime nossent. And of the first man: In quo statu recto et sine vitio, si per ipsum liberum arbitrium manere voluisset, profecto sine ullo mortis et infelicitatis experimento acciperet illam merito hujus permansionis beatitudinis plenitudinem. L. c. § 27, 28.

which alone he could fulfil all goodness.[1] The different way in which the present state of human nature was regarded, originated in a different mode of apprehending the relation of the rational creature to God; of the natural to the supernatural. While the rigid prosecution of the Pelagian principles to their consequences left no foothold whatever for the recognition of anything supernatural; in the system of Augustin, on the contrary, the point of union for the supernatural element is given from the outset. According to his conception, such is the nature of the rational spirit, that it can find nowhere, but in surrendering itself to a supernatural, godlike element, its true life, the realization of its destiny. And his views in this respect correspond to that which was expressed by the older church-teachers concerning the relation of the image of God to likeness with God. Now from these views, as its foundation, resulted the doctrine of Augustin, that since man, by his free-will, became estranged from God, the original fountain of all good, this free-will, left to itself, was now only active to sin; and that he needed a new supervenient grace, in order to be brought back to goodness; so that it was at this point the question arose which came into discussion in the dispute between the two parties.

But we may reduce this difference again still farther back to a difference in the mode of apprehending the relation of the creation to the Creator, although this difference did not actually come into discussion in the controversy. Pelagianism was based on the view, that when God had once created the world, and provided it with all the powers requisite for its preservation and development, he permitted it to go on with the powers bestowed on it, and according to the laws implanted in it; so that the continuous operation of the divine agency was with reference only to the preservation of the powers and capacities, but not to any *concursus* in order to their development and exercise. Augustin, on the other hand, conceives God's agency of preservation as a continual creation, and the life and activity of the creatures, collectively and individually, as depending on the almighty and omnipresent agency of God, and conditioned thereon; standing in absolute dependence upon it at each moment.[2]

Although this difference was not generally brought to notice and dwelt upon in this controversy, yet Jerome perceived that the whole matter was to be reduced to this; and he laid it as a charge against the Pelagians, that they denied the absolute dependence of the creature on the Creator; that they placed man on a level with God by this independence which they attributed to him in reference to his actions; and opposed to them the words of Christ in John 5: 17, respecting God's agency in the creation, which is never at rest, but always

[1] Augustin. de corruptione et gratia, § 31. Habuit primus homo gratiam, in qua si permanere vellet, nunquam malus esset, et sine qua etiam cum libero arbitrio bonus esse non posset. Liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit; ad bonum autem parum est, nisi adjuvetur ab omnipotenti bono.

[2] E. g. Augustin's words: Deus, cujus occulta potentia cuncta penetrans incontaminabili præsentia facit esse quicquid aliquo modo est, in quantumcunque est, quia nisi faciente illo non tale vel tale esset; sed prorsus esse non posset. De civitate Dei, l. XIII. c. 26.

putting forth.[1] And, in a certain sense, it may unquestionably be affirmed, that not only in its development under the form of conceptions, this difference is the most original one, but that we have also presented here the most original, fundamental difference, as it respects the position of the religious consciousness; for the shape which the religious consciousness takes in relation to God as Redeemer, certainly presupposes the shape which the same consciousness takes in relation to God as Creator. The general consciousness of absolute dependence on God is the most original of all, and the whole diversity of religious life depends ultimately on the fact how that consciousness has unfolded and shaped itself.

This difference in fundamental ideas, if it was expressed and applied with clear consciousness, must have had for its consequence an important difference in the views entertained respecting the progress of humanity, and respecting the nature of revelation and redemption; but it was very far from being the case, that Pelagius, Cœlestius, or Julian, were distinctly and fully conscious to themselves of the principles lying at the basis of their tenets, and of all the consequences which flowed from them. They came to their principles, not by impartial reflection, proceeding solely from a scientific interest, on the principles of the system of faith; but by a polemic interest in behalf of practical Christianity; and they applied these principles only to just the extent which this interest called for, as the following history will more fully show.

From what has been said, it follows that the views entertained by Augustin and by the Pelagians respecting the state of the first man, the character of the first sin and its consequences, must have widely differed from each other, although both parties professed to derive their views from the same source of information — the narrative in Genesis; and, moreover, both parties agreed with each other in their principles of interpretation, and in the mode of applying these principles, and more particularly in the literal method of exposition. Such an opposition as is supposed in the system of Augustin between the original nature of the first man while as yet disturbed by no moral schism, and the nature of his posterity involved in this schism, could not appear in the Pelagian system; for, according to the latter, human

[1] Hieronymus in epistola ad Ctesiphontem. Istiusmodi homines per liberum arbitrium non homines propriæ voluntatis, sed Dei potentiæ, factos se esse jactitant, qui nullius ope indigent. Sciamus nos nihil esse, nisi quod donavit, in nobis ipse servaverit. Joh. 5: 17. Non mihi sufficit, quod semel donavit, nisi semper donaverit. Audite, quæso, audite sacrilegum, (now if the succeeding clause was really said of the Pelagians, it would follow, that even the Pelagians themselves had brought this disputed point more clearly to consciousness:) Si voluero curvare digitum, movere manum, sedere, stare, etc.; semper mihi auxilium Dei necessarium erit? This antithesis is also distinctly set forth by Orosius: Non in solo naturali bono generaliter universis unam gratiam tributam; sed speciatim quotidie per tempora, per dies, per momenta, per *atomas* et cunctis et singulis ministrari. Dicit enim scriptura, "qui facit solem suum oriri super bonos et malos." At tu forte respondes: *Ordinem suum composita bene natura custodit; ac per hoc Deus, elementariis semel cursibus constitutis, facit inde quæ facit.* Quid ergo de illa sententiæ parte, quæ sequitur, opinaris? "Dat pluviam super justos et injustos." Utique qui dat, cum vult dat, et ubi vult dat, vel dispensando dispositam constitutionem, vel effundendo propriam largitatem. — See Orosii apologia de arbitrii libertate, ed. Havercamp. p. 607. Compare also the language of the Roman bishop Innocent cited above, p. 587.

nature has, in fact, in its spiritual and moral capacities, ever continued to be the same. All men find themselves, till they have personally sinned, in the same innocence in which Adam lived before the first transgression. The Pelagians, like the older, particularly the Oriental church-teachers, with whom they, in fact, more especially coincided, compare the state of the first man with that of an innocent, inexperienced child; only with this difference, that, as a thing necessary in order to his preservation, his spiritual and corporeal powers were already unfolded to a certain extent. From this, the Pelagian Julian would also explain the first transgression, and — as the interest of his system required, in order to be able to represent the supposition of such mischievous consequences of it to entire humanity as the more untenable — would make it to appear an altogether trivial matter, the disobedience of a thoughtless child, easily exposed to be carried away by the allurements of sense. God gave the first man a command, for the purpose of bringing him to a consciousness of his moral capacities and of his freedom. This command was a simple one, as the powers of the infantile age demanded: he required of him a proof of childlike obedience.[1] But inexperienced and thoughtless, as he had not yet learned to fear, nor seen any example of virtue,[2] he allowed himself to be enticed by the agreeable aspect of the forbidden fruit, and to be determined by the persuasion of the woman. This excitement of concupiscence was, in itself considered, nothing wrong: it belongs to man's sensuous nature, which he has in common with the brutes, and it moreover proceeds from the Creator himself.[3] It was only the act of allowing the will to be led wrong, and, in compliance with the solicitations of sense, transgressing the divine command, which is to be called sin. Augustin, on the other hand, conceived that there was this great difference between the state of the first man, and all that followed him, that he lived in undisturbed communion with God, for which he was destined; that, by this circumstance, all the powers of his nature were enhanced; the higher and the lower working together in perfect harmony. The human body was not, it is true, as yet equal to the glorified body which we are to receive after the resurrection; but, inasmuch as no schism as yet existed in human nature, it was, without resistance, the subservient organ of the soul, governed and directed by the Spirit of God; and man, if he had remained true to the divine will, would have passed immediately, without the violent transition of death, to a higher, unchangeable, and imperishable existence. Thus, according to the views of Augustin, the importance of the first transgression did not lie in the outward character of the act, in itself considered, nor in the kind of object to which it referred. Augustin, as a moral teacher, generally possessed this great merit, as we have already remarked on other occasions, that he took his stand against the quantitative estimation which contradicts the true standard of morality, and gave prominence rather to the essential thing of the disposition. The

[1] Interdictu unius pomuli testimonium devotionis expetitur.

[2] Rudis, imperitus, incautus, sine experimento timoris, sine exemplo justitiæ.

[3] Contr. Julian. opus imperfect. IV. 38.

magnitude of the guilt consisted precisely in this, that man, when he was not as yet living in the moral bondage under which his posterity suffer, transgressed with free-will the law of God. The explanation of the fact from the solicitations of sense, Augustin could not admit. Such a temptation implied already the inward corruption: such a conflict between the flesh and the spirit could not arise in that seat of peace. The will of man, subordinated to the divine will, kept even the senses in obedience as organs subservient to the soul. It was only after man, by the inward act, by the opposition of self-love, of self-will against the divine will, had fallen from the latter,— and so, in consequence of this, the cause of all other discord had made its appearance,— that the seductions of sense could lead him astray to transgression of the divine law.[1] Hence it was that the discord now extended itself into all parts of human nature; hence all physical and moral evils, and death as the punishment of sin. All this was transmitted from the first man to his posterity. As, in the first man, the love of self, which appeared in opposition to the divine will, is the source and principle of all sin — so is it also in the case of the whole race. First from this proceeds concupiscence, striving contrary to the law of reason; and on account of this conflict, which the Pelagians regarded as something inseparable from the human organism, and therefore, in itself considered, excusable, Augustin called it sinful. It was not sense, in itself considered, but the power which sensuous desires, of whatever kind, exercised over the spirit of man, destined for a higher kind of life, the conflict between the sensual and the spiritual, which appeared to him to be a consequence of that original schism, and as something sinful — it was this that he understood under the term "concupiscence."[2] But his elevated mind, longing after the free life of the spirit, was also inclined to see in every sensual desire affecting the man, in so far as it reäcted upon the soul, disturbing and checking it in its pure spiritual life, a mark of that self-procured bondage.[3] As Augustin started from the ideal of a reason ruling over sense, and, in everything that stood opposed to this natural supremacy, beheld a manifestation and a result of that internal schism, it was accordingly an unjust charge laid against him by the Pelagians, when they accused him of holding, like a Manichean, that the flesh and its affections are sinful in themselves, and proceed from an evil principle. To Julian, who derived the power of the sinful desires from nature, which man had in common with the brutes, Augustin replied, that man, in the following respect, could not be compared with the brutes: in the case of the latter, there could be no conflict between the flesh and spirit; but man was bound to govern his sensuous nature by the spirit. That, through the power of his sensuous impulses not dependent on his reasonable will, he had come to be

[1] In paradiso ab animo cœpit elatio, et ad præceptum transgrediendum inde consensio. Augustin. c. Julian. l. V. § 17.

[2] Not the sentiendi vivacitas, but the libido sentiendi, quæ nos ad sentiendum, sive consentientes mente sive repugnantes, appetitu carnalis voluptatis impellit, c. Julian. l. IV. § 66.

[3] Quis autem mente sobrius non mallet, si fieri posset, sine ulla mordaci voluptate carnali, vel arida sumere alimenta, vel humida, sicut sumimus hæc aëria?

on a level with the brutes, is the very consequence of that first schism between the human and the divine will.[1]

But now Augustin supposed, not only that this bondage under the principle of sin, by which sin is its own punishment, was transmitted by the progenitor of the human race to his posterity; but also that the first transgression, as an act, was to be imputed to the whole human race, — that the guilt and the penalty[2] were propagated from one to all. This participation of all in Adam's transgression, Augustin made clear to his own mind in this way: Adam was the representative of the whole race, and bore in himself the entire human nature and kind in the germ, since it was from him it unfolded itself.[3] And this theory would easily blend with Augustin's speculative form of thought, as he had appropriated to himself the Platonico-Aristotelean Realism in the doctrine of general conceptions, and conceived of general conceptions as the original types of the kind realized in individual things. Furthermore, his slight acquaintance with the Greek language, and his habit of reading the holy scriptures in the Latin translation, led him to find a confirmation of his theory in a falsely translated passage of the epistle to the Romans, 5 : 12.[4] It may indeed be a question, whether, even if he had had access to the New Testament in the original language, his doctrinal prejudices would not have deprived him of the sense to discern the simple meaning of that passage. But, at all events, the influence of Augustin's peculiar philosophical form of thought, as well as the influence of his narrow principles of exegesis, on the formation of this doctrine, should not be rated too high; for his whole mode of apprehending the matter had a still deeper ground in his Christian consciousness.

Pelagius and his followers, on the other hand, denied all those physical and moral consequences of the transgression of the first man on the entire race, which had been asserted by Augustin. The imputation of another's guilt conflicts with the justice of God; the propagation of guilt conflicts with the idea of sin and of free-will; sin is not a thing of nature, but only self-determination of the free-will; hence it cannot be transmitted from one to another. "Even the individual," says Julian, "cannot, by means of a simple transgression, suffer a change in his moral nature; he retains the same freedom of the will; the past sin no longer injured the first man, when he had repented of it. How, then, was it possible that the entire human nature should be corrupted thereby? The proposition of Augustin, that sin punished itself by moral bondage, that sinfulness was at one and the same time the fountain of other sins and the penalty of sin, this proposition was so far from being intelligible to Julian, that he looked upon it as blasphemy, — as if God punished sin, by plunging men into still other sins.[5] The

[1] Fatere secundum Christianam fidem, etiam istam esse hominis pœnam, quod comparatus est pecoribus insensatis et similis factus est iis. Carnis concupiscentis homini est pœna, non bestiæ, in qua nunquam caro adversus spiritum concupiscit. Opus imperfect. c. Julian. IV. 38.

[2] Propagatio reatus et pœnæ.

[3] E. g. de peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. III. c. 7. In Adam omnes tunc peccaverunt, quando in ejus natura, illa insita vi, qua eos gignere poterat, adhuc omnes ille unus fuerunt.

[4] The phrase, in quo omnes peccaverunt, where he refers the in quo to Adam.

[5] See c. Julian. op. imperfect. IV. c. 5.

Pelagians would only admit that Adam had injured his posterity by his example; and in this way they explained all those passages in the New Testament which speak of a connection between the first transgression and the sins of the entire race.[1] But, as it regards physical evils and death, Pelagius and his followers, especially Julian, who explained and unfolded this view, endeavored to show, that all this had from the beginning been implanted by the Creator in the essence of man's physical organization, and that, by the destination and historic development of human nature, it could not be otherwise. Pelagius understood those passages in the epistle to the Romans which speak of death as the punishment of sin, as referring to spiritual death.[2]

The question concerning the propagation of a sinful nature would easily connect itself with the question which had been so much discussed since the times of Tertullian and Origen, respecting the origin and propagation of souls. We have seen already how Cœlestius availed himself of this connection for the purpose of removing both the questions from the whole province of matters pertaining to the interest of faith and of church doctrine, and to place them in the category of subjects where a difference of opinion might exist without infringing on the unity of faith. On the other hand, Augustin sought, in this case, to separate that which was important as doctrine, that which was securely grounded in the teachings of sacred scripture and in the connected system of Christian truth, from that which was rather matter of speculation, and on which scripture gives no certain decision. He was not to be moved from the conviction that sin and guilt had spread from the first man to all, and he was equally sure that every scheme which conflicted with this presupposition could not be otherwise than false. But yet he did not venture to decide, whether *Creationism* or *Traducianism* was to be adopted as the true theory; although he was well aware what advantages the latter theory would give to his own system, and although this same theory, since the time of Tertullian, had by many in the Western

The deep passage in Rom. I. 28, concerning the action and reäction of moral and intellectual blindness, which Augustin had adduced in proof of his proposition, this passage Julian was so little prepared to understand, that he did not hesitate to explain away the whole depth of the thought by the supposition of a hyperbolical metonymy. To express his abhorrence of such sins, the apostle had said, as it were: Non tam reos quam damnatos sibi tales videri. Yet Augustin was enabled to show Julian, that the latter himself had been obliged to say something similar to the thought, which in another form he found so revolting, quoting the words of Julian: Justissime enim sibi bonus homo et malus committitur, ut et bonus se fruatur et malus se ipse patiatur. C. Julian. l. V. § 35.

[1] It had been easy for Julian to refute Augustin's explanation of the ἐφ ᾧ, and to show that it should be understood in the sense of propter quod; but it had been equally easy for Augustin to expose the idleness of that explanation of the whole sense, by which it was made to refer simply to the example given by Adam. C. Julian. l. VI. § 75. The apostle — Julian supposed — mentioned Adam alone, and not Adam and Eve together, though both had sinned, on purpose that men might have their minds directed solely to the effect of a given example, and not to a propagation of sin by generation. C. Julian. op. imperfect. II. 56.

[2] On Rom. 5: 12, Pelagius says: Nunc apostolus mortem animæ significat, quia Adam prævaricans mortuus est, sicut et propheta dicit: Anima quæ peccat, ipsa morietur. Transivit enim et in omnes homines, qui naturalem legem prævaricati sunt. How important he considered it, that the matter should be so understood appears from a remark on Rom. 8: 12: Manifeste nunc ostendit, quia non de communi et naturali morte superius fecerit mentionem.

church been combined with the doctrine of the propagation of a sinful nature. Probably he was deterred, by the apprehension lest he might fall with Tertullian into sensuous representations of the nature of the soul, from deciding in favor of a theory which in other respects must have been so inviting to him. On the other hand, he doubtless perceived also the difficulties which Creationism left unexplained in his system of faith. The reason which Jerome advanced in favor of this view, drawn from the never-resting but continually operating creative agency of God, according to John 5 : 17,[1] appeared to him to be no sufficient evidence ; for he could allege, on the contrary, that, in the case of all propagation in nature, the continual creative agency of God was, in like manner, presupposed.[2] Sacred scripture appeared to him to furnish a certain warrant for no particular scheme whatever ; and accordingly he ended with confessing his ignorance — a confession which, to a man of his speculative intellect, must assuredly be an instance of great self-denial. "Where scripture gives no certain testimony," he argued, "human presumption must beware how it decides either in favor of one side or the other. If it were necessary for man's salvation to know anything on these points, the scripture would be more explicit on them."[3]

Although the Pelagians denied that there was any such thing as hereditary corruption of human nature, yet they agreed with Augustin in recognizing the maxim of experience, that sin in humanity continually acquired greater dominion ; they adopted the opinion of a progressive deterioration of mankind ; and upon this they argued the necessity of counteracting influences by the various revelations of God, and the various means of grace which God had employed. This deterioration they explained, as in the case of humanity at large, so in the case of individual men, from the force of bad customs, by means of which, evil had become a second nature.[4] Yet, at the same time, since human nature comes into the world in its original purity, and no foreign principle dwells within it ; this phenomenon, of which experience testifies, is nothing but an accident. There may be exceptions from this general rule : persons, who by developing the powers of their moral nature by

[1] See Hieronymus contra errores Joannis Hierosolomytani, vol. IV. ed. Martianay, f. 310.

[2] De anima et ejus origine, l. I. § 26. Ipse quippe Deus dat, etiamsi de propagine dat.

[3] De peccatorum remissione, l. II. § 59. A young man in Mauretania Cæsariensis, Vincentius Victor, was displeased with this confession of ignorance on the part of so eminent a church-teacher as Augustin. He wrote against him a work, in which, professing with his limited understanding to comprehend everything, he uttered many absurd and obscure things; and he had the boldness to apply to Augustin the words of Ps. 48: 13, according to the Vulgate: Homo in honore positus non intellexit; comparatus est pecoribus insensatis et similis factus est illis. Augustin says to him, in the work which he composed in refutation of this production, de anima et ejus origine (l. I. § 26 :) Istum autem non ego vicissim, quasi rependens maledictum pro maledicto, pecoribus comparo; sed tanquam filium moneo, ut quod nescit se nescire fateatur, neque id quod nondum didicit, docere moliatur.

[4] Epistola ad Demetriadem, c. 8. Longa consuetudo vitiorum, quæ nos infecit a parvo paulatimque, per multos corrupit annos, et ita postea obligatos sibi et addictos tenet, ut vim quodammodo videatur habere naturæ. Accordingly they explained the passage concerning the law in the members (Rom. VII.) as referring to this influence of bad habits. See the words of Pelagius in Augustin. de gratia Christi, § 43, and of Julian in the opus imperfectum, l. I. c. 67.

virtue of their free-will, have lived to the end in perfect holiness. In his public declarations, (see above,) Pelagius, it is true, would never express himself distinctly on this point; but, in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, he says, remarking on the passage in 5 : 12, the word "all" is to be understood here as referring only to those who had sinned like Adam, and not to such as Abel, Isaac, and Jacob: the apostle says *all*, because, compared with the multitude of sinners, the few righteous amount to nothing. In his work on the free-will, he cited many examples of men and women from the Bible; and, availing himself of the already predominant superstitious veneration of Mary, he argued from her example, who was to be denominated sinless, that she must have been perfectly righteous.[1] In other times, he thought, when the number of mankind was already large, it would doubtless have been impossible to enumerate the sins of every individual; and we should not be authorized therefore to infer their non-existence, from their not being mentioned. But the case was different with the first beginning of the human race, when there were but four individuals in existence : and then the book of Genesis mentions the sins of three among the four ; but none of the fourth, namely, Abel. Hence it may be inferred that he was without sin. By this conclusion we should abide, and not assert what is not asserted in the sacred scriptures.[2] A way of reasoning quite characteristic of Pelagius!

True, according to what has been above remarked, the fundamental principle of Pelagianism would necessarily lead to the theory of a complete development of humanity in harmony with nature within the sphere of its laws, and to a denial of all interposition on the part of God; but Pelagius and his friends ever remained strangers to this further extension of their principles. Although the doctrine of God's supernatural communications had no such place in the Pelagian system as it had in the system of Augustin, by reason of the doctrines systematically unfolded by Augustin respecting the relation of the creature to the Creator, and respecting man's corruption ; yet, even in the Pelagian system, that doctrine found a point of attachment in the recognition of a moral degeneracy of human nature in general and in its idea, and of the truth that human nature, as a thing created, could and should arrive at a degree of completeness and perfection, beyond the measure of the capacities originally implanted in it by the Creator, by free manifestations of the divine love. True, the Pelagians made no such distinction and no such opposition between nature and grace as

[1] Augustin. de natura et gratia contra Pelagium, § 42. Quam dicit sine peccato confiteri necesse esse pietati. As, however, he could not prove from any declaration of scripture that those whom he named were to be represented as saints, he had recourse to the singular argument: De illis, quorum justitiæ meminit (scriptura sacra) et peccatorum sine dubio meminisset, si qua eos peccasse sensisset.

[2] Certe primo in tempore quatuor tantum homines fuisse referuntur: peccavit Eva, scriptura hoc prodidit; Adam quoque deliquit, eadem scriptura non tacuit; sed et Cain peccasse, ipsa æque scriptura testata est; quorum non modo peccata, verum etiam peccatorum indicat qualitatem. Quod si et Abel peccasset, et hoc sine dubio scriptura dixisset; sed non dixit, ergo nec ille peccavit, quin etiam justum ostendit. Credamus igitur quod legimus, et quod non legimus, nefas credamus adstruere. De natura et gratia, § 44.

Augustin did; and inasmuch as they did not hesitate to apply the latter term to designate *all* communications of the love of God, they moreover sometimes embraced together, under the general conception of "grace," all the moral and spiritual powers which God has conferred on human nature; but they did not, on this account, by any means deny that there were supernatural communications of the love of God, through which there had been bestowed on man's nature, what it never could have attained by means of the powers communicated to it by creation; and they applied the term "grace" to both, as well to God's gifts embraced under that connection, as to those that went beyond it. Thus they applied the notion grace to all the revelations of God in the Old and in the New Testament, in the law and in the gospel. Sometimes, too, they referred it solely to that which has been bestowed on mankind by Christ; as when Pelagius said, that the power of free-will is in all, Christians, Jews, and Pagans; but that in Christians alone it is upheld by grace.[1] They supposed, in reference to the above-mentioned counteracting influences of the divine means of salvation against the moral degeneracy of mankind, different stages of righteousness: first, the knowledge of God from reason and the law of right living, as it was written, not in letters, but on the heart — the stage of righteousness according to nature, (justitia ex natura;) next, the *revelation* of the positive law, designed to rekindle again the light of nature, which had been darkened by corruption — righteousness under the law (justitia sub lege.) But when the custom of sin became predominant, and the law was inadequate to remove the evil, then came Christ himself to heal the malady now become as it were desperate; and that, not by means of his disciples alone, but by his own intermediate interposition.[2]

The Pelagian Julian, in defending himself against the charge that, according to their opinion, the free-will sufficed for the worship of God, says that although God as the Creator of the world might have been known by natural reason, yet the latter was in no wise capable of arriving, by itself, at the knowledge of the mysteries of faith, as, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity, of the resurrection, and many other similar doctrines.[3]

Julian insisted only, that between the revelation of God in the sacred scriptures and the eternal truths which he had implanted in reason, there could be no contradiction; that in particular the sacred scriptures could contain nothing which conflicted with the ideas of a holy

[1] In omnibus est liberum arbitrium æqualiter per naturam; sed in solis Christianis juvatur a gratia. Augustin. de gratia Christi, § 33.

[2] De peccato originali, § 30.

[3] Opus imperfect. c. Julian. l. III. c. 106. It is well to notice the vague conception which Julian had of the cultus Dei, — how the ethical and dogmatic elements, the moral act and a theoretical knowledge of certain isolated maxims of faith, are here placed together, without a hint of any inward connection between the two, of any central point in the inner life, out of which both proceeded. As Augustin's conception of "grace" was alien from him, it was necessarily the case that the conception would also be foreign from him of any such higher unity as a divine principle of life bestows, in giving a new shape and direction to the entire religious and moral consciousness. Julian's words are: Cum enim cultus Dei multis intelligatur modis, et in custodia mandatorum, et in exsecratione vitiorum, et in ordine mysteriorum, et in profunditate dogmatum quæ de Trinitate, vel de resurrectione, multisque aliis similibus fides Christiana consequitur.

and just God, which was inseparable from the very sense of a divine being. From the sacred scriptures, therefore, nothing could be proved which was opposed to these universal and eternal ideas of reason; much rather, must all the difficulties and obscurities in single passages be so explained as to harmonize with these ideas of God, which flowed from the clear, collective contents of the sacred writings, and with those rational ideas.[1] Yet, in this fundamental principle, there was, in itself considered, no essential difference between Julian and Augustin; for the latter, too, would not admit that there was any real contradiction between faith and reason (fides et ratio.) At the same time, the Pelagians would not have consented to the principle of Augustin respecting the way in which faith precedes reason, and the latter is evolved out of the former.

Pelagius and his followers, in their doctrine concerning grace, were particularly strenuous only in maintaining its *opposition* to any theory *which impaired the freedom of the will.* They supposed all operations of grace to be conditioned on the bent of the free-will, and all means of grace to be effectual only according to the measure of the different tendencies of will; — they denied all constraining influences of grace on the free-will. Augustin, on the other hand, reckoned it as necessary to the conception of grace, that it should exclude all merit; and with this belonged, in his own view, all conditioning of grace on the different states of recipiency on the part of man. Just as soon as the whole was not referred to God's efficiency alone, just as soon as anything was made to depend on the different ways in which men stood related to the efficiency of God, the idea of grace is annihilated; for that which is bestowed on the ground of merit is no longer grace. *This* point of the opposition, namely, to any and every theory which impaired the free-will, was the only one which the Pelagians here brought prominently to view; but, in fact, their opposition doubtless carried them still further. They were in strictness really inclined, whenever they designated the supernatural by the term grace, to understand thereby simply outward revelations, communication of certain specific knowledge which transcended the powers of natural reason. More foreign to them was the notion of an internal communication of divine life, of an internal influence of God on man's will and consciousness. Although, among their manifold and vague declarations respecting the term grace, they also said a great deal which bordered on that last-

[1] In the first book of the opus imperfectum, Julian says: Nihil per legem Dei agi potest contra Deum legis auctorem. By this unum compendium, every assertion which conflicted with the recognition of God's holiness or justice could be at once set aside. Correct interpretation must serve to solve any such apparent contradiction; for wherever anything really contradictory appeared, it ought to be rejected as not belonging to the sacred scriptures. Ambigua quæque legis verba secundum hoc esse intelligenda, quod absolutissimis scripturæ s. auctoritatibus et insuperabili ratione firmatur. In another passage, Secundum id quod et ratio perspicua et aliorum locorum, in quibus non est ambiguitas, splendor aperuerit. In another place, l. II. c. 144, he makes the recognition of the scriptures as holy, to rest, not on outward tradition, but on their agreement with reason and with the essence of the Christian faith, and on the morality of their contents: Sanctas apostoli esse paginas confitemur, non ob aliud, nisi quia rationi, pietati, fidei congruentes erudiunt nos, et Deum credere inviolabilis æquitatis et præceptis ejus moderationem, prudentiam, justitiam vindicare.

mentioned character of the Augustinian conception, and although they never stood forth in a distinct and clearly conceived opposition to it; still, however, the thought may have floated before them, that, by the concession of any such internal influence of God whatever, the free-will of man would be impaired. Had they believed that they might really agree with Augustin in acknowledging this character without altering their difference in respect to the doctrine of free-will, it would in truth have been so natural for them distinctly to express this, as Augustin often attacked them on this very point, that, even though they acknowledged a supernatural revelation and communication of knowledge, we must suppose they denied *this peculiar characteristic*. But in such cases they always retreated under the cloud of a multitude of vague references to the means of grace, by which the free-will was upheld, for the purpose of showing, by this exuberance of expressions, how very far they were from denying "grace." "God upholds us," says Pelagius,[1] "by his instructions and his revelation; by opening the eyes of our heart; by revealing to us visions of the future life, that we may not be carried away with the things of the present; by discovering to us the arts of the adversary; by enlightening us by means of various and ineffable gifts of the heavenly grace."[2] The very important passage in favor of the Augustinian doctrine in Philipp. 2 : 13, "It is God that worketh in us to will and to do," Pelagius[3] explains as meaning only, "He works in us to will what is good and holy, when he consumes what is offered to our earthly desires by the greatness of the future glory and the promise of rewards, when he excites the prayerful will to longing after God by the revelation of his wisdom, when he counsels us to all goodness." Thus Julian also says, that God helps by commanding, blessing, sanctifying, chastising, inviting, enlightening.[4]

On the other hand, Augustin sets forth prominently, only that one character on which all depends. The revelation of the law can, in itself considered, give man no help, as he wants the power to fulfil the law. The revelation of the law could only serve to awaken in him the feeling of the need of the grace, whereby alone he could acquire the power to fulfil the law. Love is the fulfilling of the law; but the love of God comes not from the law, but is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.[5] Only in so far could Augustin apply his conception of grace, which he denominated the peculiarly Christian conception, to all that the Pelagians said concerning revelation and divine instruction, as these terms were supposed to denote, not merely the conception of an outward revelation and outward instruction by the written word, but an internal revelation by the inward working of God on the inner life and consciousness of man, a living knowledge and recognition of the matter revealed, proceeding out of a new divine life.[6]

[1] In Augustin. de gratia Christi, c. VII.
[2] Dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiæ cœlestis illuminat.
[3] C. 10.
[4] Opus imperfect. III. 114. Præcipiendo, benedicendo, sanctificando, coërcendo, provocando, illuminando.
[5] Proinde per legem gratia demonstratur, ut lex per gratiam compleatur.
[6] Hæc gratia, si doctrina dicenda est, certe sic dicatur, ut altius et interius eam Deus cum ineffabili suavitate credatur infundere per se ipsum. De gratia Christi, c. 14.

Connected with this difference in respect to the *doctrine concerning grace*, was another in respect to the *doctrine concerning Christ* as the Redeemer of mankind, and respecting the redemption. The *negative* reference of the work of redemption must, it is true, in the Pelagian system, have been restricted to a narrow compass; since no such corruption of the entire human nature, as according to Augustin's doctrine flowed from the transgression of the first man, was here admitted. But still, even in this system, the redemption might be held as set over against the above-mentioned gradual deterioration of man and the force of habit; and in this case the Pelagians needed only to adopt here, as they did elsewhere, the views peculiar to the Oriental church. In the latter, redemption was contemplated, not alone as a restoring of the *corrupted* human nature to health and freedom, but still more as an *exalting*, *ennobling*, and *transfiguring* of the imperfect, limited human nature to a condition beyond the point at which it was placed by the original creation, and beyond the powers which were then bestowed on it. And so the Pelagians did actually suppose, that the human nature which God created good originally, was by Christ made still better;—raised to a higher stage of advancement, which consists in Sonship to God; furnished with new powers; and assured of a state of felicity resulting from adoption into the kingdom of God, to the attainment of which the powers of nature are inadequate.[1] At the same time, however, this notion of the exaltation and renewal of human nature through Christ could not, in the Pelagian system, be apprehended in all its depth; and, as we have seen, the idea of a communication of divine life through Christ had no place in this scheme of doctrine.

In the Pelagian system, Christ appears as the divine teacher, who reveals truths to the knowledge of which human reason could not by itself have attained. In his precepts and life, he revealed the most perfect system of morals: he gave to all the most perfect pattern of holiness.[2] As the Pelagians held that Adam had injured his posterity by the first example of sin in humanity, so now they opposed to this the perfect example of virtue given by Christ.[3] But we must allow, that, according to the Pelagian system, no exclusive merit could really be pointed out as belonging in this case to Christ; for, according to this system (see above, p. 611,) there were even before Christ, persons who perfectly kept the moral law. The Pelagian Julian, therefore, found no other way of getting along here, than by supposing a difference of degree; maintaining that Christ, though he had not given the first, had yet presented the highest pattern of righteousness[4]—a mode of expression to which none but such illogical thinkers as the Pelagians, could have resorted. And even in this case, in order to come at any clear and distinct meaning, it is necessary to suppose that, according to

[1] The words of Julian are: Christus, qui est sui operis redemptor, auget circa imaginem suam continua largitate beneficia, et quos fecerat condendo bonos, facit innovando adoptandoque meliores. Augustin. c. Julian. l. III. § 8.

[2] Exacta in Christo justitiæ norma resplenduit. Opus imperfectum, l. II. § 188.

[3] Sicut ille peccati, ita hic justitiæ forma.

[4] Justitiæ forma non prima, sed maxima; quia et ante quam verbum caro fieret, ex ea fide, quæ in Deum erat, et in prophetis et in multis aliis sanctis fulsere virtutes.

the Pelagian doctrine, there was something still more perfect than the mere fulfilment of the law, namely, works of moral perfection which exceed the letter of the law, — something more than the ordinary[1] human virtue, — such perfection as they imagined Christ alluded to in the evangelical counsels, (consilia evangelica.) Furthermore, Christ created, and made known to those who believe on him, a state of perfect blessedness, respecting which they would have known nothing by the light of natural reason, and to which it is impossible to attain, except by the new means of grace which Christ has bestowed. In addition to these positive works of Christ, he also secured for the great mass of mankind, very few indeed being excepted, the forgiveness of their sins. By all these provisions, Christ supplied many new motives to moral effort, bestowed on men a new power, to gain the victory over the impulses of sense and the allurements of sin. These new motives are, for example, the hope of eternal blessedness on condition of obeying Christ's commands; the example of Christ stimulating to imitation; gratitude for the obtained forgiveness of sin; and, above all, gratitude for the great work of the Son of God in becoming man and giving his life for men. It would be wronging the Pelagians to affirm that they proposed fear of punishment and hope of heavenly rewards, as the only motives to goodness; as it might be supposed they did from some of their assertions. Julian expressly mentions the return of love, enkindled by the revelation of the love of God, and gratitude, as incentives to new moral efforts; he describes a stage of Christian attainment proceeding from such motives, at which Christians do good from pure love to God and for goodness' sake, — not for the sake of any outward reward, — where they feel themselves happy in the practice of good works even under sufferings. "The fulness of the divine love, which gave things their existence," says Julian, "revealed itself in this, that the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us. When God required an answering love on the part of those created in his own image, he showed how he had done everything out of his ineffable love towards us, that so we might finally love him in return, who evinced his love to us, in that he spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us; promising us that, if from henceforth we would obey his will, he would make us joint-heirs with his only-begotten Son.[2] This love to God enkindled in our hearts is of such effect, — as Julian, who was himself conscious of a willingness to suffer for the cause of Christ, rightly explaining and applying the passage in Rom. 5: 3, remarks,[3] — that we not only rejoice in the hope of future blessings, but, in the possession of virtue, are cheerful amidst sufferings; that we consider the wrath of our persecutors rather as trial of our patience than a disturbance of our joy; that we not only refrain from sin for the sake of reward, but even count freedom from sin as a reward in itself."

It is clear from what has been said, that, so far as justification is

[1] Similar to that distinction of the ancients between ἀρετὴ θεία and πολιτικὴ, which indeed will not harmonize at all with the essential character of Christianity, since it is at variance with the principle of *divine humanity*.

[2] Opus imperfect. I. 94.

[3] L. c. l. II. c. 166.

understood in its objective and judicial sense, the Pelagians certainly acknowledged this,[1] as also the sanctifying influence which faith in the forgiveness of sin obtained by Christ must, through the awakening of trust and love towards God, exercise on the heart of man, and so on the whole direction of his life.[2]

But although the Pelagians set forth clearly and distinctly the outward connection between Christ and believers, founded on what he had once done and obtained for mankind and secured to them for the future, still the inner connection between the two was placed by them, as it could not fail to be according to the fundamental principles of their theory, far in the back-ground. Augustin ever urges it as an objection to their scheme, that they made the grace of Christ consist solely in the bestowment of forgiveness ; that they left man, after he had obtained this, to his own free-will, and did not acknowledge, that even now his entire inner righteousness or sanctification is only the work of Christ,— that the new principle of divine life which is the spring of all goodness in believers flows from the union with him by faith. The inner connection between Christ and believers, the thence resulting justification or sanctification of man having its foundation in Christ,[3] this it was which Augustin distinctly held forth in opposition to the Pelagians. Only justification in that Augustinian sense was the subject of discussion in this controversy, and thus this controversy became one and the same with that concerning grace.[4]

Augustin represents the process of development of the moral and religious life to be as follows : He distinguishes, according to Paul, the letter of the law, which killeth, and the spirit, which maketh alive.[5] By mere knowledge of the law as an imperative letter, disciplinary grace, from which even the first motions towards goodness proceed, leads man to the knowledge of his sins, to a consciousness that by his own power he cannot fulfil the law ; hence springs the feeling of the need of a Redeemer, and so, faith in him. By faith, man not only obtains forgiveness of sin, but also enters into the fellowship of the divine life with the Redeemer ; — he attains to the grace whereby his soul is healed from the malady of sin. With the health of the soul is restored back also the free-will — as contradistinguished from that which till now was bound in the service of sin. The will is once more the servant of righteousness with free love. The divine life, which takes a specific form in man, reveals itself in works of love. This is the spirit of the law, which makes alive ; the love shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost.

[1] As Julian declares, opus imperfect. II. 165, justificatio per peccatorum veniam.

[2] Julian, (opus imperfect. II. 227,) rightly explaining the sense of the apostle Paul, says: Eo debetis servire Deo fidelius quo liberalius. Peccatum quippe dominabatur vobis, cum reatuum impendebat ultio; postea autem quam gratia Dei beneficia consecuti estis et depositis reatuum ponderibus respirastis, ingenuo pudore commoniti debetis gratiam referre medicanti.

[3] This is what Augustin understands by the term justificatio, a word which he does not take in the same sense with the Pelagians.

[4] Augustin. de gratia Christi, § 52. Eam esse gratiam Dei per Jesum Christum, in qua nos sua, non nostra justitia justos facit.

[5] As for example, in the noble work de spiritu et litera.

From this flowed another difference between the two ways of thinking. As Pelagius generally sided, for the most part, with the system of the Oriental church, and as the Greek church-teachers, owing to their more enlarged historical views, were more particular in distinguishing the different stages and periods in the divine education of man and in the development of revelation, so he separated, according to the above-explained presupposition of a progressive deterioration of human nature and of a progressive counteraction against it, the three periods: 1. Of righteousness in the state of nature; 2. Of righteousness under the law; and 3. Of righteousness under grace. Augustin, on the contrary, could only admit that one and the same need of redemption, and one and the same source of holiness, ever existed; namely, *grace*, which is obtained through faith; if not faith in the Saviour already manifested, yet faith in him as promised. "Even under the law, there were those who stood, not under the terrifying, convicting, punishing law, but under that grace which fills the heart with joy in what is good, which heals it, and makes it free."[1]

Augustin was thus led to give prominence to the principle on which the essential character and unity of everything Christian reposes, namely, the divine life that springs from the consciousness of redemption; and to mark with more precision the specific peculiarity whereby the Christian life, Christian virtue, is distinguished from all other. In the Pelagian system, on the contrary, there was nothing which enabled one rightly to understand either the essential nature of regeneration as the separating line betwixt two opposite positions of the moral life, or the nature of the new Christian life grounded therein. While Augustin thus pointed out the common centre of the religious and the moral element in Christianity, and took his stand in opposition to the separating of the doctrinal from the ethical element, in opposition to the isolating and to the making outward of the ethical, the Pelagians fell into the very error which was necessarily involved in the principles of their scheme. From what has been said, the great merit of Augustin is clearly apparent in bringing forward a system of ethics reduced to a central point, belonging in common to it and to the Christian scheme of faith. Augustin, in this respect, as also in others hereafter to be mentioned, had, by his systematic method of apprehending Christianity, a more important influence on the history of the development of the system of ethics in this period, than Ambrose of Milan, who is not to be compared to him for systematizing skill and intellectual depth; though he acquired great celebrity in the history of this science by his work De officiis, in three books.[2]

But there was something of error attached to those truths, which Augustin placed at the head of all others. In precisely pointing out

[1] De peccato originis, § 29. Non sub lege terrente, convincente, puniente; sed sub gratia delectante, sanante, liberante

[2] This work is rather a collection of practical rules for the clergy, (hence its original title, De officiis ministrorum,) drawn from certain general maxims, than a systematic development of Christian ethics. But the work is entitled to the merit of having been the first to apply the formal principles of ethics, as treated by the ancient writers, to the Christian system of morals, in that peculiar modification of them which they receive.

the peculiar principle of the Christian life, and marking the opposition between that which is Christian and that which is not Christian, since his eye was fixed exclusively on the extreme points of this opposition, he paid less attention to the manifold intermediate shades and points of transition in practical life, the various combination of the factors by which the conduct may verge even to the non-christian position. And hence he was the means of bringing into vogue an unduly rigid and partial method of judging the point of ethical development before the appearance of Christianity. He very justly distinguishes the patriotism of the ancients from that which is to be called "virtue," in the genuinely Christian sense, and which depends on the disposition towards God, (virtus from virtus vera;) but then he goes so far as to overlook altogether what bears some relationship to the divine life in such occasional coruscations of the moral element of human nature, and to see in them nothing but a service done for evil spirits or for man's glory. He contributed greatly, on this particular side, to promote in the Western church the partial and contracted way of judging the ancient pagan times, as opposed to the more liberal Alexandrian views of which we still find traces in many of the Orientals in this period, and to which Augustin himself, in the earlier part of his life, as a Platonist, had been inclined. Still the vestiges of his earlier and loftier mode of thinking are to be discerned in his later writings, where he searches after and recognizes the scattered fragments of truth and goodness in the pagan literature, (see below,) which he uniformly traces to the revelation of the Spirit, who is the original source of all that is true and good to created minds; though this is inconsistent with *his own* theory respecting the total corruption of human nature, and with the *particularism* of his doctrine of predestination.

The Pelagians appealed particularly to the splendid examples of virtue among the Pagans, as proving what could be done by the moral power of human nature left to itself, in opposition to the tenet of man's moral corruption. Augustin maintained, on the contrary, that as there is no neutral ground between good and evil; as love to God is the spring of all that is truly good, and self-love the principle of sin; as that victorious principle of goodness which overcomes the opposing selfishness of man's nature can proceed only from faith; so everything which has not its root in faith is, of course, sin; and he refers for proof to a passage of scripture which before his own time had been misapprehended in the same way, and which afterwards very generally received this false application — the declaration of the apostle Paul in Rom. 14: 23, "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin" (omne quod non ex fide, peccatum.)[1] From this Augustin argued, that the so-called virtues of the Pagans were but seeming virtues. This proposition appeared so absurd to Julian, who overlooked the principle of morality, its internal unity and religious foundation,[2] that he could not sufficiently

[1] The Pelagian Julian seems to have rightly perceived, from the connection of the words in this passage, that it referred to an entirely different matter, and simply respected actions done contrary to one's own conviction of duty. See Augustin. c. Julian. IV. 24.

[2] In other respects, Julian was well aware

express his surprise at it, and drew from it the strangest conclusions. "If," said he, "the chastity of the Pagans were no chastity, then it might be said with the same propriety, that the bodies of unbelievers are no bodies; that the eyes of the Pagans could not see; that the grain which grew in the fields of Pagans was no grain."[1] Augustin replied that moral goodness could not be contemplated in this isolated way; but that, in the estimation of moral worth, the question turned on the whole unity of the inner life, from which men's actions proceed. He referred to Matth. 6: 23, and said, The eye of the soul is the whole bent of the inner man.[2] He who seems to do a good action, but in doing it does not propose to himself the end which true wisdom prescribes for all human activity, sins by having the tendency of his inward being estranged from that which constitutes man's highest good.[3] If all actions are not judged according to this principle of temper and disposition, then what really proceeds from a sinful disposition may appear to be a virtue, and sins may seem to be conquered by sins; but virtue can never be realized in this way.

Julian betrays his own want of a profound understanding of the principles of ethics, when he adduces this remark of Augustin in evidence against him, and observes that if sin is overcome by means of sin, how much more may sin be overcome by virtue, and how much more must it be possible to lead a sinless life.[4] He took no account here, then, of the difference betwixt a *true victory* over sin, and a mere outward check placed against certain outbreaks of the evil, or the exchanging of one kind of sin for another kind, while the sinful bent of the will continued to be the same. All true virtue, according to Augustin's doctrine, proceeds from Christian love, which refers everything to God: nothing but the acts of this love is truly moral, and all the cardinal virtues must therefore be reduced to love, and have this for their animating principle.[5] In whatever exhibits itself as virtue without this ethical principle, Augustin recognizes, indeed, various natural gifts and qualities proceeding from the Creator, and also to be ascribed to his grace, but nothing which answers to the Christian idea of virtue.[6]

But then, although Julian recognized no intrinsic difference between actions called virtuous from different points of view, yet at the same

that the morality or immorality of actions must be judged, not by the outward act, but by the direction of the will. Hoc operatur foris jam ipsa justitia, quam intus voluntas sancta concepit et peperit. Opus imperfect. I. 79. But it might be true at the same time, that, while he regarded the virtues as being inner tendencies and properties of the soul, he might still not be aware of their higher internal unity, nor perceive their inmost root in the one essence, which is the moral disposition.

[1] L. c. 27.

[2] Oculus intentio, qua facit quisque, quod facit, l. c. 28.

[3] Quidquid boni fit ab homine, et non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere vera sapientia præcepit, etsi officio (opificium, the outward action) videatur bonum, ipso non recto fine peccatum est, l. c. 21.

[4] Compare what Schleiermacher says (p. 21) on the conception of virtue, in opposition to such a superficial view of the matter.

[5] Quæ per cæteras virtutes omnes diffunditur dilectio Dei et proximi. De diversis quæstionibus octoginta tribus. Qu. 61, § 4.

[6] Dona Dei, sub cujus occultissimo judicio, nec injusto, alii fatui, alii tardissimi ingenii nascuntur, alii natura lenes, alii levissimis causis ira facillima ardentes, alii vindictæ cupiditatem inter utrosque mediocres. C. Julian. l. IV. § 16.

time, not departing here from the doctrine of the church, — since he found eternal happiness, the happiness of the kingdom of heaven, promised in the New Testament only to believers, — he fell into the inconsistency of making an outward distinction between two kinds of virtue and of good works grounded on the results flowing from them: one kind, the Christian, on account of the reward connected with them, were good in a *fruitful*, — the other, from a want of these rewards, were good in an *unfruitful* way.[1] And at the ground of this view lay, in fact, the notion that religion stood in a mere external relation to morality, and that the future reward or happiness was related in an outward and arbitrary manner to man's life and conduct. Augustin very justly exposed this inconsistency, and observed that whatever is truly good can never be unfruitful, that the result must necessarily correspond to the intrinsic character and quality of human actions.

Yet the Pelagians might have been able, on their own principles, to make out a distinction between the ethical standing ground in Christianity and that in Paganism, if the systematic apprehension of the ethical element, in its connection with the religious, had not lain too remote from their ordinary habits of thinking; for as they derived the existence of peculiar motives and a peculiar direction of moral conduct from the nature of Christian faith, they needed only to carry out and apply this principle still farther, in order to find such a difference; and indeed Pelagius himself remarks, that love, which does everything for the glory of God, is a thing to which the ancient world was a stranger.[2]

Conformably with the manifold stages through which, according to the system of Augustin, disciplinary grace conducts the evolution of the divine life in human nature, that grace must receive many specific designations. In so far as grace, preceding all merit in man, first attracts the corrupt will of him who is like all others in a state of alienation from God, and with an inner irresistible necessity produces in him the first motions to goodness, awakens him to a feeling of the need of redemption and to faith, it is called *prevenient*, *preparing* grace (gratia præveniens, præparans.) It now proceeds to create in him, by faith, a free-will to that which is good, (gratia operans;) but this is not a change whereby man lays aside at once his entire nature, and is raised above all conflict with sin. There still ever continue to remain in him two principles in conflict with each other: in so far as he is born of God, lives in fellowship with Christ, he sins no more; but in so far as he bears within him the old nature, derived from the first fallen man, sin still continues cleaving to him.[3] Hence he ever continues to need the grace which upholds the restored free-will, coöperating grace, (gratia coöperans,) to bring forth that which is good, and to be carried victoriously through the struggle with sin.[4] Although Augustin referred the

[1] Fructuose and steriliter bona.

[2] Sufferunt et philosophi, sed non in caritate. Nos vero non ut laudari, sed ut ille quem sustinemus proficiat [to the honor of him whom we bear] (perhaps bear within us, represent) diligentes sustinere debemus, (for assuredly we have no reason for supposing these words to be an addition of Cassiodor's.) On Ephes. 4: 2.

[3] See e. g. de perfectione justitiæ hominis, § 39.

[4] Coöperando perficit, quod operando in-

explanation of the fact why it was that grace, although it had the power, yet brought no one in this present life to a state of perfect sinlessness, to God's incomprehensible counsels, still he offered the following as reason which appeared to him not improbable. So long as man has not attained, as he will do in the life eternal, to an intuition of the supreme good, so that in comparison with it he counts himself as altogether nothing; so long as he is not so filled with its spirit, that not barely from rational conviction, but also with eternal love, he prefers it to his own self;[1] so long as this condition is left unfulfilled, man is ever exposed to the danger of pride, which may so much the more easily fasten on the self-contemplation of the rational spirit, because this is, in fact, far loftier than all else in the earthly creation. For this reason, man must guard against this by constantly struggling with himself. To this Julian might object, that Augustin reasoned in a circle, when he said man must still continue in sin in order to be preserved against sin, viz. the sin of pride.[2] But Augustin, in reply, appealed to experience — to the fact that the apostle needed to have the thorn left in his flesh as an admonition to humility. He uses an illustration drawn from the healing art: "As if the ulcer were not painful, and the operation of the knife painful also, so that one pain is cured by another. Had we not learned this by experience, but only heard of it in some country where operations of this sort were unknown, we should doubtless ridicule the idea, and perhaps say in his own words, It is most absurd that pain should be necessary to stop an ulcer from being painful."[3]

As man, then, continues ever to be exposed in this present life, by reason of this unceasing conflict, to the danger of falling again, he accordingly needs, in order to attain salvation, the grace which can enable him victoriously to persevere to the end of the conflict; and, in reference to this, Augustin denominates grace by the title of donum perseverantiæ. This perseverance alone is the certain mark of the elect.

This doctrine concerning grace, with all its determinate forms as here unfolded, stood necessarily connected with the doctrine of absolute predestination. And if this doctrine was so taught and preached, it was liable to the imputations which the Pelagians repeatedly brought against it: that Augustin introduced, under the name of grace, a certain fatalism, (fatum;) that he absolutely denied the free-will belonging to the essence of man's nature; that he annulled all the conditions of a righteous judgment of God. In respect to free-will, Augustin ever

cipit. Ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus coöperatur perficiens. De gratia et libero arbitrio, § 33.

[1] Quamdiu non videt sicut videbit in fine summum illud et immutabile bonum, in cujus comparatione se spernat, sibique illius caritate vilescat, tantoque spiritu ejus impleatur, ut id sibi non ratione sola, sed æterno quoque amore præponat. C. Julian. IV. 28.

[2] Absurdissimum quippe et stultissimum putat, peccatum fuisse, ne peccatum esset, quoniam et ipsa superbia utique peccatum est. L. c. § 30.

[3] Quasi non et ulcus in dolore est, et sectio dolorem operatur, ut dolor dolore tollatur. Hoc si experti non essemus et in aliquibus terris, ubi ista nunquam contigerant, audiremus, sine dubio utique deridentes, fortassis etiam verbis hujus uteremur et diceremus: absurdissimum est, dolorem necessarium fuisse, ne ulceris dolor esset. L. c.

maintained, that as the law is not annulled by faith, but only fulfilled by it, so free-will is not destroyed by grace, but the will is only made truly free; and he appealed to the declaration of Christ, that he only whom the Son makes free is free indeed. But here, misled by the ambiguity of the expression, he confounded together two different conceptions[1] — the conception of freedom, as a certain state and stage of moral development, and of freedom as a certain faculty possessed in common by all rational minds. Beyond question, Augustin gave a more profound view of freedom in that former sense (this being connected with his idea of grace as a principle of divine life,) than was to be found in the Pelagian system. But it was not so with freedom in the latter sense, which was properly the point in question in this particular controversy. This, Augustin certainly denied to all the descendants of fallen man; for, in fact, he did not allow to all men the ability of attaining to that higher moral freedom. He considered this ability as being not an inalienable possession of the rational spirit, but a gift communicated, only by a special divine operation, to a certain number of men. In respect to those who belong to this latter class, it is improper to speak of a *free self-determination* in appropriating what is bestowed on them by grace; since their wills are renewed by inner necessity, through the almighty will of God. And as these latter follow an irresistible influence from above, so the great mass of mankind, the servants of sin, follow an irresistible influence of a lower kind. But at the same time Augustin maintained, that by the operation of grace the power of free self-determination was not destroyed; contenting himself here with the idea of a freedom in appearance, of a seeming freedom necessarily forming itself in the consciousness of the creature; inasmuch, namely, as the operations of grace unfolded themselves after the form of the human nature, of the rational human consciousness, in the form of self-determination outwardly and phenomenally presented. Hence man, though determined by a higher principle, transforming his will with irresistible power, which he follows in harmony with the law of his nature, is yet not conscious of his will having been subjected to constraint. In this sense he said, therefore, that the operation of grace presupposed the free-will belonging to the essence of reason; that, if man were not created in the image of God, he could not be susceptible of grace. Grace can act on man, not on stones.[2]

It was an inconsistency in the Augustinian system, that, while he unquestionably derived the first sin from man's free self-determination, he made everything else depend on an unconditional, divine predetermination. He would have been logically consistent, if, following the principle which had led him to this whole theory, he had derived the

[1] A thing which the Pelagians, too, did not fail to censure. C. Julian. opus imperfect. I. 176.

[2] Neque enim gratia Dei lapidibus aut lignis pecoribusve præstatur; sed quia imago Dei est meretur hanc gratiam. C. Julian. IV. 15. Non sicut in lapidibus insensatis, aut sicut in iis, in quorum naturam rationem voluntatemque non condidit, salutem nostram Deus operatur in nobis. De peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. II. § 6.

conduct of Adam, like all other, from this unconditional predetermination. This inconsistency was clearly exposed by Julian.[1] But still this was a noble inconsistency, which grew out of the victory of his religious, moral feeling over the logical and speculative tendency of his intellect. In this way, he could still hold fast, at one point, to the holiness and justice of God, and to the free guilt of man; could remove the origin of evil from God, and push it back to the originally present, truly free self-determining power of man. And by his supposition of the necessary and incomprehensible connection between the first man and the entire race, this inconsistency is still obviated in his own mind; for as the act of the first man may be considered as the proper act of every man, so, on this ground, the loss of the original freedom is a loss for which all are at fault.

This Augustinian system, which was constructed with so much dialectical art, could be so handled, when set forth with the prudence, wisdom, and dialectic skill of an Augustin, as to avoid the practically mischievous consequences which might flow from it in its application to life. Those who, like Augustin, had come into this system through the whole evolution of their inner life, those in whom it had become wholly fused with the fundamental experiences of their Christian consciousness, those who had already attained to a certain inward peace and stability of Christian life, might doubtless find in this system satisfaction and repose. The life in faith which they possessed — the consciousness of a divine life — raised them above the doubts which might arise from the reflection whether or no they belonged to the number of the elect. But the case was different where this system was taught in a less prudent and skilful manner, or where it came to such as were still involved in many inward conflicts, and were liable to be disturbed by reflection on their own state. Augustin could not fail to meet many such cases in his own experience, and it is remarkable to observe the way in which he disposed of them. From such cases he took occasion to unfold his system still farther with reference to its practical application.

One of Augustin's doctrinal and polemical dissertations, which referred to these disputes, his letter to the presbyter Sixtus, afterwards Bishop of Rome,[2] having been circulated among the monks of a cloister at Adrumetum, in the North-African province of Byzacene, produced great excitement and agitation in the minds of many of these recluses. This happened between the years 426 and 427. There came forward individuals among them who derived practically mischievous conclusions from Augustin's doctrines concerning grace and predetermination. Of what use, said they, are all doctrines and precepts? Human efforts can avail nothing: it is God that worketh in us to will and to do. Nor is it right to reproach or to punish those who are in error and who commit sin; for it is none of their fault that they act thus. Without grace they cannot do otherwise; nor can they do anything to merit grace.

[1] Opus imperf. VI. 22. Unde tu nosti, illud tantummodo justum fuisse, ut in Adam nisi voluntarium crimen non possit ulcisci, si injustum esse non nosti, imputari cuiquam in crimen, quod fatearis sine voluntate susceptum?

[2] Ep. 194, among the letters of Augustin.

All we should do, then, is to pray for them. Augustin, having been informed of these disturbances by delegates from the cloister, and by a letter from the Abbot Valentine, addressed to the monks two books — *one* in which he more fully unfolded his doctrine concerning the relation of grace to free-will in opposition to Pelagianism (de gratia et libero arbitrio) ; a second, in which he more distinctly explained that doctrine on the side of its practical bearings, and with reference to those consequences which had been drawn from it (the work de correptione et gratia). According to Augustin's doctrine, unconditioned predetermination is not an arbitrary act of God, whereby he bestows everlasting happiness on men while loaded with all manner of sins ; but a necessary intermediate link is the communication of grace. This is the source of divine life in those that possess it ; and it must reveal itself by an inward impulse, in the bringing-forth of good fruits. But then, even here, too, no limits can be fixed, where the divine agency commences and ceases, and where the human begins and ends ; both proceed inseparably together. The human will, taken possession of by divine grace, works that which is good with freedom, as a transformed and sanctified will ; and grace can only work through the will, which serves as its organ. Hence Augustin says : " He who is a child of God, must feel himself impelled by the Spirit of God to do right ; and, having done it, he thanks God, who gave him the power and the pleasure of so doing. But he who does not what is right, or does it not from the right temper of love, let him pray God that he may have the grace which he has not yet obtained." By reason of the inner connection which Augustin supposed between the first sin and the sin of all mankind, as it has been above explained, he maintained that the individual cannot excuse himself on the ground of the general depravity, and that his sins are none the less to be imputed to him as his own fault. Furthermore, God by his grace is, beyond question, able to operate on the hearts of men, not only without our exhorting, correcting, or reproving them, but even without our interceding for them. Beyond question, all these second causes could produce the designed effect on men only under the presupposition of divine grace, which operates through human instrumentality, and without which all human instrumentality would avail nothing, and under the presupposition that the men whom we would lead to salvation belong to the number of the elect. But as God, however, often conveys his grace to men by means of such instrumentality ; as no certain marks are given us in the present life whereby it is possible to distinguish the elect from the non-elect ; as we are bound, in the spirit of charity, to wish that all may attain to salvation ; so, assuming, in the spirit of charity, that God will use us as his instruments to convert and bring to salvation these or those individuals, who at present are living in sin, we are bound to employ all those means that are in our power, leaving the result with God.

The way in which Augustin sought, in these writings, to secure his system against misrepresentation, could not be suited to set those minds at rest, whose Christian feelings had been disturbed by what he had said respecting the relation of divine grace and predestination to the

free-will; but such persons must rather have found in this a still further confirmation of their doubts. And as his system of faith, on this side, agreed in nowise with the prevailing doctrinal way of thinking in the Western church; as, in the Pelagian and Augustinian systems, directly opposite tendencies, which on different sides were at variance with the demands of the universal Christian consciousness, stood in conflict with each other; it was natural that an intermediate and conciliatory tendency between these two opposites should make its appearance. This tendency proceeded more particularly from the cloisters of Southern France, Provence, and the adjacent islands. As its representative and most influential organ appears, in the first place, an individual who holds a very important place in the history of Western monachism, and who enjoyed a high reputation in these districts — *John Cassian*. He probably came from the country bordering on the Black Sea, (being one of the so-called Scythian monks;) and, after many travels in the East, had at length turned his steps to Marseilles, where he became the founder and abbot of a famous cloister. Without doubt, his early and long residence in the Eastern church had had a decided influence on his doctrinal bent; and perhaps in his predominant practical tendency, in his disinclination to doctrinal speculations which attempted to define too nicely on the questions here brought into controversy; his tendency to give prominence on these questions to the religious, *moral* interest, and to refer everything more particularly to the *love of God;* perhaps in all these traits we may discern the spirit of the great Chrysostom, with whom he long lived in the capacity of deacon, and whose disciple he delighted to call himself.[1] Cassian sought to grasp the doctrines of religion with the heart, rather than with speculative and systematizing thought. He counselled the monks, instead of studying a multitude of commentaries on the sacred scriptures, to aim rather at obtaining purity of heart. Nothing but the darkening of the understanding by sin caused what the Holy Spirit revealed to appear so obscure to men; and it was because men sought not to come to the knowledge of divine things with a purified sense, that so many false doctrines had been foisted upon the holy scriptures.[2] Especially in relation to the treatment of the doctrine of grace, he required that, preserving in simplicity of heart the simple faith of the fishermen, men should not receive it in a worldly spirit, with logical syllogisms and Ciceronian eloquence, but should know that it could only be understood by the experience of a pure life.[3] We might almost suppose that this passage, in the mind of Cassian, contained a reproof of the (in his opinion) too logical tendency of Augustin: it cannot be proved, however, that he meant any such direct personal allusion.[4]

[1] See Cassian. lib. VII. de incarnatione, c. 31.

[2] Monachum ad scripturarum notitiam pertingere cupientem, nequaquam debere labores suos erga commentatorum libros impendere; sed potius omnem mentis industriam et intentionem cordis erga emundationem vitiorum carnalium detinere. Institution. cœnobial. l. V. c. 33.

[3] L. c. l. 12, c. 19.

[4] In his work against Nestorius, which he wrote at the commencement of the Nestorian disputes, (de incarnatione Domini, l. VII. c. 27,) he calls Augustin "magnus

Cassian departed altogether from the Pelagian system by recognizing the universal corruption of human nature, as a consequence of the first transgression, and by recognizing "grace" as well as "justification" in the sense of Augustin. But the whole takes with him a different turn, by its connection with the idea of a divine love, which extends to all men, which wills the salvation of all, and refers everything to this; even subordinating the punishment of the wicked to this simple end. The conflict of the flesh and the spirit is, indeed, a consequence of that original schism; but this conflict is now made to subserve a salutary purpose in the moral education of man, that so the soul, amid its many struggles and efforts, necessitated to strive after moral purity, may thereby be awakened to self-consciousness, and preserved from pride and inactivity.[1] It is, perhaps, with allusion to the Pelagian positions, he says, in one passage of his institutions and rules of monastic life:[2] "We have to thank God, not only for having endowed us with reason and free-will, and bestowed on us the knowledge of his law or the grace of baptism, but also for the gifts of his daily providence; that he delivers us from the snares of invisible enemies; that he coöperates with us in enabling us to overcome the sins of the flesh; that he protects us, even when we are unconscious of it, from dangers; that he keeps us from falling into sins; that he sustains and enlightens us; that he teaches us to understand the law which he has given to help us;[3] that, by his secret influences, we are punished on account of our sins; that we are sometimes drawn to salvation even against our wills; that finally he draws our free-will itself, prone by its own inclination to what is vicious and wrong, into the path of virtue." Even in these remarks we discern the whole peculiarity of Cassian's form of doctrine on this matter. Isolated Christian experiences lie at the foundation of all which he thus collects together; and moreover all the marks and characters of Augustin's system are to be found here, excepting alone the constraining influence of grace on the free-will. But Cassian brings together isolated facts without logical order, and in a manner quite remote from the systematic development of conceptions, such as we find in Augustin.

In faith, too, he recognizes the communication of divine grace.[4] He constantly affirms the insufficiency of free-will for that which is good without grace; that, without this, all human efforts avail nothing, all willing and running of man is to no purpose; that it is vain to speak of

sacerdos;"—but this epithet must have been given to Augustin after he became distinguished in the Western church; yet it says little, compared with those epithets which he bestows on Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome.

[1] Collat. c. 7. etc.

[2] Institutiones cœnobial. c. 18.

[3] Cassian says here, adjutorium nostrum, quod non aliud quidam interpretari volunt, quam legem;—which words are manifestly aimed against the Pelagians. Tillemont wrongly supposes that he has discovered here something bordering on the Pelagian mode of expression, which Cassian could not have allowed himself to fall into, after the above-named decisions of the Roman bishops against the Pelagians. But this mode of expression is, in its essential meaning, so anti-Pelagian, that Augustin himself might have approved of it. Cassian, in fact, says here that it was only by the inward enlightening influence of grace, the law itself could be of any help to man.

[4] Collat. III. c. 16.

any proper merit or desert on the part of man, although the operation of grace is ever conditioned on the free self-determination of the human will; that, in many cases, there is moreover such a thing as prevenient grace.[1] He especially labored, in his monastic colloquies, the famous thirteen among his Collations, to unfold and explain what lay scattered in the above-cited passages. Here also he speaks in the same decided and emphatic manner against the two extremes, as well the Augustinian denial of free-will, as the Pelagian infringement of grace. In both these opposite tendencies he sees human presumption, which would explore and define what is unsearchable to human reason. He says here, free-will and grace are so blended and fused with each other, that for this very reason the question has been much discussed by many, whether free-will depends on grace, or grace on free-will; and in answering this question in a presumptuous manner, men have fallen into opposite errors. He affirms that this question does not admit of a general answer suitable for all cases. He controverts as well those who wholly denied a prevenient grace, and made grace always dependent on man's desert, as those who denied to the human will any ability to create the germ of goodness by its own efforts, and who supposed grace to be always prevenient. This question, he thought, could not be settled by general conceptions, formed a priori, respecting the modus operandi of grace; but could be answered only according to the various facts of experience, as they are brought to view in the holy scriptures; though here, from want of more profound reflection, he neglected to consider that this inquiry transcends the limits of experience and of the phenomenal world, the question relating to invisible motives and laws. Would any one assert that the beginning of the good will always proceeds from man, the examples of Matthew the publican and of Paul are against him. Would any one say, on the contrary, that the beginning of the good will is always communicated by divine grace, he must be embarrassed by the examples of Zaccheus, and of the thief on the cross, whose craving spirits, taking the kingdom of God by violence, anticipated the special call of divine grace. Against those who asserted the last, he endeavored to show that human nature had, by the fall, in nowise lost all its ability for goodness. Men should take heed how they refer all the merits of the saints to God in such a sense as to assign nothing but what is bad to human nature. Through the benevolence of the Creator, the seeds of all virtue were by nature implanted in the soul; but, unless excited by the help of God, they would never germinate and grow up to maturity. Where grace, then, permitted human striving, feeble as it was, to have the precedence,[2] still it should be considered that what grace bestows on man is far beyond all human desert:[3] there is no comparison between the two. He calls it profane to say, that grace is imparted only according to human desert. While Augustin employed the declaration of the apostle Paul in Rom. XI. concerning the unsearchableness of

[1] Collat. IV. c. 4, etc. and other places.

[2] Ne penitus dormienti aut inerti otio dissoluto sua dona conferre videatur.

[3] Gratia Dei semper gratuita.

the divine judgments, to prove the doctrine of the secret, unconditioned counsels of predestination; Cassian, on the other hand, referred it to the manifold modes of the operation of divine love, controlling, directing, and bestowing its gifts in wisdom; and this he set over against the dogmatic narrowness of heart — the presumptuous littleness of mind, which would fix and determine everything according to one idea. He who trusted he was able by his own reason perfectly to fathom or to express the ways which God takes for man's salvation, contradicted those words of the apostle, that God's judgments and ways are unsearchable to men. The God of the universe so works all in all, as that he excites the free-will, upholds and strengthens it, not so that he again withdraws from man the free-will which he himself bestowed. If man's reason, and the induction of evidence, seem to have made out anything which militates against these propositions, all this should much rather be shunned, than countenanced to the destruction of faith.

Cassian's opposition to the system of Augustin found great acceptance among the monks and even the bishops of these districts.[1] Doubtless, too, many of the monks had, of their own free impulse, without any influencing cause from without, become opposed to the Augustinian doctrine of election; individuals who subsequently attached themselves to Cassian, as the most important man among them, on account of his theological training; for it may be gathered, from what Prosper reports about them to Augustin, that all did not perfectly agree with Cassian in their views respecting the disputed points, though they agreed in opposing the doctrine of absolute predestination.

When Augustin's work de correptione et gratia arrived in Gaul, these opponents of Augustin's doctrine of predestination — whom for brevity's sake we will denominate Semi-Pelagians,[2] a name which came into use at a much later period — perceived from it that those practically mischievous consequences which had ever appeared to them the dubious thing in this doctrine, had actually been derived from them by those African monks; but they were not at all satisfied with the manner in which Augustin got rid of these consequences; and hence they were only the more fully confirmed in their own persuasions. Besides this Semi-Pelagian party, there was, however, in this part of Gaul, a small party also of enthusiastic admirers of Augustin, and devoted adherents to his whole system of doctrine, to whom, though they perhaps recognized the difference between Semi-Pelagianism and Pelagianism, yet every doctrine which represented the operations of divine grace in man as conditioned on man's recipiency, appeared to be a denial of grace proceeding from impious pride. At the head of this party stood, at that time, an ecclesiastic by the name of Prosper, who, induced perhaps by the desolations of war, had left his native country, Aquitania,

[1] See Prosper's letter to Augustin.

[2] The Semi-Pelagians themselves were far from applying to their sect any such name as this, as they wished to have nothing in common with the Pelagians; but their opponents, too, were very far from wishing to designate them by this name, the opponents of Pelagianism not admitting that there was any middle ground. They looked upon Semi-Pelagianism as nothing but a mere off-shoot of Pelagianism.

and settled down in these parts. Amid the great and fearful revolutions of this century, particularly in his own country, by which within a short space of time the lot of whole nations as well as individuals was reversed, he found consolation and repose in entire submission to God's inscrutable decrees, in renouncing all earthly hopes, and relying on God's all-controlling grace; and the great facts of that particular age in the history of nations furnished him with abundant evidence in confirmation of the doctrine of absolute predestination.[1] This Prosper, and his friend Hilary, another warm admirer and zealous disciple of Augustin, gave him, each in a separate letter, an account of these movements among the monks, and begged that he would come to the rescue of the truth now assailed.

In reply to this request, Augustin wrote his two works, De prædestinatione sanctorum, and De dono perseverantiæ. He expresses his astonishment, that those persons were not to be convinced by the many plain and express passages of sacred scripture respecting grace, which is always denied, when it is made to depend on human desert. Yet he is at the same time just enough to admit, that, by acknowledging original sin, the insufficiency of the faculty of free-will for all good, and prevenient grace, they differed essentially from Pelagianism, properly so called. And, considering the great importance which he attached to the other disputed points, we must respect the spirit of Christian moderation, evinced by him when he added: "We must apply to them the words of Paul, in Philippians, 3 : 15. If they walk according to the measure of their knowledge, and pray to Him who giveth wisdom, he will reveal to them that also which they still want, in order to a correct insight into the doctrine of predestination."[2]

In these two tracts, he lays open his disputed scheme of doctrine, holding to it firmly in all its strictness, in the way we have already described; and we need here only notice what he says new in reference to the scruples professed by the Gallic Semi-Pelagians. These, as Prosper reported to Augustin, had affirmed that even if the doctrine of unconditional predestination were according to the truth, yet it ought not to be preached, because the doctrine could be of no use to any one, and might be mischievous to all. It tempts the pious to feel secure and to be inactive, and leads sinners to despair, instead of allowing them room for repentance. On the other hand, Augustin says: "We might keep silent as to those truths, the knowledge of which would only enrich

[1] Prosper, and also the author of the work de vocatione gentium, refer to these facts, especially as showing how different tribes of people were led to embrace the faith of the gospel. In the beautiful poem of "A husband to his wife," in which the writer refers to the state of those times as an argument and motive for renouncing earthly things, and which in some manuscripts is ascribed to Prosper, are to be found the feelings and ideas at least which characterized his own religious tone of mind. He says of his times:

Non idem status est agris, non urbibus ullis:
Omniaque in finem præcipitata ruunt.
Impia confuso sævit discordia mundo,
Pax abiit terris; ultima quæque vides.

And after having expressed his resolution to devote himself entirely to Christ, he adds:

Nec tamen ista mihi de me fiducia surgit.
Tu das, Christe, loqui, tuque pati tribuis.
In nobis nihil audemus; sed fidimus in te.
Spes igitur mea sola Deus, quem credere vita est.

[2] De prædestinatione sanctorum, c. I.

the intellectual insight of those who were capable of understanding them, without exerting any influence on their moral improvement; but the misunderstanding of which would redound to the injury of those who were incapable of understanding them. But it is otherwise with those truths the right understanding of which is subservient to holiness, and the misunderstanding of which leads to all mischief. And among these latter truths is to be reckoned the doctrine of absolute predestination. It is only when misconstrued and falsely applied, it can become practically injurious. But the doctrine of divine foreknowledge is liable to the same misconstruction; as, for example, when it is so conceived as to lead men to make such statements as the following: "You may live as you please, yet that and that only will happen with you which God foresaw." In *preaching* the doctrine of predestination, all that is necessary is simply to keep it ever in mind, that the preacher of the gospel is addressing either those who are already partakers of the redemption, or who are yet to become partakers of it, consequently the elect; so that the reprobate must be considered as those who are without the church, and be spoken of only in the third person. With great adroitness and skill, he showed how the doctrine of predestination should be used only for the purpose of exciting believers to an unshaken trust and confidence in God himself and in goodness, and at the same time to humility; — and how, on the other hand, everything should be avoided which, through misconstruction, might lead to false security or to despondency. The doctrine of predestination, if rightly presented, would, beyond question, contribute much to the furtherance of genuine Christian piety. "This doctrine," he concludes, "should be so set forth that he who properly receives and appropriates it will glory, not in that which is of man, hence not in that which is his own, but in the Lord; and even this, to glory only in the Lord, is, like all the rest, a gift of God, and indeed, *the* gift of God, without which all other gifts are nothing." As Augustin's opponents could often cite against him, and that not without good grounds, the authority of the older divines; so, on the other hand, he himself appealed, not without reason, to the original and common expression of the unalterable Christian consciousness; as, for example, in the church prayers for the conversion of unbelievers, for the perseverance of believers to the end, in which prayers the assembled church were wont to join by saying, Amen. But at the same time, in interpreting these expressions of the Christian consciousness, as well as many passages from the older divines, he was led, by the influence of his own doctrinal system, to introduce more into them than they really contained, when he would find in them testimony in favor of the doctrine of a grace which is conditioned on no sort of recipiency on the part of man, and of a predestination connected with this notion of grace.

These writings made, and indeed were calculated to make, no other impression on the Semi-Pelagians than Augustin's earlier productions. Hence, Prosper — feeling himself constrained to stand forth in defence of the *conviction* of which his heart was so full, and of *the man* to whom

he clung with an enthusiastic attachment,[1] as the triumphant defender of this fundamental truth against the adversaries of the doctrine of grace — wrote, in opposition to those whom he designates as the *ungrateful*, his carmen de ingratis. By this designation, Prosper understands in general all those who considered the operations of grace as in any way conditioned by the free recipiency of man; those who did not refer everything in man to grace alone. Although his attack was directed in this case more particularly against the Semi-Pelagians, yet, in looking at the subject from this particular point of view, Semi-Pelagianism would necessarily seem to coincide with Pelagianism; — and, in truth, he endeavors to show that the doctrines of the Semi-Pelagians led ultimately to Pelagian principles.[2] He complains that his adversaries, who were for the most part rigid monks, misled many through the respect which they inspired by the virtues connected with their Christian renunciation of the world: but, as they looked upon these virtues as being in part their own work, they were but seeming virtues, destitute of the principle of all true goodness, that temper of the heart which refers everything to God alone, and which feels the sense of dependence on him for all things.[3] A deep and sincerely Christian feeling of dependence breathes through this production, imparting to it warmth and vitality; but with all this, the author overlooks in his opponents the interest of a morality which would be free, and which assuredly has no less its foundation in Christianity, than the sense of dependence. "Do they perhaps consider it a shame," says he of his opponents, "that Christ will one day be all in all in the redeemed? But if this is, above all things else, great and noble, why are they ashamed in this present vale of sorrow to be mighty through God, and to have in them as little as possible of their own, of that which is a mortal work, which is nothing but sin?"[4]

The contest between the Augustinian and Semi-Pelagian party in Gaul still continued, after the death of Augustin.[5] Prosper opposed, it is true, to his adversaries, the decisions of the Roman bishops and

[1] This very fact, that the firm persuasion of man's being nothing through himself, but everything through God alone, had pervaded Augustin's entire life, appears to Prosper the characteristic trait of this great man, the fundamental principle of his peculiar character. This is beautifully expressed by Prosper in his carmen de ingratis, where he says of Augustin (v. 90:)

Quem Christi gratia cornu
Uberiore rigans, nostro lumen dedit ævo,
Accensum vero de lumine; nam cibus illi
Et vita et requies Deus est, omnisque voluptas
Unus amor Christi est, unus Christi est honor illi.
Et dum nulla sibi tribuit bona, fit Deus illi
Omnia, et in sancto regnat sapientia templo.

[2] As Prosper says himself: ingrati, quos urit gratia, v. 685.

[3]
Licet in cruce vitam
Ducant et jugi afficiant sua corpora morte,
Abstineant opibus, sint casti, sintque benigne,
Terrenisque ferant animum super astra relictis;
still, surgendo cadunt, non horum templo
est Christus petra fundamento. V. 775.

[4]
Viles ergo putent se deformesque futuros
Cum transformatis fiet Deus unica sanctis
Gloria: corporei nec jam pressura laboris
Conteret incertos; sed in omnibus omnia semper
Christus erit. Quod si pulchrum et super omnia magnum est,
Cur pudet hac etiam, fletus in valle, potentes
Esse Deo, minimumque operis mortalis habere,
Quod non est nisi peccatum.

[5] The last years of his long and laborious life Augustin had set apart for completing the theological works which were partly connected with these disputed points which seemed to him so important. As the multiplied engagements of his episcopal office left him no leisure for this, he, with the consent of his community, made arrangements to have his labors lightened by the assistance of Eraclius, a presbyter educated under his own eye. He was occupied du-

of the emperors; but the Semi-Pelagians felt assured that they were not touched or affected by those authorities, for they in fact were also opponents of the Pelagian doctrines condemned by those decisions. For this reason, Prosper and Hilary sought to establish, in opposition to them, another new church authority. They appealed to the Roman bishop Cœlestin, and entered a complaint to him against presbyters given to disputation and fond of novelty, who propagated false doctrines, and presumed to attack the memory of Augustin. They probably hoped to obtain from the Roman bishop a distinct response in favor of the system of Augustin, against the Semi-Pelagian principles, concerning grace and concerning free-will; but their expectations were not fulfilled. Cœlestin, it is true, in answer to this application, published, in the year 431,[1] a letter to the Gallic bishops. In this letter, he complains that several presbyters, of whom he speaks with some contempt, had taken

ring this time in preparing a critique on all his own writings. (his retractationes.) What led him to engage in this work was doubtless the fact, that many passages from his earlier writings were cited against him, especially by Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians: whence his enthusiastic admirers were embarrassed, since they would not allow that the man whose authority stood so extravagantly high with them could be convicted of any errors. But Augustin himself was far from claiming any such authority for his writings. Such authority was due, according to his judgment, only to the Bible. He says to those extravagant friends, that they labored to no purpose: they had undertaken a bad cause. They would lose their suit, even if tried before himself, (frustra laboratis, non bonam causam suscepistis, facile in ea me ipso judice superamini, ep. 143 ad Marcellinum.) He rejoiced in the confession, that he had made some progress in truth, and acknowledged several of his earlier errors as such, which he was not now ashamed publicly to expose in his writings. Unquestionably it was true also, as may be gathered from what has been already remarked, that his mind, more fettered and confined in several respects, now represented as error what at an earlier period had been conceived with more freedom, or that he unconsciously interpreted his earlier views as being in accordance with his present altered way of thinking.

Next, he employed himself on his last work in the Pelagian controversy with Julian, which he was unable to finish. He wrote for this work amid the violent political agitations which brought devastation and ruin over this flourishing portion of the world. He had the pain of seeing the misery proceed from a man who had once been one of his most beloved friends. The count (comes) Bonifacius, one of the most distinguished and successful generals of the Roman empire in its decline, had been led by the advice of Augustin himself, instead of retiring to the monastic life, to the resolution of devoting his powers still further to the defence of the oppressed Roman Christendom against the incursions of barbarian tribes. But by the intrigues of his rival in military renown, the general Aëtius, he had been afterwards drawn into the great mistake of rebelling against the imperial government; and, for the purpose of maintaining himself in this contest, he invited over the Vandals to his assistance from Spain. Augustin availed himself of a favorable opportunity of addressing himself to the conscience of Boniface, in a letter written with true Christian dignity, and with great wisdom, (a true model of proceeding in such intricate circumstances.) The latter was compelled to find out by bitter experience the truth of that which his old friend had predicted to him. He was carried further than he meant to be, and when he endeavored to retrace his steps, found it to be too late. The Vandals looked upon the flourishing country as their own property, and, from being the allies of Boniface, became his enemies. Augustin's episcopal residence, the city of Hippo, was besieged by them. Amidst these sufferings, and in sight of the new trials which were threatening him, it was Augustin's daily prayer, that God would deliver the city from the enemy, or bestow on his servants the power to endure everything which his will had in store for them; or that he would grant him a release out of the present world. The last event happened. In the third month of the siege, which lasted fourteen months in all, Augustin died, at the age of seventy-six, A.D. 429.

[1] As he himself alleges, he had already on some earlier occasion decided in like manner, in a *responsum* to a certain bishop Tuentius, which has not reached our times.

the liberty to set in agitation certain curious questions.[1] Quite in the spirit of the Roman church, he considers it a great scandal that presbyters should wish to set themselves up as teachers of the bishops; and he ascribes it chiefly to the fault of these latter, that presbyters presumed to make themselves so important. Doubtless it might be, he says, that some of them had but recently left the ranks of the laity, and hence had not yet become fully aware of what belonged to them as bishops. And he intimates a suspicion, which the accusers of the Semi-Pelagians had probably found it convenient to insinuate, that several among themselves might be inclined to the same errors. He moreover expressed, in strong terms, his respect for Augustin, who, by his predecessors also, had been considered to belong among the most eminent teachers of the church. But notwithstanding all this, the decisions of the Roman bishop were still so indefinite, that the opponents of Semi-Pelagianism could derive from them but little advantage. Cœlestin, indeed, forbore to enter into a particular description of the doctrines of those presbyters against whom he inveighed. What he understood by the expression "curious questions," was left wholly in the dark; and the Semi-Pelagians accused their opponents of this very thing, namely, that instead of holding fast to matters of practical moment, they busied themselves with such questions. He had said, Let the spirit of innovation — adding, if there is such a spirit — cease to attack the ancient doctrine.[2] But still it was left undefined what was to be understood by the ancient and what by the novel doctrines. The Semi-Pelagians, in fact, also asserted, — and they could do it with even more justice than their opponents, — that by them the ancient doctrine of the church was defended against the false doctrine recently introduced concerning absolute predestination, and against the denial of free-will; tenets wholly unknown to the ancient church. As a matter of course, therefore, the Semi-Pelagians might interpret these decisions as being in favor of their own scheme of doctrine; and so, accordingly, they did interpret them.[3] The Vincentius already mentioned, who had been educated at a cloister on the island of Lerins in Provence, which was one of the most distinguished seats of Semi-Pelagianism, seems also to have given the decision this interpretation; and it was, perhaps, at the fiercest stage of this controversy, in the year 434,[4] that he wrote his famous Commonitorium, if not with the single, yet with the special or partial, design of applying a principle to the refutation of Augustin's

[1] Indisciplinatæ quæstiones. All questions on the subject why God bestowed his grace on some and not on others; all such questions, which were not to be disposed of by reference to the secret incomprehensible counsels of God, belonged, in fact, according to the judgment of such men as Prosper, to this class; and Cœlestin here speaks at first only in the language of his accusers.

[2] Desinat, si ita res sunt, incessere novitas vetustatem.

[3] Prosper himself, in his book against Collator, (§ 3,) gives it to be understood that many Semi-Pelagians, by a *maligna interpretatio*, contrived to explain this decision of the Roman bishop to their own advantage. Cœlestin — said they, as it would seem as if we must gather from his language — had by no means approved, by that eulogium of Augustin, all his writings with reference to the doctrines which they contained; and if he approved the earlier ones, he could not the later, in which Augustin himself set the *novitas* in opposition to the *vetustas*.

[4] See chap. 42, his own chronological statement.

doctrine of predestination, which was recognized by Augustin himself; namely, that the subjective views of a church-teacher, however holy and highly gifted, could yet establish nothing in opposition to the ancient and hitherto universally prevailing doctrine of the church; and that such views would ever continue to be nothing more than private opinions, unless accompanied by the marks of antiquity, universality, and general consent (antiquitas, universalitas, consentio.)[1]

Since Hilary and Prosper had now made a journey to Rome for the express purpose of procuring a favorable decision, and, we may take it for granted, they would spare no pains to accomplish their object, we may the more confidently conclude, that the Roman bishop had good reasons for not expressing himself more definitely and decidedly on this disputed question, when he had assumed a tone so entirely different in the Nestorian controversy.[2] The only course which remained for Prosper was to contend against the Semi-Pelagians with the productions of his pen:[3] but, as in a case where the tendencies of Christian feeling and of the reflections springing therefrom were so entirely opposed to each other, there could be no chance for a common understanding between Prosper and his opponents; and his own arguments

[1] Vincentius enables us to discover his connection with the Semi-Pelagian party, by naming among the false teachers Pelagius and Cœlestius, but not their pretended offshoots the Semi-Pelagians; and by neglecting to mention Augustin among the many church-teachers who are praised by him. Thus now, too, at the end of the second section of his commonitorium, of which only a fragment has been preserved, he cites those passages from the letter of Cœlestin to the French bishops. Although he does not explain any further, even in this passage, what Cœlestin meant by the term "novitas," but chooses to leave the more particular application to each individual himself; yet he certainly betrays here the Semi-Pelagian forced by the authority of Augustin to tread somewhat too softly. A person of the same temper with Prosper would have expressed himself doubtless in this case more strongly and distinctly, and the more, as he must have been aware that his opponents turned the vagueness of that passage to their own account. Moreover, in explaining the phrase, "si ita res est," he discovers the Semi-Pelagian, who considered the charge to be without foundation. Most probably it was from this Vincentius that the capitula objectionum Vincentianarum proceeded, against which a small tract of Prosper was directed.

[2] If the collection of decisions by Roman bishops and North-African councils against the doctrines of Pelagius and Cœlestius, which is united in several of the older collections of ecclesiastical laws with this letter of Cœlestin, really belonged to the same, Cœlestin would beyond all question have expressed himself in a more distinct manner: for this collection has manifestly for its object to establish the whole Augustinian scheme of the doctrine of grace in opposition to the Semi-Pelagians; because these accused Augustin of having over-stepped the proper limits, and because they, moreover, contrived to interpret the authority of the Roman bishops in their own sense. But the way in which Cœlestin's letter concludes, shows clearly that nothing was to follow after. In this additional clause itself, is exhibited a different tone of language from that which we are accustomed to meet with in Roman bishops; and Prosper, who, as we have remarked, appeals to the letter of Cœlestin, would assuredly not have omitted to mention this clause, if he had known it as one which proceeded from Cœlestin. We cannot doubt, therefore, that this piece is a later addition; and from whomsoever it might be that this certainly very old appendix, belonging to the very time of these controversies, proceeded, it still remains worthy of notice that its author professes indeed the doctrine of that grace of God from whose agency nothing is to be excluded, but that he does not, however, declare himself in favor of the doctrine of absolute predestination; but rather expressly avoids the inquiry as unprofitable, when he says: Profundiores vero difficilioresque partes incurrentium quæstionum, quas latius pertractarunt, qui hæreticis restiterunt, sicut non audemus contemnere, ita non necesse habemus adstruere.

[3] His writings against Cassian, liber contra Collatorem, his responsum ad capitula Gallorum, the tract already mentioned against Vincentius, his epistola ad Rufinum.

had quite as little weight with them, as theirs with himself; and, as Cœlestin's decision had so very much disappointed his expectations, he endeavored to prevail on Sixtus, the successor of Cœlestin, to finish the work of his predecessors, and annihilate the last remains of Pelagianism. As his predecessors had suppressed the open Pelagians, so Sixtus ought to suppress altogether the concealed Pelagians, since this work had been reserved for him by divine Providence.[1] But neither did he succeed as yet in carrying this point.

The writings of Prosper suggest one remark, important in its bearing on the course and progress of this controversy. On the one hand, the Semi-Pelagians endeavored so to represent the doctrine of absolute predestination as to bring most prominently to view the point in which it grated most harshly on the Christian feelings; namely, its irreconcilable ness with the Christian ideas of God's holiness and love. They affirmed that, according to this doctrine, God had created only a small portion of mankind for eternal happiness, and the rest for damnation; God had predestinated these latter to sin; he was the author of sin; Christ had died not for the salvation of all men, but only for the redemption of this small and determinate portion of them. On the other hand, Prosper labored with great skill and effect to avoid everything in the exposition of this scheme which might seem repulsive to the Christian feelings; although we must admit he rather concealed all the difficulties by happy turns and forms of expression, than really avoided them in the material contents of the thought. The charge that God was made the author of sin, he evaded,[2] as Augustin had done, by deriving all sin from a free act of Adam. God's predestination and his foreknowledge were by no means to be considered as identical. In reference to that which has its ground in God himself, goodness, as the bestowment of his grace, and just judgment, were undoubtedly both one. But the case was otherwise in reference to sin, which has its ground in the will of the creature; and in relation to this, we can speak only of the divine foreknowledge. But should any be now disposed to find an arbitrary will standing in contradiction with the idea of a holy God, in

[1] Confidimus Domini protectione præstandum, ut quod operatus est in Innocentio cæt., operetur in Sixto, et in custodia Dominici gregis hæc sit pars gloriæ huic reservata pastori, ut sicut illi lupos abegere manifestos, ita hic depellat occultos. — Hujusmodi hominum pravitati non tam disputationum studio, quam auctoritatum privilegio resistendum est. C. Collator. c. 21, § 4.

[2] If indeed Prosper had been disposed to proceed consistently, after the same manner in which he derived his conception of grace, as opposed to the Semi-Pelagian views, from the doctrine of an almighty power of God excluding everything of the nature of conditions, and of an absolute dependence of the creature, he must have come at last to consider all the inward operations of God on human nature as absolutely unconditioned from the first and at every point of time, and accordingly also as wholly excluding, even in the case of Adam, the free self-determination of the will. See the remarkable passage in the carmen de ingratis, v. 370. We ought not to regard God's agency upon man — says he — as so feeble a thing as that of one man upon another, when by his words he seeks to produce love or hatred or any other affection in the heart of another, so that the speaker is unable really to communicate this affection to the other, but it depends on the other to yield himself to this affection or not. It is not so with divine grace, which is almighty: this employs all subordinate causes only as its instruments, is not dependent on them.

Ipsa suum consummat opus, cui tempus agendi
Semper adest, quæ gesta velit: non moribus illi
Fit mora, non causis anceps suspenditur ullis.
v. 384.

the fact that, of those who stood in the like condition of alienation from him, he rescued some by his grace, and left the others to their merited destruction, Prosper answers: Men's minds would easily be set at rest, were it but held fast as an incontrovertible maxim of faith, that with God there is no place for arbitrary will: nothing he does can stand in contradiction with his holiness and justice: and that no salvation is to be found without the grace of Christ. But as our Theodicee must fail to explain many things which take place in the life of nations and of individuals, while still we are not perplexed or hindered in our faith in God's wisdom and holiness; so here, too, we must cling fast to our faith, although it may be impossible for us to fathom or comprehend the counsels according to which God dispenses that grace. Well for us, could we but acknowledge the limited nature of our present knowledge of divine things.[1] Prosper charged his opponents, as they did him, with attempting, in opposition to the apostle Paul, to explore the unsearchable judgments of God.[2] He said, instead of searching into the deep things of the hidden God, and losing ourselves in a labyrinth of unanswerable questions, we ought rather to employ our thoughts on the ample range of revealed grace, and hold fast to that which the apostle Paul declares: God wills that all men should be saved. This will of God is revealed in the fact of his having provided men with all the means of coming to the knowledge of himself, whether it is revelation by the gospel, by the law, or by the works of creation. But, verily, by all these means, they cannot be led to salvation without the grace which gives them faith. Thus was there here already brought to view, the germ of that distinction between a will of God universally revealed and *conditioned*, and a secret, special, and *unconditioned* will of God;—the former being, in fact, taken up and absorbed by the latter. All these shifts and turns were not strictly peculiar to Prosper; but we here discern in him only the apt and skillful disciple of Augustin,—a disciple who well understood how to seize, to combine, and to distribute the scattered thoughts of his master.

This tempered exhibition, aiming to avoid the repulsive aspects of the Augustinian scheme, which proceeded from Prosper, had manifestly an important influence on the course of this controversy. Out of the germs contained in the writings of Prosper, was formed a still more refined and happily conceived exhibition of this system, executed with great spirit, and based upon conciliatory motives. This is set forth in a work entitled, The call of all the nations, (de vocatione omnium gentium,) the author of which is not certainly known.[3] This

[1] Non ergo instamus clausis, nec aperta procaci
Urgemus cura, satis est opera omnipotentis
Cernere et auctorem cunctorum nosse bonorum.
v. 740 et s.

[2] Responsio ad capitula Gallorum, c. VIII. Profitentur sibi scrutabilia judicia Dei et vestigabiles vias ejus.

[3] The comparison of this remarkable work with the writings of Prosper shows, without doubt, a great agreement between the former and the latter in fundamental ideas; and many single thoughts also occur with the same application in the two kinds of writing. But the author seems to be a person who had not previously taken part in these disputes, but who, after they had been going on now for a long time, felt himself called upon to make the experiment, whether he could not by a certain mode of exhibition provide some way for reconciling the opposite views on the disputed doctrines. This does not suit the case of Prosper, who

work evidently proceeded, as the author himself intimates in the introduction, from a person who was seeking to bring about a reconciliation between the two parties so fiercely opposed to each other, — and that certainly with a decided leaning to the Augustinian system of doctrine, for the fundamental ideas of which he labored to procure a more general admission, by exhibiting them in a dress and in a combination peculiar to himself; taking pains to divest them of everything which exposed them to the censures of the Semi-Pelagians, and which served to give those censures a more plausible appearance. That he might more easily effect his object, to act as a mediator, he refrained from all allusion to Augustin, though the authority of that father must certainly have stood very high with him. In general, he was remarkably distinguished for his predominant dialectic method, which was independent of all church authorities.

He endeavored in the first place to show, that an entire harmony subsisted between the doctrines of grace and of free-will, so that the one could not be maintained without the other. Take away the free-will, and no organ would be left for the expression or existence of the true virtues. Take away grace, and the fountain-head would be wanting, from whence everything truly good must flow. He next proceeds to distinguish three different bents of will, and corresponding positions of men. The lowest stage or position is that of a will directed solely to the things of sense, (the voluntas sensualis;) next follows the will which rises above the things of sense, but is still left to itself, and bent on its own ends, (voluntas animalis) — the will which has not, as yet, been attracted and pervaded by the godlike element. The more active man's changeable will, the more easily is it carried away by evil, so long as it is not governed by the unchangeable will of God. The third stage or position is that of a will attracted and actuated by the godlike, — the will which the Spirit of God, with whom the man has come into communion, employs as his organ, (the voluntas spiritalis.) By virtue of this, man comes to refer himself, his whole life, and every-

from the first had been at the head of one of the two parties. Moreover, it does not accord with the character of Prosper, as it appears in his acknowledged and genuine writings, that the author of the work in question refrains from all violent attacks upon his opponents; that he cites absolutely no authorities, and passes over Augustin in entire silence. To this must be added the difference of style. Now, it is true that ancient manuscripts ascribe the work to Prosper; but, on the other hand, there are still older ones which ascribe it to Ambrose, to whom it could not be ascribed without a sorry anachronism. It is accordingly evident that the authority of manuscripts cannot pass in this case as historical testimony. Owing to its contents, the work excited a great sensation, — hence, too, the Roman bishop Gelasius cites it among the books of approved orthodoxy. But inasmuch as there was no historical tradition respecting the author's person, Gelasius himself citing it as an anonymous work, men were readily disposed to ascribe it to some approved church-teacher, and it was at least a more felicitous and well-grounded conjecture which made Prosper its author. If we follow the internal evidence, a certain resemblance of thought and expression gives some color of probability to the conjecture of Quesnel, that Leo the Great wrote this book, while he was a deacon. But in this case the fact that the work should still remain anonymous is still more surprising; and it may be asked, whether everything is not sufficiently explained, if we suppose that the book was written by a theologian, unknown to us, belonging to the second half of the fifth century, and who was an earnest student of the writings of Prosper and of Leo the Great.

thing else, to God alone, and loves in all things only the godlike. This will is the incipient germ of all virtue. Here all becomes divine and all human; divine in reference to Him who has bestowed it, human in reference to him who has received it.[1] Grace, which bestows this divine life on man, works upon and within him, not by a compulsory or magical influence, but in a way altogether in harmony with the laws of his nature. The nature of the human will, as such, has not been destroyed by the fall; its form remains the same; and it is simply by appropriating this, that grace works upon him and within him. At first, it operates in various ways, to prepare the will so as to be ready to receive its gifts;[2] for without the coöperation of the will, there can be no virtue.

Now this work distinguishes two kinds of grace; and this distinction itself belongs to the peculiarity of the method whereby the author seeks to banish the appearance of *particularism* from the system of Augustin; although the peculiarity in this case consists merely in the form of expression and the more complete exposition, — the principal thoughts having been presented already by Prosper. He institutes a distinction, to wit, between general grace[3] and special grace.[4] By the first, God leads all men to the knowledge of himself; and thereby he reveals his will, that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved. This general grace consists in the revelation which God has made of himself to the rational spirit by the works of creation.[5] But the sense and import of this outward revelation of God could still be only understood by man, by virtue of the inner revelation of God in the human heart, only through the consciousness of God in the mind itself. Thus it came about, that the greatest portion of mankind neither understood nor followed this law of God; and by *these* visible testimonies also we must learn, that the letter killeth, and that the spirit only maketh alive. The author recognizes, then, a universal inward revelation of God as the original source of all religion. But in as much as men, by the darkening of their own understandings, became estranged again from this heavenly light shining within them, this sense of God was again suppressed or falsified.[6] It still remains true, that none can attain to salvation otherwise than by that special grace

[1] Omnis actio ad unum refertur, et quod ad unum refertur, utriusque est, quia nec a Deo alienari potest quod dedit, nec ab homine quod accepit. A like sentiment is found in the letter to Demetrias (which, too, was falsely ascribed to Ambrose, but seems to have come from the same author:) Implet Spiritus Sanctus organum suum, et tanquam fila chordarum, tangit digitus Dei corda sanctorum. This moral fellowship of man with God is represented, as in the quotation made above from Prosper, to be an anticipation of the eternal life on earth: Nec dubie ista subjectio jam ex magna parte in illius futuræ beatitudinis est constituta consortio, ubi Deus erit omnia in omnibus.

[2] Ut in eo quem vocat, primum sibi receptricem et famulam donorum suorum præparet voluntatem.

[3] Gratia generalis, generalia gratiæ auxilia.

[4] Gratia specialis, dona, auxilia specialia.

[5] Implente omnia Spiritu Dei, in quo vivimus, movemur, et sumus. Per quæ humanis cordibus quædam æternæ legis tabulæ præbebantur, ut in paginis elementorum ac voluminibus temporum, communis et publica divinæ institutionis doctrina legeretur.

[6] Quod *illuminante Dei gratia* invenerant, obcœcante superbia perdiderunt. Relapsi a superna luce ad tenebras suas. In the letter to Demetrias: In pulchritudine cœli et terræ quædam sunt paginæ, ad omnium oculos semper patentes, et auctorem suum nunquam tacentes, quarum protestatio doctrinam imitatur magistrorum et eloquia scripturarum. Sed quid(quid) illud est, quo

(gratia specialis) by which man's will becomes transformed through faith in Christ into a spiritual will. If we ask why this grace is imparted to some and not to others among the great mass of mankind, who are alike alienated from God, and how this is to be reconciled with God's revealed will that all should be saved ; we can obtain no other answer than that here, as in innumerable other cases, we perceive the fact, without being able to explore the cause; that, as in innumerable other things, knowledge lingers behind faith ; that our knowledge is but in part. We must stand fast by the faith, that God everywhere acts according to his own infinite justice and wisdom ; although the question *how* may be wholly beyond the reach of our penetration. In this very thing it behooves us to show the strength of our faith in God's justice and wisdom, that by these difficulties, which admit of no solution in our present earthly life, we still do not suffer ourselves to be perplexed or disturbed.[1] When we are so disposed as neither to deny the things which are revealed, nor to explore those that are hidden, we find ourselves in the right relation to truth.

While, as we have described, the prudent defenders of Augustin's scheme were particularly interested in carefully guarding against all those conclusions calculated to revolt the religious and moral feelings common to all men, and so easily capable of being shown to be practically mischievous, which had been charged upon the system by its enemies ; so it was natural, on the other hand, that the opponents would be very unwilling to be deprived of an advantage which, on account of the impression it produced on most minds, was so important to them, and, in spite of all these logical distinctions which had been brought to bear against them, would still believe themselves obliged not to give up the defence and justification of these conclusions. When we learn, then, that writers of a decidedly Semi-Pelagian stamp, living in Gaul in the last half of the fifth century,[2] represent those very tenets which were repudiated by the above-named defenders of Augustin's scheme, and called unfair inferences from their doctrine, as the tenets of a newly-risen sect, styled *Predestinatians*, (Prædestinati or Prædestinatiani,) we might be easily led to conjecture that the Predestinatians, so called, were none other than the defenders of Augustin's doctrine of predestination ; that their opponents in this period, as in earlier times, took the liberty of charging them with their own inferences from the doctrine they taught, as this doctrine itself ; and that they invented a distinctive sectarian name for the defenders of such a doctrine, in order that they might stigmatize it as heretical, without seeming to interfere with the universally acknowledged authority of Augustin, and

corporeorum sensuum exteriora pulsantur, in agro cordis, cui impenditur ista cultura, nec radicem potest figere, nec germen emittere, nisi ille summus et verus agricola potentiam sui operis adhibuerit et ad vitalem profectum quæ sunt plantata perduxerit.

[1] Latet discretionis ratio; sed non latet ipsa discretio. Non intelligimus judicantem ; sed videmus operantem. Quid calumniamur justitiæ occultæ, qui gratias debemus misericordiæ manifestæ ? — Quanto hoc ipsum difficiliore intellectu capitur, tanto fide laudabiliore creditur.

[2] As for example, the younger Arnobius, presently to be mentioned, author of the Prædestinatus. Commentar. in Psalm. 146, f. 327, bibliotheca patrum Lugdun. T. VIII. Nota tibi, Prædestinate, quod loquor — and Faustus Rhegiensis.

thus also convert the detested doctrine of predestination itself into a heresy. This conjecture would seem to be confirmed by our observing that those persons who speak of a heresy of the Predestinatians, in no way distinguish the doctrine of predestination, apprehended according to its original sense, from such extravagant inferences derived from it; but ever speak of the doctrine of absolute predestination, in itself considered, only as a doctrine apprehended in that form in which it appears to them as a Predestinatian heresy.[1] But the mere possibility of such an explanation would still not warrant us in the conclusion, that the fact was actually so. It would certainly not be unnatural to conceive, that all the advocates of the doctrine of absolute predestination would not conduct with the prudence and caution of an Augustin, a Prosper, and the author of the book De vocatione gentium. A doctrine like this might, in its further spread, easily gain fanatical adherents, who, abandoning themselves to a single one-sided direction of religious feeling, would assume an offensive position to the harmonious sentiment of religion, as it is grounded in the essence of man's nature, and was brought to consciousness by Christianity; and thus suffer themselves to be misled into the error of pushing the doctrine of absolute predestination, in their own statement of it, to that revolting extreme of harshness. Zealots, who were ready to sacrifice to their interest for this single Christian dogma the interests of the universal Christian faith, might, especially by their uncompromising opposition to Semi-Pelagianism, be driven to this extreme, as the like has often happened in other cases. Now an appearance of the doctrine they so detested in this new form would be extremely welcome to the Semi-Pelagians, since they could take advantage of it for the purpose of representing their own inferences from the doctrine as the actual tenets of the party they contended against, and as their prevailing, generally acknowledged principles; and their own interest would naturally prevent them from making the distinction which justice required between the genuine and spurious disciples of Augustin. But, after all, it must still remain doubtful, whether in truth there was a sect of Predestinatians in the sense above described, or whether the existence of such a sect was merely an invention due to the Semi-Pelagian unfairness of inference. The reasons for and against the latter presumption would still continue to counterbalance each other, and we should still want the documentary evidence necessary to establish the existence of such a sect. This evidence, however, has been found, since the publication of a small tract, composed by one of these Predestinatians, in which the mode of thinking and of expression peculiar to these people is very clearly set forth.[2] In this book, the doctrine of absolute predestination is certainly expressed in the sternest asperity, and every possible expression purposely sought after which can grate on the moral feelings. The work not only departs throughout, in style of representation, from the style and method

[1] Thus the two things are put together by Arnobius in ψ. 117, f. 305: Prædestinationem docere et liberum hominis arbitrium infringere, libertatem arbitrii ita excludere, ut peccantes existimet Dei abjectione peccare.

[2] The second book of the work entitled Prædestinatus, published by the Jesuit Sirmond, 1643.

of Augustin, so distinguished for logical skill and a delicate regard to the moral feelings ; but also a difference of doctrine on one point lies at the basis of its whole peculiarity of representation. The principles expressed in it lead to the hypothesis of a divine predetermination, cutting off all free self-determination from the creature, and all contingency. But such delicacy of moral feeling can hardly be supposd in *this* writer, as we find in Augustin, which would lead him to be inconsistent with himself, and make the will of Adam an exception from that principle.[1] He knew of no difference betwixt foreknowledge and predestination. God predestined man to righteousness or to sin ; since otherwise we must suppose that God, without foreknowledge, created men who could act differently from what he pleased. God remains undefeated in his will, while, on the other hand, man is constantly defeated. If, then, you acknowledge that God cannot be defeated in his counsels, you must also acknowledge that men cannot be other than that for which God has created them. Hence we conclude, that those persons whom God has once destined to life, even though they are neglectful, though they sin, though they *will* not, shall yet, against their will, be conducted to life ; but those whom he has predestined to death, although they run, although they hasten, yet labor in vain. He gives the following illustration: "Judas heard daily the word of life ; he daily lived in the society of our Lord ; he daily heard his admonitions, daily witnessed his miracles ; but because he was predetermined to death, he was suddenly overthrown by a single blow. Saul, on the other hand, who daily stoned the Christians, and laid waste their churches, was suddenly made a vessel of election, because he had been predestined to life. Why fearest thou then," he proceeds, "thou who continuest in sin ? If God vouchsafes it, thou shalt be holy. Or why art thou, who livest a holy life, overburthened with concern, as if thy concern could preserve thee ? If God does not will it, thou shalt not fall." Perhaps with reference to the Semi-Pelagian opponents, who were so highly respected as zealous monks, he says : "Wilt thou, who art holy, and takest pains that thou mayest not fall, who busiest thyself day and night with prayer, fasting, reading of the scriptures, and all manner of holy discipline, wilt thou be saved by these efforts of thine ? Wilt thou be holier than Judas ? Cease, O man ! cease, I say, to be careful for thy virtue, and securely confide on the will of God." With a view to extol predestination and the arbitrariness of grace, he depreciates the work of redemption. Human nature was so entirely corrupted by the fall of Adam, that it obtained a restoration by Christ, not in reality, but merely in hope.

The writer who has been the means of transmitting to us this remarkable book, together with a preliminary brief description of the most important older heresies,[2] and a refutation of the book in question, was evidently a Semi-Pelagian ; and expresses with great freedom and

[1] Probably here too we have a forerunner of the Supralapsarians, afterwards so called.

[2] Among these are to be found, indeed, some Pelagians; but the Semi-Pelagians, to whom the author himself belonged, are of course wanting. The Prædestinatians constitute the ninetieth and last heresy.

boldness his own doctrinal views, which differ entirely from those of Augustin. He holds to a prevenient grace only in so far as is meant by it, the grace — preceding all merit on man's part — manifested in redemption, without which no man could obtain salvation.[1] The grace of God, too, bestows immeasurably more than all that we can do, to make ourselves befitting subjects of it; but still it depends on the will of the individual, whether he receives it or not. It is the same as when one distributes alms, and is willing to bestow them on all, if they will but stretch forth their hands to take what is offered. Would a poor man, then, who has run forward, taken the alms and thereby become rich, be able to say: I have become rich by my own labor, because I willed and ran? No. He would be obliged to say: I have received nothing on the score of the desert of my willing or running; but I am indebted for all solely to the grace of him who bestowed his gifts on me. In this sense are to be understood, the words of the apostle Paul, in Romans 9 : 16. In opposition to those Predestinatians who had adduced the conversion of Paul as an example of grace operating in a sudden and irresistible manner, he endeavors to show, that for this operation of grace, the way had been prepared, and the necessary conditions provided, in the antecedent bent of the will of Paul; for although he persecuted the Christians, yet that which impelled him to do so was a burning zeal, — though a zeal misguided by want of correct knowledge,— for the cause of God, 1 Tim. 1 : 13, — not, as the Predestinatians supposed, a spirit of Cain, but a spirit of Elijah, which already contained the germ of the apostolic spirit.[2]

According to the testimony of this Semi-Pelagian, the Predestinatian tract above mentioned was forged under the name of Augustin, and had been already condemned by the sentence of the Roman bishop Cœlestin. The adherents of the Predestinatian doctrine, who are represented as being extremely few in number, are said to have circulated this tract stealthily, as containing a doctrine which all were not able to comprehend, and by means of it to have opened the way for their opinions, particularly among women.

We must admit the transmission of this Predestinatian tract by a Semi-Pelagian writer might once more excite our suspicions of its genuineness, and lead us to surmise that the Semi-Pelagian had himself composed the work which he refuted, for the purpose of confirming the report of the Predestinatian heresy, and of placing that heresy in the most hateful light. But the truth is, that not only the marks of a well-defined, living, and personal character are too plain in this work to admit of any such supposition, but also many passages occur in it, which a Semi-Pelagian, who was aiming to exhibit the doctrine of absolute predestination in a hateful light, would certainly have expressed otherwise.[3] Still, the work is not of that stamp which would lead us to suppose that the author meant to have it considered as a production of

[1] Quin non haberet homo hoc ipsum velle, nisi unigenitus nobis de cœlo veniens, omnibus officinam suæ gratiæ reserasset.

[2] Jam meritis apostolicis plenus, vas electionis erat.

[3] The places where predestination is derived from foreknowledge.

Augustin; and this circumstance again is another mark in favor of its genuineness: it is a proof that the Semi-Pelagian ascribed to the work in which he had no hand himself, a design not really intended by the author of it. Furthermore, the advocate of the doctrine of absolute predestination was under no necessity of forging writings under Augustin's name for the purpose of supporting that tenet, since he could find arguments enough in Augustin's genuine productions. The Semi-Pelagian interest was opposed to the acknowledgment of this; it was far more inviting to represent the matter as if it was first necessary to forge a tract under the name of Augustin, in order to gain the advantage of possessing in him a direct witness in favor of that doctrine.[1]

Among the distinguished men of the Semi-Pelagian party in the second half of the fifth century belonged *Faustus*, who had been educated as a monk in the cloister of Lerins, and who, in the year 454, became bishop of Rhegium, (Reji, Riez,)[2] in Provence; a man who, by his practical Christian spirit and his active and devoted zeal, was the means of great good, in that whole region, during a period so signally disastrous to those districts on account of the devastating inroads of wandering tribes. He was drawn into a dispute with a certain presbyter Lucidus, who was reckoned among the party of the Predestinatians, and had exhibited the doctrine of absolute predestination in the most uncompromising language.[3] In vain had Faustus attempted by oral argumentations to induce him to recant the errors laid to his

[1] Between the doctrine on these points which is to be found in the commentary of the younger Arnobius, an ecclesiastic who came probably from a cloister of the Semi-Pelagians in Southern France, and the doctrine of the Semi-Pelagian just mentioned, we may certainly discern a very striking agreement. Arnobius, too, represents the grace of redemption generally as being the gratia præveniens, the gratia Dei generalis, antecedens omnium hominum bonam voluntatem. In Ps. 147, f. 327. Moreover, he exhibits the doctrine of absolute predestination only in the form of Predestinatianism, and calls the defenders of it heretics. In Ps. 77, f. 280. The commentaries on Ps. 117, Ps. 147, and Ps. 126, compared with the second and third books of the Predestinatus, prove also that Arnobius had this work before him; but the reasons are less for considering him to have been its author.

[2] This Faustus deserves notice also on account of his dispute concerning the corporeality of the soul. He affirmed, as others before him had already done, (e. g. Hilary of Poictiers on Matth. 5: 8, and even Didymus in his work de Trinitate, l. II. c. 4: Οἱ ἀγγελλοι πνεύματα, καθὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀσώματοι, σώματα ἐπουράνια διὰ τὸ ἀπείρως ἀπέχειν τοῦ ἀκτίστου πνεύματος,) that God alone is a pure spirit; in the essential nature of finitude is grounded limitation as by time, (a beginning of existence,) so also by space; and hence all creatures are corporeal beings, the higher spirits as well as souls. He was led by his controversies with the Arians of the German tribes, who were then spreading themselves in these countries, to unfold these views still farther: for he supposed he could demonstrate that if equality of essence with the Father was not ascribed to the Logos, it would be necessary to regard him as a corporeal being. He found an opponent who surpassed him in philosophical spirit, in the presbyter Claudianus Mamertus of Vienna, a man on whom the speculative spirit of Augustin had exerted a great influence. He wrote against Faustus his work de statu animæ. Here, too, we may perceive indications of the kindred bent of mind among the Semi-Pelagians, and of the opposition of their way of thinking to that of Augustin. So, too, the Semi-Pelagian Arnobius (Commentar. in Ps. 77) couples together the attributes: Solus Deus immensus est et incorporeus.

[3] Faustus says expressly that the council of Arles was called together for the purpose of condemning the false doctrine of absolute predestination. In the letter to the bishop Leontius of Arles, he says: In condemnando prædestinationis errore.

charge. At length, however, he was prevailed upon by the authority of a council held at Arles, in 475, to lay down the required confession in negative and positive propositions.[1]

Commissioned by this council and another held in the same year at Lyons, Faustus now endeavored to expound the correct system of doctrine on the disputed points, in his work De gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio.

Although in this book he adopted the Semi-Pelagian mode of exposition above described with regard to the relation of the free-will to grace; yet he unfolded this scheme in a way peculiar to himself. If he did not express himself so distinctly as to satisfy the acute and clear-headed theologian, yet we see presented in him, in a beautiful manner, such a harmonious tendency of Christian feeling, keeping aloof from all partial and exaggerated views, as prevented him from giving undue prominence either to the work of redemption, so as to infringe on that of the creation, or to the work of creation, so as to infringe on that of the redemption. "As the same Being," says he, "is both Creator and Redeemer; so one and the same Being is to be adored both in the work of creation and of redemption.[2] Among the attributes which, as expressing the image of God, could not be destroyed in human nature, he reckons preëminently the free-will. But even before the fall, the free-will was insufficient without the aid of grace, and still less can it at present, since sin has entered, suffice by its own strength for the attainment of salvation. It has now lost its original power; yet it is not, in itself, destroyed; it is not altogether shut out from the divine gifts, but only it must strive once more to obtain them by intense efforts and the divine assistance. Like the author of the work De vocatione gentium, he makes a distinction between general grace, (gratia generalis,) a term by which he designates the religioso-moral capability, which God has furnished to man's nature, and which, too, has not been

[1] Among the last occurs also the following: Profiteor etiam æternos ignes et infernales flammas factis capitalibus præparatos, quia perseverantes in finem humanas culpas merito sequitur divina sententia. Now, as we may in general infer from the character of the positive propositions which Lucidus was obliged to confess, the character of the opposite ones which he had taught, or, at least, was accused of having taught, so we may in the same way draw some probable conclusion respecting this proposition. Either Lucidus may have said, in order to set distinctly forth the unconditioned will of God in absolute predestination, that those who died in baptism, and as orthodox members of the Catholic church, though they lived to the very end in wickedness, would still finally be made happy; while those, on the contrary, who among heathen nations had led lives which seemed to be ever so virtuous, would be damned, which indeed was the farthest possible removed from the spirit of Augustin; or he had simply appealed to the fact — as was done also by other advocates of the doctrine of absolute predestination in this period — that while many who had led a virtuous life till near the close of their earthly existence, fell at last, because they lacked the donum perseverantiæ, into some grievous sin, died with it cleaving to them, and hence were lost, while others, on the contrary, after a vicious life to the end, still repented on the death-bed, and hence attained to blessedness, as belonging to the number of the elect. The practical Christian zeal of Faustus would necessarily move him to take a position directly opposed to such tenets, as, in fact, he was moved thereby to controvert the efficacy of a death-bed repentance in his letter to Benedictus Paulinus.

[2] II. c. 8. Quum vero ipse sit conditor, qui reparator, unus idemque in utriusque operis præconio celebratur. Jure itaque utriusque rei munus assero, quia scio me illi debere, quod natus sum, cui debeo quod renatus sum.

wholly supplanted by sin, as well as the universal inward revelation of God by means of this universal religioso-moral sense, — between general grace so understood, and special grace, by which he means, all that was first bestowed on mankind through Christianity. But the relation of these two kinds of grace to each other is defined by him quite otherwise than it is in the work above mentioned. Although, as a general thing, the grace of redemption, and in many cases, also, the calling, is antecedent to all human merit, still the operation of that special grace in man is dependent on the manner in which he has used that general grace; and in many cases the striving and seeking of the man which proceeds from the former, the self-active bent of the free-will, is antecedent to that which is imparted to the man by this special grace; a thing which Faustus endeavors to show by examples similar to those which the Semi-Pelagians had been accustomed to adduce since the time of Cassian.[1] He denominates the imperishable germ of good in human nature, a spark of fire implanted within by the divine hand, which, cherished by man, with the assistance of divine grace, would become operative.[2] He recognizes, therefore, a preparatory development of the religious and moral nature even among the heathen, and controverts those who were unwilling to allow, that by a faithful use of that general grace, the heathen might have attained to the true service of God. From this it might also be inferred, that Faustus was an opponent of the doctrine which taught that all the heathen would be unconditionally condemned; and that it was his opinion, that the worthy among them would still be led, after the present life, to faith in the Saviour, and thereby to salvation; but on these points, he does not express himself more distinctly.

There is much good sense in the remarks of Faustus, where he compares the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the relation of grace to free-will, with the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. As in the doctrine concerning Christ's person some gave undue prominence to the divine, others to the human element; and as the result of so doing, were led into errors which, on opposite sides, injured the doctrine of redemption, so he says it was also with the doctrine concerning human nature.

The moderate Faustus was, moreover, unwilling to be regarded as the antagonist of Augustin. He himself cites from the latter a remark, mentioning him with respect, although not with those enthusiastic expressions of reverence which characterize the adherents of the rigid Augustinian scheme.[3] A contemporary of Faustus, who entertained the same views with himself, ventured to speak much more sharply of Augustin. The presbyter Gennadius of Marseilles, a very moderate Semi-Pelagian,[4] had the boldness, in his collection of brief notices re-

[1] Quod aliquoties in dispositionibus nostris, non quidem in vitæ nostræ primordiis, sed duntaxat in mediis, gratias speciales et ex accedenti largitate venientes voluntas nostra, Deo ita ordinante, præcedat.

[2] Hoc in homine ignis interior a Deo insitus et ab homine cum Dei gratia nutritus operatur.

[3] He merely says of him, (II. 7:) Beatissimus pontifex Augustinus doctissimo sermone prosequitur.

[4] He acknowledges a prevenient grace,

specting the church-teachers, to say of Augustin, that by writing so much, he had fallen into several errors of doctrine, and hence, also, had given occasion to the exaggerated statements of the doctrine of absolute predestination.[1]

Yet from this same cloister of Lerins went forth also church-teachers who did not remain true to the Semi-Pelagian tendency which there prevailed, but were led along by the study of Augustin and by the development of their own inward life, to moderate views of Augustin's scheme of doctrine respecting grace, similar to those which are expressed in the book De vocatione gentium. At the head of this party stood an individual whose unwearied, active, and pious zeal, ready for every sacrifice in the spirit of love, and his great and successful labors in a period and under circumstances of universal desolation, had gained for him deserved respect, the bishop Cæsarius of Arles,[2] who had been drawn to embrace this doctrine simply by *that* tendency of Christian feeling which led him to refer every thing to God, and to acknowledge his kindness in every blessing; and since in holding fast only to this interest of practical Christianity, he carefully avoided all the excesses which might do violence to any Christian feeling, he could hardly fail, by this means, of contributing the more towards opening the way for the admission of this scheme of doctrine. Besides this, distinguished bishops and clergymen from the church of North Africa, on whose theological culture the spirit of Augustin had exerted an important influence, warm and zealous adherents of his peculiar scheme of faith, had been driven by the persecution of the Vandals, to take refuge in Sardinia and Corsica. Among these, the most eminent was Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe in Numidia, who took up his abode in Sardinia. These persons also contributed, by the weight of their authority, to bring about at last, a decision of the controversy between the Semi-Pelagian and the Augustinian parties. But the impulse whereby

which calls men to salvation; but he attributes to the free-will the capacity of choosing by itself the good, or of following the call of grace. Manet ad quærendam salutem arbitrii libertas, sed admonente prius Deo et invitante ad salutem, ut vel eligat vel sequatur. De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, c. 21.

[1] De viris illustribus, c. 38. Multa loquenti accidit, quod dixit per Salomonem Spiritus Sanctus: In multiloquio non effugies peccatum, Prov. 10, 19. And when he speaks afterwards of an error illius sermone multo contractus, he evidently means the doctrine of predestination, though it cannot be certainly determined, whether by the words lucta hostium exaggeratus, he means to say that he fell into this mistake by exaggeration in controversy, or that this error was afterwards carried to an extreme by the enemies of Augustin, as he would consider the Predestinatians to be. Still more obscure are the remarks of Gennadius which follow.

[2] He became in the year 501 bishop of Arles, died in 542, at the age of 73. As a bishop he was distinguished for his zeal in the business of religious instruction, and that of such a sort as had for its end the advancement of a vital, practical Christianity. These traits of his character we learn from his sermons, which are to be found partly in the fifth volume of the Benedictine edition of Augustin, partly in the collections of the church fathers, and in part have been published by Baluz. A complete collection, critically compiled, of these sermons, conveying so much important information respecting the character of Cæsarius and his times, — a fact to which the authors of the hist. lit. de la France refer — still remains a desideratum. He is to be ranked along with those other men who knew how to assuage by the glowing zeal of Christian charity, and whatever that can do, even the physical distress of those times of desolation. See his biography by a disciple, at the 27th of August in the Actis Sanctorum.

this whole matter was set in agitation anew, proceeded from two other quarters.

The work of Faustus of Rhegium had found its way among the foreign clergy residing at Constantinople, where it created a lively sensation, — some condemning, others defending it. Certain monks from the districts bordering on the Black sea, (Scythian monks, as they were called) who sought to establish their authority everywhere as zealous champions of orthodoxy, fiercely assailed this work also. This was under the reign of the emperor Justin, in 520, and at that time Justinian and Vitalian, men who stood at the head of civil affairs, took a lively part in this as in all other doctrinal disputes. They induced the North-African bishop Possessor, who resided at Constantinople, to propose the matter in the form of a question, to the Roman bishop Hormisdas. The latter replied to the question with a freedom of spirit and moderation, the more remarkable as coming from a bishop of Rome; whether the fact was, that these qualities, which did not so eminently characterize him in other relations, were the cause of his conduct, or that he acted according to the policy of Roman bishops, who were never willing to offend any important doctrinal party. This author — he declared — did not belong to the class, whom men regarded as fathers of the faith.[1] But men should treat him as they should every other ecclesiastical writer; that is, adopt whatever he taught which agreed with pure doctrine, and reject whatever was at variance with it. There was but one foundation, on which every solid structure should be erected; each must take heed for himself, and see whether he built upon this foundation what was valuable or worthless. Nor was it a censurable thing to peruse writings in which errors were to be found. All that deserved rebuke, was, when men sought to propagate those errors. On the contrary it was a laudable diligence, when men searched through many writings, and following the maxim of Paul, examined all things, and held fast that which is good. Often times it was necessary in order to obtain information with regard to that by which opponents might be refuted.[2] For the rest, he went on to say, that various writings of Augustin, and especially his tracts addressed to Hilary and Prosper, were regarded as models of orthodoxy in respect to the doctrines of grace and of free-will, and declared himself ready to transmit to Constantinople specific articles on these points, which represented the doctrine of the Roman church, and which were to be found in the church archives.[3] Those monks, however, were by no means satisfied with this declaration of the Roman bishop; it seemed to them a self-contradiction, to make Augustin's writings a rule of the pure doctrine concerning grace, and yet not condemn the work of Faustus, which

[1] Quos in auctoritate patrum recipit examen catholicæ fidei.

[2] Nec improbatur diligentia per multa discurrens; sed animus a veritate declinans. Sæpe de his necessaria providetur, de quibus ipsi æmuli convincantur, instructio, nec vitio dari potest nosse quod fugias; atque ideo non legentes incongrua in culpam veniunt; sed sequentes. Quod si ita non esset, nunquam doctor ille gentium acquievisset nuntiare fidelibus: Omnia probate, quod bonum est, tenete.

[3] In scriniis ecclesiasticis expressa Capitula. Perhaps those capitula joined with the decretals of Cœlestin.

was opposed to them. They had the boldness to write with great warmth against the decretals of the Roman bishop, not being able to persuade themselves, as they pretended, that they really proceeded from him.

They sent the work of Faustus to those bishops who had been driven from North Africa, at whose head stood Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, and asked them to signify their agreement with the doctrines expounded by themselves, relative to this and to another subject. Fulgentius was thus led to write several works in refutation of Semi-Pelagianism, and in defence of the system of Augustin, in which he explained and unfolded the latter with logical consistency. Moreover, in doing this, he carefully avoided the harsh points of the Predestinatian view of the matter. He severely censured those who talked of a predestination to sin. He spoke indeed of a two-fold predestination, (prædestinatio duplex;) but by this he understood either the election to eternal happiness of those who were good by the grace of God, or the predestination of those who were sinners by their own choice, to deserved punishment.

In the south of France, also, this subject was agitated anew; and a synod held at Orange, (Arausio) in 529, confirmed a scheme of doctrine drawn up by the bishop Cæsarius of Arles, by whom the doctrine of grace was expounded in opposition to Semi-Pelagianism as well as to Pelagianism; and hence also the doctrine of prevenient grace, as the cause of even the *first motions* of all goodness, in the strict sense of Augustin. No man — it was asserted among other things — has anything which can strictly be called his own, but falsehood and sin. But whatever of truth or goodness man possesses, flows from that fountain, after which we must thirst in this wilderness, that quickened and revived by some drops from it, we may not faint by the way. In the spirit of the genuine Augustinian doctrine, it was affirmed that man could not have preserved himself even in his original condition without God's assistance. Conformably to the mild, pious spirit of Cæsarius, this council declared strongly against the Predestinatian extravagances, in such expressions as the following: "That God's power has predestinated certain individuals to sin, we not only do not believe, but if there are any who are inclined to believe a doctrine so monstrous, we condemn them with the utmost abhorrence." A following council confirmed these decrees; and also the Roman bishop, Boniface II, gave them his approbation, and in the letter relating to them, he himself declared that those were offshoots of Pelagianism who refused to acknowledge prevenient grace to be the cause of faith, but considered that to be a work of the corrupted nature, which, however, could only be a work of Christ.[1]

Thus had the Augustinian scheme of doctrine concerning grace as the operating cause of all goodness obtained the victory, on this side also, over Semi-Pelagianism. But still, the predominant practical

[1] Ut ad Christum non credant Dei beneficio, sed naturæ veniri, et ipsius naturæ bonum, quod Adæ peccato noscitur depravatum, auctorem nostræ fidei dicant magis esse quam Christum.

Christian tendency of those from whom this victory proceeded in Southern France, was the cause that among these articles nothing was established on the doctrines of absolute predestination and irresistible grace; while also at Rome there would perhaps be an aversion to express propositions which were abhorrent to the Christian feelings of so many. This latter result of the controversies was important in its influence on the succeeding times; for thus it could happen, that many, although they received the prevailing scheme of grace, yet on account of the practical objections in their own religious and moral feelings, avoided expressing the doctrine of absolute predestination, which had not been in so many words established by any public determinations of doctrine.

On the development of doctrine in the Oriental church, these controversies peculiar to the West had but little influence, and they excited but little interest, except where more importance came to be attached to them on account of their connection with other disputes, as in the case of the proceedings with Nestorius. Theodore of Mopsuestia alone seems to have taken a lively interest in these controversies, and his participation in them can be rightly understood and judged, only when considered with reference to his peculiar views of human nature, which were closely connected with his whole system of doctrine. And here we have to lament that no information, except of the most vague and indefinite character, has reached us respecting his outward relations with regard to the matter in question.

Julian of Eclanum refers in his writings[1] to his agreement with Theodore. He took pains to visit him, in hopes of being able to unite with him in a system of faith. Theodore himself wrote a work, which was manifestly directed against the advocates of Augustin's system — "against those who affirmed that men sinned from nature and not with design."[2] This work, as it should seem, was pointed especially against Jerome, whom Theodore represents as the author of that whole new, blasphemous system, according to which, things were asserted of the divine Being, which could not possibly be conceived to be so, even in men of ordinary intelligence and uprightness. Jerome, who resided at Bethlehem, might be far better known by him than Augustin, who lived at so great a distance; and hence he ascribes the spread of all these doctrines to the influence of Jerome on the Western church.[3]

[1] Marius Mercator, in his tract on the symbolum Theodori Mopsuesteni, says, in the prefatory letter addressed to the reader, that Julian in his writings bestows unbounded praise on Theodore. He may have done this in writings that are lost; but it may also be an exaggeration. In what still remains to us of the writings of Julian, there is but *one passage* to be found (in Augustin. opus imperfect. l. III. c. 111) where he names Theodore along with Chrysostom and Basil as witnesses of the truth.

[2] Πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Phot. cod. 177.

[3] Marius Mercator (opp. ed. Garnier, f. 97) says, that Theodore's work was aimed against Augustin, and a good deal which Theodore said against his opponents, according to the citations of Mercator in his second excerpt, f. 103, may beyond question apply very properly to Augustin: Quippe qui in divinis scripturis nequaquam fuerit exercitatus, nec ab infantia juxta b. Pauli vocem sacras didicerit literas — which seems not to apply so well to Jerome, who at so early an age had already engaged in biblical studies. Sed sive de scripturæ sensibus, sive de dogmate sæpe declamans, multa frequenter inepta de ipsis scripturis dogmatibusque plurimis imprudenter depromp-

Yet if we follow the account of Marius Mercator, Theodore, at some later period, must have altered his views on these disputed questions; for it is said that he was member of the synod held in Cilicia, at which the sentence of condemnation on the doctrines of Julian was pronounced after his departure. But it may be asked whether, and how far, the account which comes from so passionate an author, deserves confidence. It is very possible indeed that Theodore, who in the outset had only glanced at the fact that the Pelagian system was opposed to that of Augustin, and in this respect entirely agreed with it, after having become more accurately acquainted with the system of Julian, observed many points of difference between his own doctrinal scheme and the Pelagian, as in fact the relation of the doctrine of redemption in the two systems constituted an essential difference between them; yet it may still be a question whether, considering the very imperfect knowledge which Theodore could have had respecting the mode of treating doctrinal subjects in the Western church, it was easy for him to become clearly aware of this difference. The affinity as well as the disagreement between the doctrines of Pelagius and of Theodore will be readily seen from a brief statement of the connection of ideas in the Anthropology of the latter.

Theodore ascribed to man the most important place in the evolution of the universe. He was to be the representative and revealer of God for the entire spiritual and sensible creation, the common bond uniting both worlds; — a theory in which Theodore approximated nearly to the doctrines of the Gnostics, from which otherwise he was so far removed. After having sought, in his exposition of Genesis, to refute the different

sit: nam potentiæ motus nullum contra sinebat effari; sed tantummodo taciti, qui divinarum scripturarum habebant notitiam, detrahebant. Then concerning the present disputed point: Novissime vero in hanc dogmatis excidit novitatem cæt. But, still, it may be certainly gathered from the notice of the contents of the work in Photius, cod. 177, that the book was aimed against Jerome, whom he calls Aram. In this book he very unjustly objects to Jerome the fifth gospel invented by him, (the gospel of the Nazarenes, which he translated;) his contempt of the ancient Greek translators of the Old Testament, and his own new translation, undertaken without any knowledge of the sense of the Old Testament, under the influence of earthly-minded Jews. It is possible, indeed, to reconcile the discrepancy between Marius Mercator and Photius, by supposing the work was aimed at one and the same time against Augustin and against Jerome. But, according to Photius, Theodore represented Jerome as being the inventor of this blasphemous system; and he traced the spread of it in the Western church solely to the influence of the writings of Jerome, which were there circulated. And now on more accurate examination it will be found, that what he says, according to the report of Mercator, admits very well of being applied to Jerome; nay, a good deal, considering the position held by Theodore, admits better of being applied to him than to Augustin. For when Theodore speaks of absurd opinions which that individual had taken pains to circulate even before this controversy, it may well be doubted, whether he could have learned so much in this respect with regard to Augustin. On the other hand, with regard to Jerome, who often, for example, followed the allegorical expositions of Origen, he might very early have learnt a good deal which would appear singular enough to him, judged from his own point of view. What he says respecting the despotic influence of the person, applies very well to the relation in which Jerome stood with those around him. And though Jerome had for many years been engaged in biblical studies, yet the Syrian, who was born in a country where the bible constituted the foundation of the earliest training, might be very likely to make this objection to him, especially as he evidently wrote in a violent passion, and even, according to the quotations of Photius, actually allowed himself in so many unjust accusations, grounded in the perversion of facts.

explanations given of the image of God in man, as partial and failing to exhaust the whole subject, he approves of this one view as embracing the whole, namely, that man, as in fact the very notion of an image implies, was destined to manifest God, who was represented by him as by an image, to the entire creation — a pregnant idea, which it must be allowed he in part reduced too much within the province and calculations of the understanding judging by sense: "Just as a monarch," said he, "after having built a great city, and embellished it with many and various works, when the whole is completed, causes a great and magnificent image of himself to be erected in the centre of the city, that its builder may thereby be known — and as all the inhabitants must honor this image in order thereby to express their gratitude to the founder, so the Creator, after he had embellished the world with his manifold works, finally produced man as his own image, to bind together all the works of creation by their common reference to man's advantage. The elements, the starry host, and the invisible powers, Heb. 1 : 14, work together for the service of man. Thus man was to form the common bond of union for the whole universe. Both worlds are knit into fellowship by the union of soul and body."[1] Also in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, recently published, Theodore expresses the view: "that God formed man with a view of uniting the visible with the invisible in one, and made him, as it were, a pledge of harmony in the universe. For the visible serves to promote his advantage, as we learn from experience itself; but the spiritual powers preside over the sensible, guiding them so as to promote our advantage.[2] From the position held by man as God's image in the universe, he explains the different relations of the angels to man. In like manner as the servants of the king pay all honor and respect to his image, but the insurgents endeavor to tear it down, so the angels maintain this different bearing towards God's image in man.[3] But, although man was furnished by God with all the requisite faculties for attaining and accomplishing this high destination, as, for example, with reason and free-will; yet still, he was not directly adequate to accomplish it. Human nature, furnished with these faculties, must, in the first place, in order to be able rightly to employ them, be interpenetrated by a principle of divine life. As when left to itself it is exposed, since it is a finite nature, to fickleness and change, it must first be raised above itself by means of communion with God; —its spiritual and moral powers must first receive *thereby* an unchangeable direction. And from man this new unchangeable direction was to pass over to the whole spiritual creation. Theodore supposed generally, as we have already remarked,

[1] See J. Philopon. de creatione, VI. 10 and 17, and Theodoret. quæst. in Genesin I. 20. It is evident from comparing the passages that Theodoret in this place took the greatest part of what he says from Theodore.

[2] Βουλόμενος εἰς ἓν τὰ πάντα συνῆφθαι, πεποίηκε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὥσπέρ τι φιλίας ἐνέχυρον τοῖς πᾶσι· χρήσιμα μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ φαινόμενα, ὡς αὐτῇ τῇ πείρᾳ μανθάνομεν. Ἐφεστῶσι δὲ αὐτοῖς αἱ νοηταὶ φύσεις, πρὸς τὸ ἡμῖν ὠφέλιμον αὐτὰ κινοῦσαι. Spicileg. Rom. T. IV. ed. Maji, p. 527.

[3] Οἱ μὲν εὐνοοῦντες ἀγγέλλοι τῷ θεῷ προθύμως τὴν διακονίαν, ἐφ' ᾗ ἀποστέλλονται πληροῦσι, διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, ὁ διάβολος δὲ καὶ οἱ δαίμονες πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβούλην πάντα ποιοῦσιν. Philopon. VI. 10.

two periods of development in the whole spiritual creation, the changeable state of the spiritual creation left to itself, and the unchangeableness of the spiritual creation interpenetrated by a divine principle of life.[1] Hence, at the first stage, the appearance of moral evil, (the probation to which beings are subjected in their mutability,) not merely in the human nature, but also in the higher world of spirits.[2] It was first through Christ that human nature was to be exalted to that condition of imperishable, immutable divine life; — it was first through Him, indeed, that the image of God in human nature was to become realized in its fullest extent. The first man, therefore, could possess no preëminence in this respect. He was by his own nature created mortal — as Theodore endeavored to demonstrate from the essential nature of the human organism; but still God threatened the first man with death, and placed before him death in connection with sin, because this was a wholesome and salutary thing for man's discipline. The omniscient God would not otherwise have given him a command which he foreknew that he would not be able to keep. But he permitted sin, because he knew, that this would in the end redound to man's salvation. He proceeded with man, like the wisest and most affectionate father, according to a deeply laid scheme of education. He would lead him, by himself, to the consciousness of his own weakness. He would cause him to come, of himself, to perceive that in his then moral state he was unfitted to sustain an immortal existence, and that this would not make him happy. For this reason death was announced to man by God as the punishment for his disobedience, although God by no means first suspended death over human nature as the punishment of sin; but from the beginning had created it mortal. Man was in the first place to become acquainted with virtue and learn to practice it by self-development in the practical antagonism between good and evil.[3]

Theodore compares the state of the first man, who must be led, by means of a law given to him, to distinguish between good and evil, with the state of all his posterity, to whom laws have been given for the same reason. He compares the sin of Adam with the sins committed by his posterity in the transgression of the law. "The example of Adam," says he, "serves to make clearly apparent the nature of the law. He might have partaken freely of all the fruits, had there not been prescribed to him a law of abstinence; and it was no sin for him to wish to partake of that particular fruit with the rest: but when he received a law bidding him to abstain from eating that fruit, the desire of which however was within him, and when he was restrained by the law, since he held it a sin to eat of what was forbidden, — in this, sin found a

[1] Ap. Marium Mercatorem Excerpt. f. 100. Quod placuit Deo, hoc erat in duos status dividere creaturam; unum quidem, qui præsens est, in quo mutabilia omnia fecit; alterum autem, qui futurus est, cum renovans omnia ad immutabilitatem transferet.

[2] He referred to versa multoties decem millia dæmonum, in which apocryphal book he may have found this.

[3] Vid. Catena Nicephori, I. f. 98. Ὅτι τῷ θνητῷ βίῳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ηὐτρεπίζεν, αὐτὸ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ ἀῤῥενος καὶ τοῦ θήλεος δεικνῦσιν, ἐν τῃ δυνάμει τὴν παιδοποιίαν εὐθὺς καὶ ἐκ πρώτης δεικνύμενον· ὥστε ἡ μὲν πλάσις ἡτοιμάσθη τῷ θνητῷ βίῳ· ἡ δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ὁδὸς καὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον προεγύμνασε καὶ ἔδωκε τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν αὐθαίρετων ἀγώνων τὴν πρόφασιν καὶ τὸ τῆς θνητότητος συμφέρον ἔδειξεν.

foot-hold, inasmuch as the law restrained from eating, but Adam would not look to the reverence due to the law, but believed the words of the tempter, and surrendered himself wholly to the desire of eating. And not only was this occasion of sin to him, but we also may learn from it, that it does not become us to follow the enticements of our desires."[1] This passage deserves notice, as clearly showing how Theodore conceived of the origin of the first sin wholly after the analogy of every other sin taking place under the ordinary conditions of human life. It is a characteristic exemplification of that mode of apprehension by the understanding after the notices of sense and experience, which was combined with his systematizing spirit. So he says concerning the necessity of the law in the present life, by means of which the power of discrimination within us is excited and called forth, since we learn what we have to shun and what we have to do, so that even the reason within us is active:[2] "Without the law, there could be no such thing as distinguishing between good and evil; we should, like the irrational brutes, do whatever immediately occurred to us."[3] Death, in the case of all the posterity of Adam, he describes as the punishment of each one's own sin; as in commenting on Rom. 5 : 13, where he says: "Death becomes master of all who have in any way sinned; for although Adam's sin was not the same in kind with the sins of other men, yet the others have not been exempted from death, but in whatsoever way they may have sinned, they have received on this account the sentence of death: for death was not threatened as the penalty of that particular sin, but as the punishment for all sin."[4] The mortal body under the dominion of sensuous wants he regarded as the source of many temptations to sin. In this sense, he explains the words in Rom. 5 : 21, that sin hath reigned unto death.[5] Thus he explains the passage in Rom. 5 : 18: "As Adam's sin made the rest of mankind mortal, and thereby inclined to sin, so Christ has bestowed on us the resurrection, so that we might live in perfect righteousness in an immortal nature free from all sin."[6] Understanding the creation (κτίσις) in Rom. 8 : 19, as referring to the angels who became estranged from man by sin, and reconciled with him again by the redemption, he says: "When, by the pronounciation of the sentence, Adam became mortal, the soul became separate from the body, and the union of the creation into one whole, which was to be brought about through man, was dissolved,[7] the higher spirits were disturbed, and they were not friendly to us, since we were the guilty cause of so great an evil. But when, in the process of time, men, continually degenerating, drew down on

[1] Comment. in ep. ad Roman. p. 516.

[2] Ὅτι ἀναγκαίως μὲν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον νόμοις πολιτευόμεθα· ὑφ' ὧν ἡ ἐμφυτος ἀνακινεῖται διάκρισις, παιδευομένων ὧν τὲ ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ ἃ ποιεῖν προσήκει. ὥστε καὶ τὸ λογικὸν ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργὸν εἶναι.

[3] L. c. p. 517.

[4] Οὐ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ οὐχ ὁμοῖον ἦν τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας εἶδος τό τε τοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων, θάνατον γεγόνασιν ἐκτὸς οἱ λοιποί, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡμάρτανον ὁπωσδήποτε τοῦ θανάτου τὴν ἀπόφασιν ἐδέξαντο πάντες· οὐ γὰρ τῆς τοιᾶσδε ἁμαρτίας τιμωρία ὁ θάνατος ὡρισται, ἀλλὰ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. L. c. p. 504.

[5] Μείζονα περὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν βοπὴν ὑνητοὶ γεγονότες ἐσχήκαμεν. L. c. p. 506.

[6] L. c.

[7] Ὁ μηχανηθεὶς διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σύνδεσμος τῆς κτίσεως διελύετο. L. c. p. 528.

themselves the sentence of death,[1] they despaired of us, and conceived a great hatred towards us. Hence, moreover, they were unwilling to do any more for our help, turning their backs upon us as aliens. What took place after this? The Lord announced to them, that he would work out our restoration, awaken us and make us immortal; so that they need not fear any change and dissolution of the common bond of the creation. Thus they were once more made joyful, when they received this promise; when they learned that divine grace would heal the evil brought about by our guilt, and abundantly restore to us what we had lost by our own fault; that then the common bond of the universe would never again be dissolved, and the harmony of creation would remain indestructible. And in this hope — says he — they were ready to do anything for us."[2] If we took all this in an isolated manner, and without reference to its connection with the whole system, we should not perceive here that Theodore entertained any peculiar views, differing from those which generally prevailed, on the connection between sin and death.

From this exposition of the anthropology of Theodore, it is plain, that in contending against the system of Augustin, he must have coincided in many points with the Pelagians; and in general, it may be said that many points of coincidence are to be found in their respective doctrines of human nature. There were the same views of the original weakness of man's nature, of the consequences of the first sin, of man's inalienable freedom as opposed to the doctrine of a constraining grace and of predestination. But *the great difference* between the two systems was *this;* — that in the Pelagian, the doctrine of a redemption and of a Redeemer had no foothold whatever, while in Theodore's system it had a thoroughly essential one, and indeed constituted the central point of the system. Human nature, nay, the nature of all created spirits, is, according to this system, so constituted from the beginning, that it could no otherwise than by a redemption attain to its final destination. Only in the system of Theodore, the Redeemer does not, as in that of Augustin, appear preëminently as the restorer of corrupted nature, but as the author of a new creation in the world of men and of spirits, whereby the original creation is raised to a higher development, extending beyond the limits of the finite nature. Grace appears here, not so much to heal and restore nature, as to exalt and to ennoble it. Hence Theodore could, without any mention of original sin, claim for children also the fellowship of Christ, in order that their natures might be brought to share in those blessings which can flow only from this fellowship of divine life with him. With this idea was intimately connected, indeed, his peculiar mode of apprehending the person of Christ, of which we have spoken before. Hence, according to his theory, in the case of Christ, as in that of all men and of the whole creation, that

[1] Ἐπέσφιγγον ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ θανάτου τὴν ἀπόφασιν. This is intended to express the persistency with which they ever continued to make themselves still more worthy of the death which had been once pronounced on them.

[2] Καὶ μὲν ·· ὁ καθολοῦ σύνδεσμος διάλυσιν οὐδεμίαν ἐπιδεχόμενος τοῦ λοιποῦ, μενεῖ δὲ ἄῤῥηκτος καὶ τῇ κτίσει πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἡ φιλία. L. c. p. 529.

refinement and elevation of nature which was to be first fulfilled in him, must be conditioned on the antecedent free development of that nature. And in this view of the work of redemption, as being preëminently a new ennobling creation, not a healing of corruption, Theodore may in fact have secured a point of union and sympathy generally between himself and what belonged peculiarly to the Oriental church doctrine, which in his system was only more distinctly set forth in opposition to other modes of apprehension, and placed on a more systematic foundation in connection with his whole doctrine of human nature.

It is at the same time also noticeable, that while Theodore so zealously contended against the doctrine of a divine causality of evil, and so strenuously insisted on the doctrine of a self-determining freedom as the condition of all development in the spiritual world, still his principle led him to regard sin as a necessary transition point in the development of the spiritual world, while an ultimate universal destruction of sin by the redemption was at the same time grounded in that system; which last result, as we shall see hereafter, Theodore did in fact actually express with clear consciousness.

From the Antiochian school proceeded Chrysostom; who differed, however, from his early friend Theodore, in possessing a spirit more practical than systematic; and this difference had also an influence especially on his peculiar mode of apprehending the doctrines of which we are here speaking. We find in him that form of doctrine which chiefly prevailed in the Oriental church, and which sprung up there at the same point of time when the Pelagian controversy broke forth in the West. But his mild, predominantly practical and feebly systematizing spirit, which was strongly disinclined to all stiff and harsh extremes, could also most readily blend with the Oriental mode of apprehension and genially work upon it. The whole peculiarity of his character, the course of his life and training, would of themselves necessarily keep him at a distance from the system of Augustin. His Christian life and character had not been the result of any such violent crisis as we observed in the case of Augustin; but from his early youth it had harmoniously developed itself under the influence of a profound study of the sacred scriptures, and of pious friends and associates surrounding him with a gentle atmosphere of Christian excitement. By a constantly applied and earnest self-discipline in zealous efforts to attain to the ideal of Christian holiness, as well as by incorporating the holy scriptures into his inner life, and learning to understand them by means of a rich inward experience, by all this he was preserved from the one-sided views of the Pelagian anthropology. He had come to learn from his own inward experience, as well as from a deeper knowledge of scripture, what the essential nature is of that divine principle of life which renovates man's nature. The study of the ancients, and his own free, gentle and amiable temper, however, had also impelled him to search after all the scattered rays of relationship to God in man's nature while yet unrenewed, and to embrace them with love wherever they were to be found. Charity, the predominant element in his heart, caused that he also, in contemplating the course of development of

human nature from the beginning, should look upon the whole, chiefly from that point of view which led him to trace the hand of a paternal disciplinary love; and to this he felt compelled to subordinate punitive justice. The sincere and lively feeling of the need of redemption, which proceeded in his case from the depths of the Christian spirit, led him to recognize the importance of the doctrine concerning grace; but his strong feeling of moral, free self-determination impelled him, too, to set a high value on the free-will of man, as a necessary condition of all the operations of grace. A Christian stoicism, pervaded and ennobled, however, by the spirit of Christianity, and most intimately conjoined with Christian humility, animated and inspired him. Firm and deeply rooted in him was the conviction, to which he remained true under all trials and sufferings, and which formed the great motto of his life, that no power could injure that man who did not wrong himself, did not abandon and betray his own highest interests.

It appeared to the moral zeal of Chrysostom, an object of the highest importance to deprive man of every ground of excuse for failing to put forth moral efforts. His fields of practical labor at Antioch and Constantinople encouraged and promoted in him this bent of mind; for in these great cities he found many who, in the weakness of human nature, in the power of Satan, or of fate, sought grounds of excuse for their deficiences in practical Christianity.

These motives, from within and from without, had no small influence in giving direction to the development of Chrysostom's habit of thought, especially on these subjects; and with his peculiar style of homiletic composition, calculated upon, and adapted to, immediate practical needs, his mode of exhibiting his thoughts and views depended very much on the predominant interest which he was pursuing for the moment. His essential ideas are as follows:

"The first man lived like the angels, in a state of undisturbed blessedness; — hence he could the more easily lose sight of his dependence on God. God gave him a precept, for the purpose of bringing him to a sense of his dependence. He fell by his own moral negligence. As he had rendered himself unworthy of the undisturbed enjoyment of happiness, he was expelled from paradise, for his own profit, that so he might train and discipline himself in conflict. His earlier state of communion with God, in a life exempt from pain and from care, was a type of the immortality to which he would have passed without a struggle. But now his body became mortal, and accessible to many temptations to sin."[1] In explaining Romans 5 : 19, Chrysostom says: "This passage is not to be so understood, as if by the sin of one, all became sinners; but that the condition of human nature, which to the first man was a punishment, was thus transmitted to all his posterity. But this change redounds only to man's profit, if he is not wanting as it respects his own will. He derives therefrom many calls to despise things perishable, to strive after those that are heavenly, — many opportunities for the development and exercise of the virtues.

[1] Antithesis between the *σῶμα θνητόν* and *παθητόν*, and the *σῶμα ἀπαθές*.

The examples of the ancient heroes of the faith prove this." And accordingly Chrysostom here takes occasion to express his favorite maxim: if we but *will*, not only death, but even Satan himself shall never harm us.[1] The sinning of Adam under circumstances so well adapted to facilitate the practice of goodness, as contrasted with the good actions of others performed under hard conflicts, he often brought forward as an illustration of the truth so constantly present to his mind, that every thing depends on man's will, and except through this, nothing from without, whether hurtful or helpful to him, can have any influence upon him.

Chrysostom was deeply penetrated with the feeling of the need of redemption, of the need of a fellowship of life with Christ. With great emphasis he announced the truth, which he found in the epistles of Paul, as well as in his own heart, that justification, by which he understood not merely forgiveness of sin, but also the communication of that more exalted dignity and worth which far transcended the powers of the limited finite nature, by means of the fellowship of life with Christ, was acquired, not by any merit or doing on the part of man, but by faith alone.[2] In the eighth homily on the first epistle to the Corinthians, § 4, he says: "Christ is the Head, we are the body. Can there be anything intervening between the head and the body? He is the vine, we are the branches. We are the temple, he is its inhabitant. He is the life, we are the living. He is the light, we are the enlightened. All this points to union, and leaves no room for the least intervening space." But he felt it to be important also, to set everywhere distinctly forth, that to believe or not to believe depends on man's self-determination; that there was no such thing as a constraining grace, not conditioned in its operations on the peculiar bent of man's own will; but that all grace is imparted according to the proportion of the will's determination. Here, too, he attached the most importance to the practical element — to counteract as well a proud self-confidence, as moral inactivity and self-neglect. God draws us to himself, not by force, but with our own free-will — says he, in the fifth homily on John, § 4. "Only shut not the door against the heavenly light, and thou shalt enjoy it abundantly." "God comes not with his gifts before our will; but if we only begin, if we only will, he gives us many means of salvation."[3]

Nestorius agreed in his views of human nature more nearly with Chrysostom than with Theodore.[4] During the same time that he was

[1] H. 10 in ep. ad Rom. § 3.

[2] See e. g. H. VII. et VIII. ep. ad Romanos.

[3] Hom. 18 Joh. § 3.

[4] As may be gathered from the extracts from his writings, and four of his sermons, which Marius Mercator has preserved in a Latin translation, and of which sermons the fourth still remains extant in the Greek original under the name of Chrysostom. See his works, ed. Montf. T. X. His violent enemy, Marius Mercator, acknowledges himself the Anti-Pelagian drift. It may be, that these sermons were, as he supposes, preached in opposition to Pelagian opinions, on occasion of the controversy excited through the banished Pelagian bishops at Constantinople; but we are in nowise under the necessity of supposing this. Though there might be some reference of this sort, yet Nestorius probably had no design of combatting the Pelagians, with whose doctrines he was so little acquainted; but rather to shield himself against the charges which his connection with those bishops had perhaps drawn upon him.

involved in the controversy on the doctrine concerning Christ's person, Julian and Cœlestius, with several other bishops of like mind, who had been deposed as Pelagians, came to Constantinople ; and they had sought protection at the imperial court. They had also had recourse to the patriarch. Nestorius was not disposed, like his predecessor Atticus, to whom they had previously applied, to repel them at once, as men condemned by the highest ecclesiastical authorities of the West. Probably also the representations which they themselves made of their cause, were calculated to render him favorably disposed towards them, looking at the matter from the position of his own temperate Antiochian Anthropology. Before deciding either for or against them, he wrote to the Roman bishop Cœlestin, and requested of him a precise statement of the erroneous doctrines laid to their charge. He wrote twice without obtaining an answer, as perhaps the pride of the Roman bishop was hurt by the form of his interrogatory; and this it was, which did so much injury to the cause of Nestorius in his relations with that prelate.[1] At this time, the Marius Mercator, so often mentioned by us, was residing at Constantinople. He was probably a layman from North Africa, who had some time before taken a lively part in the Pelagian controversy,[2] and who was at the same time full of suspicion as to the orthodoxy of the new patriarch, and one of his first zealous antagonists. He was led by these transactions to distribute at court among the bishops and nobles a memorial on the Pelagian matter, which memorial had for its consequence, probably, at a later period, when the authority of Nestorius was on the decline, the expulsion of these refugees. The combination into which the Roman bishop entered with the enemies of Nestorius might perhaps render the latter more favorably disposed to those individuals who had met with persecution from the same quarter. He wrote to Cœlestius a letter of condolence,[3] exhorting him, as a persecuted witness of the truth, to a steadfast confession, and inspiring him with the hope, that the storms which then agitated the church, would also bring about a new investigation redounding to his own advantage. Nestorius was, indeed, at the outset, expecting good would result from the council that was to assemble at Ephesus.

These incidents were the occasion which led the Cyrillian party of the council of Ephesus, out of homage to the authority of the Roman bishop, to condemn, at the same time with Nestorius, the two leaders, Pelagius and Cœlestius, and their adherents, respecting whom and their doctrines they doubtless knew little or nothing, and about whom they otherwise gave themselves little concern. But neither did the Orientals wish by any means to be considered as Pelagians. On the contrary, their delegates at Constantinople sought to make the party of Cyrill suspected by the Western agents as men who had received

[1] See above, p. 461.

[2] See Augustin's reply to a letter of his of the year 418, ep. 193 among the letters of Augustin.

[3] Marius Mercator has translated it. See his works, fol. 71.

to their fellowship[1] heretics, Euchites, who taught the same doctrines as Pelagius and Cœlestius.[2]

It continued still to be the prevailing tendency of the doctrine taught in the Greek church, to preserve the medium between two extremes, without entering into any very precise determinations of the relation between free-will and grace. For the sake of illustration, we will here take another example, and bring under one view the doctrines of a distinguished teacher of the Alexandrian church, the abbot Isidore of Pelusium. "By reason of the first sin, the nature of the first man became subject to the dominion of punishable things and to the excitements of sensual pleasure.[3] As in this state he went on propagating his kind, the same condition was transmitted to his posterity, and the evil was still augmented among men through the negligence of each man's individual will. There still remains, however, the seed of goodness[4] in human nature. They who fostered this, distinguished themselves; they who suppressed it, were punished. Even for that which proceeds from our own will, we need the assistance of divine grace. But this is never wanting to any who are only willing to do what belongs to themselves. There may, doubtless, in particular cases, be such a thing as prevenient grace, although, according to the general rule, grace is not prevenient — but there is no such thing as a constraining, irresistible grace. The assistance of grace is not such as that it may not be forfeited and lost by man's own fault; not such as is bestowed without any efforts of his own. The grace which awakens even those that are asleep, and impels even the not willing, will assuredly not forsake those who choose the good of their own accord. The words of our Lord: 'All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given,' Matth. 19 : 11, are in no wise to be so understood as if the better part were bestowed on many by arbitrary determination;[5] for in that case the kingdom of heaven would not be the reward of conflict."[6]

d. *Doctrine of the Sacraments.*

The history of the doctrine concerning the church, especially among the Latins, we have already unfolded sufficiently at large in the first section. In the Greek church, it is true, the consequences flowing from the confounding together of the visible and the invisible church, of which we spoke in that section, were not in theory so systematically elaborated and carried out, and in individual instances, as in the case of Chrysostom and Isidore of Pelusium, there were gleams of a more

[1] They knew perhaps but little about these latter; they had doubtless only heard, that these men taught believers might attain to perfect holiness, and hence were led to compare the Euchites with them.

[2] Τὰ αὐτὰ φρονοῦντας Κελεστίῳ καὶ Πελαγίῳ, Εὐχῖται γάρ εισιν ἡγουν Ἐνθουσιασταί. It was by no means Pelagians, then, who were meant, but Euchites; described, however, as holding the same tenets with Pelagius, in order to represent them, by a name better known in the West, as heretics. See the letter of the delegates to bishop Rufus, ep. 170 among the letters of Theodoret. T. IV. ed. Halen. p. 1352.

[3] Σῶμα ψυητὸν καὶ παθητόν.

[4] Τὰ εἰς καλοκαγαθίαν σπέρματα.

[5] Ἀποκλήρωσις.

[6] See l. III. ep. 204, l. II. ep. 2, III. 171, III. 13, III. 165.

spiritual apprehension of the notion of the church. Yet, on the whole, the practical church life was not less governed here than in the West by those principles growing out of the confusion of the visible and invisible church, with regard to the authority of an outward church, of tradition, of councils, and by the notions grounded thereupon respecting the nature and the effects of the sacraments.

The conception of the sacraments would of course be at first extremely vague: for there was not here, as in the case of other doctrines, a certain subject-matter already given in the sacred scriptures, and in the Christian consciousness, which needed but to be more fully developed; but in this case the general conception must first be formed from particulars, by the process of grasping together the common relations of these particulars to the Christian life and consciousness. In addition to this, there were no fixed and settled grounds on which to determine the choice of those objects themselves, which were to be brought under this conception; and the difficulty was moreover increased by the ambiguity and vagueness of the term, which had been invented without any definite consciousness of its meaning. The term sacramentum grew out of the translation of the Greek word μυστήριον; it was employed already in the preceding period, by a license allowable in the Latin use of the word, to denote any thing consecrated to a holy use, any thing considered holy and sacred, and then applied sometimes to holy doctrines, sometimes to holy symbols. Already in the preceding period, this designation had been applied particularly to baptism, to the holy supper, and to the rite of confirmation; but we remarked in fact, already in the preceding period, the existence of an inclination to multiply holy symbols in the church life. In this present period, such a multiplication of symbols was promoted, especially in the Greek church, by the prevailing liturgical, and in connection therewith, mystico-theurgical tendency;[1] as we see exemplified in the spurious writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, belonging to the fifth or sixth century. Augustin is entitled to the credit of having first introduced into this doctrine, in place of rhetorical exaggerations, a greater strictness of doctrinal phraseology; and by striving to seize it with clearer consciousness in its connection with the Christian spirit, of furnishing a counterpoise to the erroneous magico-theurgical tendency, which had come to attach itself to the apprehension of these doctrines.

Augustin describes the sacraments as being visible signs representing invisible, divine things, by means of which the divine matter is exhibited, as it were, by writing, by outward language. We have in his theory, therefore, the distinction between the invisible divine reality, the invisible divine power, the communication of the divine reality itself, and the sacrament as its outward representative symbol, (the res divinæ sanctæ, the virtutes sacramenti, and the sacramentum.) Without such outward symbols no religious society can subsist, whether growing out

[1] It is easy to see how mysticism, according to the different traits of individuals, may convert the objects of sense into symbols for the expression of its own feelings and intuitions, or even assume an attitude of hostility against all attempts to sensualize the spiritual and divine.

of a true or of a false religion. Hence, such symbols were no less necessary in Christianity than in Judaism. The one thing is the eternal and unchangeable reality; the other, its changeable expression, — just as words and written characters change, although that which they signify remains the same.[1]

It was, therefore, possible for God, without departing from his unchangeable counsels, to allow those external forms to change with the vicissitudes of time, to which they were successively adapted. This was urged by Augustin particularly against the Manichæans, inasmuch as they asserted, that if the Old Testament institutions really proceeded from the same God as the New Testament, they could not have been annulled by him. The outward symbol has no power of conveying to man the divine reality, unless man's inward being is susceptible of communion with God — a position which followed from Augustin's doctrine concerning grace; — and here came in the opposition to the superstitious practices which grew out of the magical effects ascribed to the sacraments, on which side the influence of Augustin, for the promotion of vital Christianity, was felt in the succeeding centuries down to the time of the Jansenist controversies. Nor is the divine substance so necessarily connected with the outward signs, that the grace of God cannot dispense with them.[2] But, in the usual order, the sacraments are the appointed means for the communication of the divine reality; and whosoever despises them, excludes himself, by his contempt of the divine institution, from all participation in the divine reality itself. The sacrament, as a divine ordinance, retains its objective significance, independent of the subjective character of him who receives it, as of him who imparts it, though it redounds only to the condemnation of the individual who administers or receives it unworthily. This position Augustin was led to set forth distinctly in his controversy with the Donatists. In reference to baptism, he often compared it with the sign marked upon the soldiers as an emblem of the imperial service, which remained ineffacible, and remained even with those who were unfaithful to the service; but, in that case, was only a testimony against them, (the stigma militaris, character militaris, hence character indelebilis.) Augustin regarded it as the peculiar mark of Christian freedom, as opposed to Jewish bondage, not only that Christianity, as the religion of the spirit, possessed but a few simple signs, easy to be observed, but also, that in Christianity the sacraments were celebrated with the conscious knowledge of that which they imported, and hence with freedom; while in the Old Testament economy, on the other hand, they were celebrated

[1] Quid enim sunt aliud quæque corporalia sacramenta, nisi quædam quasi verba visibilia, sacrosancta quidem, verumtamen mutabilia et temporalia? — In nullum nomen religionis, seu verum seu falsum, coagulari homines possunt, nisi aliquo signaculorum vel sacramentorum visibilium consortio colligentur. Augustin. c. Faustum, l. XIX. c. 11 et 12, and Tractat. 80, in Joannem, § 3.

[2] Quomodo et Moses sanctificat et Dominus? Non enim Moses pro Domino, sed Moses visibilibus sacramentis per ministerium suum; Dominus autem invisibili gratia per Spiritum Sanctum, ubi est totus fructus etiam visibilium sacramentorum. But he pronounces it absurd to assert etiam istam invisibilem sanctificationem sine visibilibus sacramentis nihil prodesse. Quæstionum in Leviticum, l. III. quæst. 84.

with reverential fear and awe, without this accompanying consciousness; — hence, the spirit was subservient to the outward symbols. The understanding of the sacrament is evinced in this, that it reveals to contemplation the love of God, and fires the heart with the love of God and of man. The prophets, who knew how to distinguish the sign from the divine thing signified, and reverenced in the former nothing but the latter, lived, therefore, already in the spirit of freedom.[1]

In respect to the number of sacraments, the way had, in fact, long since been prepared by the existing ideas relative to a particular priesthood, to the outward transmission of the Holy Spirit from the Apostles downwards by the imposition of hands, for apprehending the rite of ordination as holding equal rank with the other three sacraments.[2] The mystical and symbolizing spirit of the Pseudo-Dionysian writings led to the reception of two others besides the four sacraments above noticed, namely, consecration to the monastic life, and the ceremonials at the burial of the dead. Augustin, on the other hand, would be led by his correct views respecting the free spiritual worship of God as opposed to the slavish ceremonial religion in Judaism, to receive but few sacraments; as, in fact, where he speaks of this opposition, he names only baptism and the Lord's Supper,[3] with the additional clause, and any thing besides these, if it is recommended in the holy scriptures. Yet, the conception which he had opened out of the sacrament as a holy symbol, was still not sufficiently precise to exclude the introduction of many other things; and what Augustin found already existing in the general usage of the church, he believed might be derived either from apostolic tradition or the divine institution through general councils, and hence would adopt all such sacred usages and signs into his conception along with the rest. Hence, he sided with the Western church, where the prevailing rule was to allow four sacraments, which, in other respects, too, fell in with his ideas;[4] and in maintaining against the Pelagains,[5] that obedience to the natural instinct is sanctified by the religious and moral reference of the marriage union, he was led accordingly to reckon the solemnization of marriage among the sacraments, which, perhaps, might seem to him to be sanctioned by the use of the word *μυστήριον* in this reference in the epistle to the Ephesians;[6] and,

[1] Posteaquam resurrectione Domini nostri manifestissimum judicium nostræ libertatis illuxit, nec eorum quidem signorum operatione gravi onerati sumus; sed quædam pauca pro multis, eademque factu facillima et intellectu augustissima et observatione castissima, ipse Dominus et apostolica tradidit disciplina. — Quæ unusquisque cum percipit quo referantur, imbutus agnoscit, ut ea non carnali servitute, sed spiritali potius libertate veneretur. De doctrina Christiana, l. III. § 13. Nihil tám pie terret animum, quam sacramentum non intellectum; intellectum autem, gaudium pium parit et celebratur libere, si opus est tempori — The right antithesis to the deification of the sacraments. Expositio epistolæ ad Galatos, c. 3, § 19. Comp. ep. 54. ep. 55 and 138 ad Januarium.

[2] Thus it is placed together with baptism and the Lord's supper, in Gregory of Nyssa, on the baptism of Christ. He who was before *εἰς τῶν πολλῶν, ἀοράτῳ τινὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι τὴν ψυχὴν μεταμορφωθεὶς πρὸς τὸ βελτίον.*

[3] Ep. 118.

[4] See c. ep. Parmenian. l. II. c. 13.

[5] When these accused him of making marriage itself a sinful thing through his idea of the concupiscentia as springing out of sin.

[6] De nuptiis et concupiscentia, l. I. c. 17.

at all events, the higher Christian conception of marriage lay at the basis of what is there said.

As it respects the doctrine concerning baptism, from which, for reasons stated under the preceding period, the doctrine of regeneration was not severed, we must observe that the difference here again became strongly marked, which we discern in the views of the Eastern compared with those of the Western church, with regard to human nature and the doctrine of redemption; namely, that in the Western church, with original sin, the negative effect of the redemption in procuring deliverance from this, and in the Eastern church, on the other hand, the positive effect of the redemption considered in the light of a new creation, were made especially prominent. Thus Gregory of Nazianzus[1] calls baptism a more divine exalted creation than the original formation of nature.[2] Thus, too, Cyrill of Jerusalem, addressing the candidate for baptism, says: "If thou believest, thou not only obtainest the forgiveness of sins, but thou effectest also that which is above man. Thou obtainest as much of grace as thou canst hold."[3] This difference would be strongly marked, especially in the case of infant baptism. According to the North-African scheme of doctrine, which taught that all men were from their birth, in consequence of the guilt and sin transmitted from Adam, subjected to the same condemnation, that they bore within them the principles of all sin, deliverance from original sin and inherited guilt would be made particularly prominent in the case of infant baptism, as in the case of the baptism of adults; and this was favored by the ancient formula of baptism, which, however, originated in a period when infant baptism had as yet no existence, and had been afterwards applied without alteration to children, because men shrunk from undertaking to introduce any change in the consecrated formula established by apostolical authority, though Christians were by no means agreed as to the sense in which they applied this formula. Accordingly, says Gregory Nazianzen, to children baptism is a seal, (a means of securing human nature in the germ against all moral evil by the higher principle of life communicated to it;) for adults it is, moreover, forgiveness of sin and restoration of the image degraded and lost by transgression.[4] Hence, he looks upon infant baptism as a consecration to the priestly dignity, which is imparted to the child from the beginning, that so evil may gain no advantage over him.[5] In a homily addressed to the neophytes, Chrysostom specifies ten different effects of grace wrought in baptism; and then he complains of those who make the grace of baptism consist simply in the forgiveness of sin.[6] True, the difference here becomes manifest between the more rhetorical Chrysostom and the systematic Augustin; for the latter would have referred

[1] Orat. 40, de baptismo.

[2] Πλάσις θειότερα καὶ τῆς πρώτης ὑψηλότερα.

[3] Catech. 17, c. 17, 18. Ποιεῖς καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον.

[4] Τοῖς μὲν ἀρχόμενοις σφραγὶς, τοῖς τελειότεροις τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ χαρίσμα καὶ πεσούσης εἰκόνος διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἐπανόρθωσις. Orat. 40, f. 640.

[5] Μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἡ κακία, ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω. L. c. 648.

[6] Vides quot sunt baptismatis largitates; et nonnulli deputant, cœlestem gratiam in peccatorum tantum remissione consistere; nos autem honores computavimus decem.

those ten specifications to one fundamental conception, in which they might all be summed up together. But at the basis of this difference lay that other, which has already been noticed, in respect to the general mode of Christian intuition. Hence Chrysostom adds: It is for this reason we baptize also infants, though they are not, like others, stained with sin, that so holiness, justification, adoption, heirship, and brothership with Christ, may be imparted to them through Christ, that so they may be members of Christ.[1]

These words of Chrysostom are, indeed, known to us only in the Latin translation, and through a citation of the Pelagian writer, Julian.[2] But their genuineness is evinced by the fact that Augustin had nothing to object to them on that score, but must seek to deprive Pelagianism of this support by giving the passage another interpretation. And, in truth, this passage strictly accords with the peculiar character already noticed, belonging to the type of doctrine not only of the Oriental church generally, but of Chrysostom in particular. Julian was wrong in explaining the words of Chrysostom wholly according to his own sense, as if Chrysostom had meant to say, that human nature is still born in the same state as it was at first; for this is, in fact, at variance with his doctrine concerning the innocence (*ἀπαθεία*) lost by the sin of the first man, (see above.) But if Julian was wrong in this single respect, that he contemplated the words wholly out of their connection with Chrysostom's entire mode of thinking on doctrinal matters, Augustin, on the other hand, manifestly tortured them, when he explained them according to *his* system, as referring barely to the absence of actual, personal sin; for, in this case, the antithesis made by Chrysostom would, in fact, not hold good.

Isidore of Pelusium also replies to the question, why infants, who are without sin, should be baptized,[3] in the following way. Some, who took too narrow a view of the matter,[4] said it was that they might be cleansed from the sin transmitted to them from Adam. This, indeed, he said, was not to be denied, but it was not the only reason. This would still be a thing not so great after all; but there would be besides many other gracious gifts communicated to them, which far exceed any possible attainments of human nature. Infants were not only delivered from the punishment of sin, but, moreover, had imparted to them a divine regeneration, adoption, justification,[5] fellowship with Christ. The remedy amounted to far more than the mere removal of an evil.[6]

Theodore of Mopsuestia seized in this case upon only one side or moment of the Oriental church doctrine, which moment, in infant baptism, was ever made the more prominent one; but the other he dropped entirely, as his system required that he should. It is, according to his doctrine, the same state of human nature, mutable and liable to temptation, in which the first man was created, (see p. 654,) and in

[1] Hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coinquinati peccato, ut eis addatur sanctitas, justitia, adoptio, hæreditas, fraternitas Christi, ut ejus membra sint.

[2] Vid. Augustin. c. Julianum, l. I. § 21.

[3] Epp. V. 195.

[4] *Σμικρολογοῦντες.*

[5] *Δικαίωσις*, here used, beyond doubt, in the sense of Augustin, viz., the making just, making holy by union with Christ.

[6] No *φαρμακὸν ἀντίρροπον τοῦ τραύματος.*

which all infants are born. Baptism in the case of adults has a two-fold purpose, to bestow on them the forgiveness of sin, and to exalt them by fellowship with Christ to a participation in his freedom from sin, and his moral immutability; which is the passing over from the first portion of the development of life in humanity, into the second, which is fully entered upon only at the general restoration, (see p. 657.) That which is received at baptism is the principle and pledge of that freedom from sin (anamartesia) which will then first come to be fully realized. In the case of infant baptism, then, the forgiveness of sin, according to Theodore's doctrine, does not properly come into consideration; but its purpose and object is simply the imparting of that new and higher life exempt from sin, of which the entire human nature stands in need. He distinguishes, accordingly, a two-fold meaning of the forgiveness of sin, to the bestowment of which the formula of baptism refers.[1] He supposed, therefore, in this latter respect, the same supernatural communication in the case of infant baptism as in the case of the baptism of adults: though, following out the natural bent of his acute and discriminating understanding, he carefully distinguished here, too, that which is merely the symbol and vehicle, from that which is the working principle, lest that should be ascribed to the magical operation of the water, which could only be ascribed to the agency of the Holy Spirit.[2] The water, he maintained, according to the comparison employed by Christ in his conversation with Nicodemus, stood related to the creative power of God in the new and higher birth, as the body of the mother to the creative power of God in the natural birth.[3]

This mode of apprehension was adopted, as we learn particularly from the explanations of Cœlestius and of Julian, by the Pelagians; though it did not in their system rest upon the same foundation as in the Oriental and in the Antiochian systems. In this way we must understand what Cœlestius says in the creed which he sent to Rome: "Infants must, according to the rule of the universal church, and according to the declaration of the Gospel, be baptized in order to the forgiveness of sin. Since our Lord has determined that the kingdom of heaven can be bestowed only on the baptized, and since the powers of nature are not adequate to this, it must be the free gift of grace."[4] It is

[1] So Theodore, in his address to the neophytes: Renatus, alter factus es pro altero, non jam pars Adam, mutabilis et peccatis circumfusi; sed Christi, qui omnino inculpabilis per resurrectionem factus est. Act. IV. Concil. œcumen. V. c. 36. Δύο ἀφέσεις τῶν ἁμαρτίων, τὴν μὲν τῶν πεπραγμένων, τὴν δὲ τὴν ἀναμαρτησίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίων τελείαν καὶ κυριώτατην καὶ ἀναίρεσιν ἁμαρτίας παντελῆ. (The ambiguity which is attached to the Greek word ἄφεσις by its etymology here came to his assistance.) Ἤρξατο μὲν ἐμφανίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας καὶ ἐν ἀῤῥαβῶνος ἡμῖν δίδοσθαι τάξει. Δίδοται δὲ τελείως καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔργοις καὶ ἐν τῇ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀποκατάστασει, ὑπὲρ ἧς ἵνα τύχωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ βρέφη βαπτιζόμεθα.

[2] The water τὸ ἐν ᾧ πληροῦται τὸ ἔργον; the πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τὴν οἰκείαν πληροῦν ἐνεργείαν. τούτου γὲ ἕνεκα καὶ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα μετὰ πατρὸς καὶ νἱοῦ ὀνομαζόμεν, τοῦδε ὕδατος οὐ μεμνήμεθα, ὡς φαίνεσθαι, ὅτι τὸ μὲν σύμβολον καὶ χρείας τινος ἕνεκεν παραλαμβάνεται, τὸ δὲ ὡς ἐνεργοῦν ἐπικαλούμεθα.

[3] Ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς φυσικῆς γεννήσεως ἡ κοιλία τὸ φυσικὸν ἐργαστήριόν ἐστιν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ τικτόμενον ἀποτελεῖται θείᾳ δυνάμει, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ ὕδωρ ἐν τάξει τῆς μητρὸς λαμβάνεται, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐν τάξει τοῦ διαπλάττοντος δεσπότου.

[4] Augustin. De peccato originis, c. V.

clear that Cœlestius, in denying that any sinfulness adhered to infants, could understand baptism for the forgiveness of sins in this case only after the same manner with Theodore of Mopsuestia; and, accordingly, he understood also, in like manner with the latter, by the kingdom of heaven, that which transcends the limits of human nature, that which can only be bestowed upon it by a higher communication from God. Thus the Pelagian Julian, though he absolutely denied the possibility of any forgiveness of sins in the case of infants, could still declare that baptism, having been once instituted by Christ, must be acknowledged as universally valid and necessary for every age; that eternal condemnation awaited every one who denied that this rite was profitable also for children.[1]

The grace of baptism, said he, is every where the same; but its effects appear different, according to the different relations and circumstances of the subjects of it. In some, the negative effect, the forgiveness of sin, must precede the positive, the exaltation of man's nature. In infants the effect is only to *ennoble* the nature which remains in its original condition of goodness."[2] Although it would be natural for the Pelagians, according to the principles of their system, to ascribe to baptism, as being an external act, a merely symbolical import, yet they did not find it possible to disentangle themselves wholly from the church tradition of their period; but they sought to reconcile what they found in that tradition, as they best could, with their own principles, which had arisen in an entirely different way. Moreover, with regard to the relations of the divine matter to the external sign, of regeneration to outward baptism, they had precisely the same notions which were the prevailing ones in the church; for this becomes sufficiently clear from what they taught respecting the effects of infant baptism; and Julian expressed himself on this point with distinctness and precision.[3]

On the one hand, the doctrine which, ever since the time of Cyprian, by the habit of confounding the inward grace with its outward sign in baptism, had become predominant, especially in the North-African church, the doctrine of the damnation of unbaptized infants, appeared to the Pelagians as something revolting, something whereby a tyrannical arbitrary will was imputed to the divine Being. But, on the other hand, they must themselves, however, according to the theory just unfolded, suppose the higher grace of participating in the highest stage of blessedness in the kingdom of heaven was conditioned solely on the obtaining of baptism; and even *they* found this asserted in the words of Christ to Nicodemus, as even *they* made no distinction of the baptism

[1] Nos gratiam Christi, id est baptisma, ex quo ritum ejus Christus instituit, ita necessariam omnibus in commune ætatibus confiteri, ut quicunque eam utilem etiam parvulis negat, æterno feriamus anathemate. Opus imperfect. c. Julian. l. III. c. 149.

[2] L. c. § 151. Quæ tamen gratia, quoniam etiam medicina dicitur, facit alios ex malis bonos; parvulos autem, quos creat condendo bonos, reddit innovando adoptandoque meliores. Æqualiter cunctis a se imbutis adoptionis et sanctificationis et promotionis dona conferre. L. c. l. II. c. 116.

[3] When he says of baptismal grace: Infusa semel uno virtutis suæ impetu atque compendio diversa et plurima delet crimina. Opus imperfectum, l. II. c. 212.

of the Spirit from the baptism with water. Accordingly they must of necessity affirm, with regard to unbaptized infants, that although free and exempt from punishment, they were still excluded from that higher state of being, and attained only to a certain intermediate state. This was what Cœlestius really meant to say in the declarations above cited.

And to the same result on this subject must every one have been led, who was inclined to adopt the Oriental mode of considering the effects of baptism, and would consistently follow out the matter to a definite conclusion; unless he supposed a universal redemption or restoration as the final end, to which that intermediate state was destined to prove a point of transition for unbaptized infants. Such an intermediate state Gregory Nazianzen also assigned for those who were unbaptized, through no fault of their own.[1] Augustin himself had once entertained a like opinion.[2] Ambrose of Milan[3] believed, also, that it was necessary to infer from the words of Christ to Nicodemus, that none could enter into the kingdom of heaven without baptism; but it was his opinion, though he had no confidence in it, that unbaptized infants would be exempted from punishment. Pelagius himself shrunk from expressing any decided opinion on this point, though by logical thinking it was absolutely out of his power to avoid that consequence of his principles. He affirmed of unbaptized children, that of one thing he was sure, namely, that they could not, as innocent beings, suffer punishment consistently with the divine justice. But what would become of them, was more than he knew, doubtless because he was of the opinion that no distinct declaration on this point could be found in the sacred scriptures.[4]

But then Augustin could, however, not without good reason, accuse the Pelagians of inconsistency, when they charged the advocates of the doctrine of absolute predestination with imputing arbitrary will to God, while they themselves were still more involved in this error, by supposing that God excluded innocent beings from the kingdom of heaven, which he bestowed on others who were in no respect more worthy of it. The notion, moreover, of an intermediate place between the state of wo and the kingdom of heaven, was a thing altogether unscriptural and incredible in itself; for man, being in the image of God, was destined to find his bliss in communion with God, and out of that communion could be no otherwise than wretched.[5] The Council of Carthage, A.D. 418, finally condemned, in its II. Canon, the doctrine concerning such an intermediate state for unbaptized children, on the ground, that nothing could be conceived as existing between the kingdom of God and perdition. But then, too, according to the doctrine of this council, the eternal perdition of all unbaptized infants was expressly affirmed; a consistency of error revolting to the natural sentiments of humanity. It is worthy of notice,

[1] Orat. 40.
[2] See l. III. de libero arbitrio, c. 23.
[3] De Abrahamo, l. II. § 84.
[4] Quo non eant, scio, quo eant, nescio. And perhaps he meant the same thing by his words in the letter to Innocent, bishop of Rome: in perpetuam certamque vitam renasci eum, qui natus sit ad incertam.
[5] Augustinus: Nunquam explicant isti, qua justitia nullum peccatum habens image Dei separetur a regno Dei. De peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. I. c. 30. Hoc novum in ecclesia, prius inauditum est, esse vitam æternam præter regnum cœlorum, esse salutem æternam præter regnum Dei. Sermo 294.

however, that this particular passage of the canon is wanting in a portion of the manuscripts.

But such being the prevailing doctrine concerning baptism, reflecting minds must now have been struck with the difficulty of conceiving how a divine influence could take effect in the case of infants devoid of all conscious moral action of their own. Augustin, by means of his correct principles, above explained, respecting the essence of sacraments, might have found out a better way, if he had not been fettered by the authority of the church doctrine. His reply, indeed, explains nothing; but it proceeds from a profound feeling of the essential nature of Christian fellowship. He says: The faith of the church, which consecrates infants to God in the spirit of love, takes the place of their own faith; and albeit they possess as yet no faith of their own, yet there is nothing in their thoughts to hinder the divine efficacy."[1] His scheme, then, amounted to this: that as the child, ere its corporeal and independent existence was fully developed, was supported by the vital forces of nature in its bodily mother, so, ere it came to the independent development of its spiritual being in its own consciousness, it is supported by the heightened vital forces of that spiritual mother, the church; — an idea, which would involve some truth, — supposing the visible church corresponded to its ideal — when applied, without being so literally understood, to infant baptism.

With regard to the doctrine of the holy supper, we find in this period almost precisely the same gradations in the notions respecting the relations of the external signs to the things signified, as in the period preceding. In this period, too, the idea chiefly predominant was that of a supernatural communion, in part spiritual and in part corporeal, with Christ, by means of the intimate interpenetration of the bread and wine by the body and blood of Christ. As in the former period this view was most distinctly expressed by Irenæus and Justin Martyr, so in the present it was most strongly asserted by Cyrill of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Nilus, Hilary of Poictiers, and Ambrose of Milan. Thus Cyrill of Jerusalem declares it to be the purpose of the sacrament of the supper, that we should take within us the body and blood of Christ, Christ himself;[2] that by the body and blood of Christ passing over into our members, we may become partakers of the divine nature, be sanctified in body and soul.[3] Chrysostom says, that we may be not only united with our Saviour by love, but in our entire nature blended with his body.[4] He contemplates the institution of the eucharist as a proof of the greatest love of our Saviour to men, of his will to be united to them, and to impart himself to them in the most intimate manner, to cause his own body to pass over into their entire nature. He gave himself not only to be seen, but also to be touched and to be partaken of by those who desire him.[5] So Hilary of Poictiers affirms that between Christ and believers there exists not only a unity of will, but a

[1] Nullus obex contrariæ cogitationis, ep. 23 ad Bonifacium.

[2] Σύσσωμοι καὶ σύναιμοι Χριστοῦ, χριστόφοροι.

[3] Cateches. myst. 4.

[4] Εἰς ἐκείνην ἀνακερασθῶμεν τὴν σαρκα, κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα.

[5] Hom. 46 in Joann.

natural union, (not only per concordiam voluntatis, but also per naturæ veritatem,) partly because Christ assumed human nature, and partly because in the eucharist he gives his body, and thereby his divine life residing therein, to believers.[1]

True, these church-teachers sometimes have recourse to figures, for the purpose of describing the efficacy of the consecration at the Lord's supper, which seem to indicate a proper transubstantiation, like the change of the water to wine at the marriage feast at Cana;[2] and they employ expressions which *might* denote transubstantiation.[3] But these terms were also frequently employed to indicate another change to something more exalted, not precisely a transubstantiation; and especially, in the rhetorical language of church-teachers, who would fain set forth in strong light the wonderful nature of the transaction, such expressions should not be too rigidly interpreted. Even in the case of these comparisons, every thing turns upon the point to be illustrated, namely, that by a miracle the substance present becomes something other than it was before, no matter in what particular sense this is to be understood. These comparisons are counterbalanced by others, which totally contradict the notion of transubstantiation; as, for instance, the comparison with the anointing oil used in confirmation, or with the higher consecration bestowed on the water in baptism.[4] The disputes concerning the two natures in Christ gave the first occasion for entering into a more distinct exposition of the conceptions respecting the relation of the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ; for those who affirmed the union of two natures unchangeably persisting in their essence, sought to make this clear by introducing the comparison of the Lord's supper. As the symbols of the body and blood of Christ — says Theodoret — remain in their original substance and form, admit of being seen and felt as precisely the same as they were before, but the contemplation of the spirit and of faith sees in them that which they have become; and they are also adored[5] as that which they are to faith.[6] Even

[1] Hilarius de trinitate l. VIII. § 13. Quomodo non naturaliter in nobis existimandus est, qui et naturam carnis nostræ jam inseparabilem sibi homo natus assumsit, et naturam carnis suæ ad naturam æternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit, (he would impart to us the natura æternitatis, his own divine essence, in imparting to us his body in the sacramental form — the same that Irenæus called ἕνωσις πρὸς ἀφθαρσίαν.

[2] See Cyrill. Cateches. 22 Ambros. de mysteriis, c. 9.

[3] As for example, μεταποίειν, Cyrill. Cateches. 23, transfiguratio in corpus et sanguinem. Ambros. de incarnationis dominicæ sacramento, l. I. c. IV. § 23, de fide, l. IV. c. X. § 124.

[4] See Cyrill. Cateches. 21, § 3.

[5] See vol. II. p. 701, and Ambros. de Spiritu Sancto, l. III. c. XI. § 79, caro Christi, quæ in mysteriis adoratur.

[6] Theodoret in the second dialogue of his Ἐρανιστής: Μένει ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἴδους καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν, νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται. Ed. Hal. tom. IV. p. 126. Thus, too, the μεταβολὴ τῃ χάριτι is opposed to the μεταβολὴ τῆς φύσεως. Dialog. I. tom. IV. p. 26. The first unfolding of views of this sort would be found in Chrysostom, if the fragment of a letter of his to the monk Cæsarius, which must have been aimed against the Apollinarists, were really genuine. But this letter was most probably interpolated on occasion of the controversy concerning the two natures. Yet a comparison which Nilus, the disciple of Chrysostom, employs, indicates the same mode of apprehension: — As a document, after having been signed by the emperor, is called a *sacra*, so ordinary bread and wine, after the consecration and inward working of the Holy Spirit, is called the body and blood of Christ. Lib. I. ep. 44.

Gelasius, a *Roman bishop* towards the close of the fifth century, explained his views after the same manner.[1]

Gregory of Nyssa might in this respect undoubtedly constitute an exception. While aiming in his catechetical disquisition, (λόγος κατηχητικὸς,) c. 37, to explain the way in which bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ, and particularly to solve the difficulty, how the body of Christ, being one, is distributed among so many thousand believers in the world, and still remains one and the same and complete, he is led to an exposition which seems to presuppose a transubstantiation, and which, moreover, was seized upon by the later theory of the transformation of the bread among the Greeks. It was this — that in like manner as, during the life of Jesus on earth, the natural means of nourishment, bread and wine, were transmuted into the essence of the body united with the deity, through the power of the divine Logos, but *mediately* by that natural process whereby the means of nourishment are converted into flesh and blood; so, at present, the same effect is produced, bread and wine is converted into the body of the Logos, by the same power of the Logos, only working at present in the way of an immediate miracle. Yet *he*, also, was still certainly very far from holding fast, with clear consciousness, the idea which seemed to be here lying at bottom; for in his sermon on the baptism of Christ,[2] he makes use of comparisons which are grounded on a totally different idea, as, for instance, the heightened efficacy of the consecration of the baptismal water, of the anointing oil, of ordination. It is also deserving of remark, how little, in the case of this theologian, in other respects so systematic, these particular doctrines were carried out in coherence with his peculiar principles; for his ideas concerning the character of Christ's glorified body, (see above, vol. II., p. 428,) would have easily led him to dispose of the difficulty above noticed by him in an altogether different way; but that idea of the repetition of the incarnation of the Logos which had taken possession of his mind, did not leave room for him here to think of Christ's *glorified body*.

The idea of a union with Christ presents itself already, under a form in which it appears to be less sensuously apprehended, in the writings of Athanasius. From John 6 : 62,[3] he endeavors to show that according to that passage, the partaking of the flesh and of the blood of Christ was not to be understood in the literal sense. Christ — he says — mentions on this occasion his ascension to heaven, *for the very purpose* of turning away men's minds from sensuous notions, and leading them to the idea of a spiritual nourishment;[4] inasmuch as Christ communicates himself to each after a spiritual manner.[5] The addition, "as the preservative to a blessed resurrection,"[6] shows that he also

[1] De duabus naturis in Christo, adversus Eutychem et Nestorium, in the Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. VIII.: In divinam transeunt, Spiritu Sancto perficiente, substantiam, permanente tamen in sua proprietate natura.

[2] T. III. f. 370.

[3] Ep. IV. ad Serapionem.

[4] The term πνευματικόν is not restricted, indeed, to the meaning "spiritual," but may also denote supernatural as opposed to natural, sensible nourishment.

[5] Πνευματικῶς ἀναδίδοσθαι.

[6] Φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς.

conceived of a higher principle of life being communicated to the body, by means of the contact with Christ.

The doctrine of the North-African church, as we have already described it in the preceding period, we once more meet with in Augustin. He explains the words of institution as follows: that Christ's body was the same thing as the symbol of his body.[1] He says that the expression, to give his body and flesh to eat, contains a bold figure, and that the sense which lies at bottom must be expounded according to the analogy of faith.[2] According to the analogy of the religious use of language, by virtue of which the sacramental sign is substituted for the thing itself, in the same way, for example, as the sacramentum fidei is substituted for faith itself in the case of children who are as yet incapable of faith, according to this analogy, the symbol of Christ's body is put for the body itself.[3] But although Augustin, in the case of the eucharist, as everywhere else, considered the consecrated outward elements as symbols merely, clearly separating and holding apart the sacramentum and the res sacramenti, yet he at the same time supposed, as in the case of the sacraments generally, so in the case of the eucharist in particular, a divine matter united with the holy symbols, and which is communicated to the believing heart. The res sacramenti is the uniting of the faithful, as members, with their One great Head, and the fellowship, grounded therein, of the faithful with each other, as members of one body; therefore their union into one community of the saints.[4] By the body of Christ in the eucharist, Augustin understands the spiritual body of the members united with Christ as the head. To the question, how Christ, who died and arose again, sits at the right hand of God, and will come again to judgment, can here distribute his body, to this question he gives an entirely different answer from that of Gregory of Nyssa. According to his spiritual mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Lord's supper, there could be no difficulty on this point. By pointing to the spiritual sense as the only correct one, he had at once answered the question. On this very account was the transaction called a sacrament, because one thing is presented to the eye of sense, and another thing discerned by the eye of the spirit.[5] Hence Christ said to the Jews, when he should be seen to ascend up where he was before, then they would be obliged to understand that he could only have spoken of a spiritual communication, of a fellowship of divine life.[6] The flesh profiteth nothing; that is, without the spirit. The flesh was only the vessel through which the

[1] Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere: hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui. In the like connection as when he says "Petra *erat* Christus" is equivalent to significabat Christum. C. Adimantum c. 12.

[2] Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum, l. II. c. 9.

[3] See l. III. de trinitate c. X. § 19 et 20, ep. 98.

[4] Hunc cibum et potum vult intelligi societatem corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta ecclesia. — Corpus Christi si vis intelligere, apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus: vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa dominica positum est, mysterium vestrum accipitis.

[5] Ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur.

[6] Certe vel tunc intelligetis, quia gratia ejus non consumitur morsibus.

spirit wrought, through which Christ communicated himself to us.[1] Christ is eternal life, and in his flesh and blood gives himself. Augustin distinguishes the inward and the outward manducation of the supper, (manducare intus et foris.) The former is the privilege only of believers;[2] but the unbelieving and the unworthy receive nothing but the *sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ.[3]

Next, we find a more spiritual apprehension of this doctrine in those church-teachers on whose theological education the study of Origen had exerted a decided influence; from which number, however, it is evident from what has been said, Gregory of Nyssa[4] must be excepted, although on other subjects, he accords very nearly with Origen. Gregory Nanzianzen calls the eucharist an archetype of the great mystery of the sacrifice of Christ;[5] the symbol of the sacrifice by which the salvation of mankind had been wrought out.[6] Assuredly, however, he conceived in connection with this a higher divine influence, as is sufficiently evident from looking at the connection of his ideas relative to the priesthood and to sacrifice; and this is confirmed, moreover, by certain individual expressions of his concerning the effects of the eucharist, as when he calls it a sacrifice, by which we enter into fellowship with Christ, into fellowship with his sufferings and his divine nature,[7] — the holy transaction which exalts us to heaven.[8] He accordingly supposes a certain sanctifying influence of the Logos, which, by virtue of the words pronounced by the priest, becomes united with the symbols of the bread and wine; and in so far then as the outward symbols, as vehicles of this supernatural sanctifying impartation of the Logos, are substituted in place of the real body of Christ, they are called the body and blood of Christ.[9] Eusebius of Cæsarea probably distinguishes, like his teacher Origen,[10] the sensible and the spiritual eucharist. In reference to the former, he says; it is enjoined upon Christians to celebrate the remembrance of Christ's sacrifice by the symbols of his

[1] Si caro nihil non prodesset, verbum caro non fieret, ut inhabitaret in nobis. Caro vas fuit; quod habebat, attende, non quod erat.

[2] Habe fidem, et tecum est quem non vides.

[3] Sermo 235, 272. Tractat. 26, Evang. Joh.

[4] At the same time, however, this mode of apprehension does not appear, with him, to be an entirely isolated thing, but stands strictly connected with his whole system: for in this is made distinctly prominent the fundamental idea, that as the principle of corruption (*φθόρα*) was propagated in human nature from the first sin; so, in opposition to this, the principle of incorruption, (*ἀφθαρσία*,) proceeding from Christ, must pervade the entire human nature as the first fruits (*ἀπάρχη*) of the new creation. Yet another modification of this idea might, indeed, have offered itself to him, corresponding to that notion of the character of Christ's glorified body, explained above on page 428.

[5] Orat. I. f. 38. *Τῶν μεγαλῶν μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον.*

[6] *Τύποι τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας.* Orat. XVII. f. 273.

[7] Orat. III. f. 70. *Δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς θεοτήτος.*

[8] *Ἄνω φέρουσα μυσταγωγία.* Orat. XVII. f. 273.

[9] See ep. 240 ad Amphilochium, among the few letters which are inserted at the beginning of the first volume of his works: *Ὅταν λόγῳ καθέλκῃς τὸν λόγον· ὅταν ἀναμάκτῳ τομῇ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τέμνῃς δεσποτικὸν, φωνὴν ἔχων τὸ ξίφος.* These words, no doubt, admit of being understood, according to the mode of apprehension already noticed, as referring to a repeated incarnation, (*ἐνσάρκωσις*:) but we must consider too, that Gregory was much addicted to rhetorical exaggeration.

[10] See vol. I. p. 648.

body and blood.[1] In reference to the latter, he thus paraphrases the words of Christ in the 6th chapter of John's gospel: "Think not that I am speaking of the body which I bear with me, as if this must be eaten. Neither think that I bid you drink my sensible and bodily blood; but know that the very words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life, so that my words and doctrines themselves are my flesh and blood. He who, by appropriating to himself these, becomes, so to speak, nourished with the bread from heaven, will be made a partaker of the heavenly life."[2]

e. *Doctrine of the Last Things.*

In respect to the doctrine concerning the last things, it is to be observed that the notions respecting disciplinary or purgatory sufferings, which in the East and West had already in the preceding period shaped themselves out into different forms from a commixture of Persico-Jewish and Christian ideas, passed over into this period also. It was supposed that the doctrine of a purgatorial fire was to be found in Malachi 3, and in 1 Corinthians, 3 : 12.[3] In connection with the notion of a dead faith, and the confounding together of the conceptions of the visible and of the invisible church, this doctrine, as had happened before under a Jewish-Christian mode of apprehension, that for example of the Clementines, was abused in being made the foundation of the false view, that whoever was a member of the orthodox catholic church, and at the same time led a vicious life, would possess this advantage over the unbelieving, that although he needed to pass through such a purification after death, he would still in the end attain to salvation. Thus the passage just mentioned in the first epistle to the Corinthians was so misconstrued, that it was supposed it might be affirmed of him who united with the pretended faith in Christ every species of vice, that he built on the foundation, which is Christ. The moral zeal of Pelagius against an error so practically mischievous, led him to contend against the doctrine of such an ignis purgatorius, — as may be gathered from his declaration which he made at the synod of Diospolis.[4] Augustin sought to guard this doctrine against such misinterpretations.[5] He considered that passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians, as referring immediately to the purification by means of trials in the present life, of those who, though inspired by love to Christ, were still not as yet so penetrated by it, as to have their hearts entirely cleansed from the love of earthly things; for, in order that Christ should really be the foundation, it was required that the love to him should overbalance all other interests, and that the soul should be ready to sacrifice every thing for him.[6] Such a proof of purification, continuing to

[1] Demonstrat. evangel. lib. I. c. 10, f. 39.
[2] Theol. eccles. l. III. c. 12.
[3] Vid. Cyrill. cateches. 15, § 9: Πῦρ δοκιμαστικὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων before the last judgment. Pœnæ quædam purgatoriæ. De civitate Dei, l. XX. c. 25; l. XXI. c. 13, 24.
[4] See above, p. 584, Note.
[5] In his enchiridion ad Laurentium, c. 68.
[6] Si Christus in corde fundamenti habet locum, id est, ut ei nihil anteponatur, et malit homo qui tali dolore uritur, rebus quas ita diligit, magis carere quam Christo, per ignem fit salvus. Si autem res hujus modi temporales ac seculares tempore tentationis maluerit tenere quam Christum, eum in fundamento non habuit,

go on even after death, but only in the case of those who, in the sense just described, had made Christ the basis of their life, he considered to be a supposable thing; so that many believers attained to the state of blessedness through a certain purifying fire, enduring for a longer or shorter time, according as they had set their affections more or less on perishable goods. But he puts down this doctrine as somewhat doubtful.[1]

The doctrine of eternal punishment continued, as in the preceding period, to be dominant in the creed of the church. Yet, in the Oriental church, in which, with the exception of those subjects immediately connected with the doctrinal controversies, there was greater freedom and latitude of development, many respectable church-teachers still stood forth, without injuring their reputation for orthodoxy, as advocates of the opposite doctrine, until the time when the Origenistic disputes caused the agreement with Origen in respect to this point also to be considered as something decidedly heretical. The scepticism with regard to that doctrine arose from very different points of view, and very different interests. For the most part, in the great cities of the East, it arose by no means from a more free and earnest reflection on religious subjects, but from a lack of Christian seriousness and a superficial and trifling mode of judgment. There were persons who could not seize the contrariety of moral evil to God's holiness in its strict truth, entangled as they still were too much in the pagan view of evil as a property of nature, and hence were still too far from rightly understanding the true essence of Christian sanctification. They would fain reason away the doctrine of eternal punishment, simply because this doctrine presented terrifying images, which disturbed them in a life too deficient in point of moral strictness and purity. God — they imagined — could not so severely judge the weaknesses of mankind. Those declarations of holy scripture respecting everlasting punishments contained nothing but terrifying threats. Chrysostom, who, in the great cities where he labored, came most frequently in contact with this frivolous way of thinking, was incited, by the lively zeal which he felt against every thing destructive to practical Christianity, to controvert these opinions with earnestness,[2] although perhaps otherwise his mild and amiable spirit might not be altogether disinclined to the doctrine of a universal restoration, with which he must have become acquainted at an earlier period, from being a disciple of Diodorus of Tarsus.[3]

But from two theological schools there went forth an opposition to the doctrine of everlasting punishment, which had its ground in a deeper Christian interest; inasmuch as the doctrine of a universal restoration was closely connected with the entire dogmatic systems of both these schools, namely, that of Origen, and the school of Antioch. As it

cum in ædificio prius non sit aliquid fundamento.

[1] Incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit, quæri potest.

[2] In epist. I. ad Thessal. Hom. VIII.; ep. II. Hom. III.

[3] It is remarkable that Chrysostom in his homoletic exposition of the first epistle to the Corinthians, (chap. 15: 28,) mentions the opinion of those who would find in these words the doctrine of a total destruction of evil (ἀναίρεσις τῆς κακιας) without controverting it; see Hom. XXXIX. in ep. I. ad Corinth. T. X. ed. Montf. f. 372.

concerns the former, we may remark here still another after-influence of the great Origen upon individual church-teachers whose theological education had been shaped by the study of his writings, as, for example, a Didymus,[1] and a Gregory Nazianzen. But this particular doctrine was expounded and maintained with the greatest logical ability and acuteness, in works written expressly for that purpose, by Gregory of Nyssa.[2] God, he maintained, had created rational beings, in order that they might be self-conscious and free vessels and recipients for the communications of the original fountain of all good.[3] Now if the soul exist in a condition of harmonious correspondence with this destination, and of harmonious activity for the reception of the godlike life, it is blessed. If this harmonious relation is disturbed by that which is alien from it, by moral evil, it is wretched. The expressions reward and punishment, are but inadequate terms to denote the present existence or the disturbance of this harmony of relations; just as when the healthy eye, in the exercise of the power residing within it, perceives objects in the sun-light, or when it is prevented from so doing by disease. All punishments are means of purification, ordained by divine love with a view to purge rational beings from moral evil, and to restore them back again to that communion with God which corresponds to their nature. God would not have permitted the existence of evil, unless he had foreseen that by the redemption, all rational beings would in the end, according to their destination, attain to the same blessed fellowship with himself.[4]

In like manner the doctrine of universal restoration was closely connected with the fundamental views of Theodore of Mopsuestia concerning the two great periods in the development of the rational creation, and concerning the final end of the redemption, whereby the immutability of a divine life should take the place of that mutability and exposure to temptation, which had before prevailed in the entire rational creation. Moral evil appeared here, in fact, as a universally necessary point of transition for the development of freedom.[5] Diodorus of Tarsus had already unfolded this doctrine in his work which has not come down to us, on the incarnation of the deity, (περὶ οἰκονομίας,) and Theodore exhibited it in his commentary on the gospels.[6] In

[1] Though in the writings of Didymus which have come to our knowledge, there are no distinct traces to be found of the doctrine of restoration, (ἀποκατάστασις,) yet in the work De trinitate published by Mingarelli (Bologna, 1769) an intimation of this kind may be found in his exposition and application of the passage in Philipp. 2: 10, where in reference to the καταχθόνια as well as to the ἐπίγεια, he speaks of the calling on the name of Christ, which extends to the salvation of all; see l. III. c. 10. 365.

[2] As for example, in his exposition of 1 Corinth. 15: 28, in his λόγος κατηχητικός, c. 8 and 35, in his tract on the soul and on the resurrection, in his tract on the early death of children.

[3] Ὡς τὸν πλοῦτον τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν μὴ ἀργὸν εἶναι, ἀλλ' οἷον ἀγγεῖά τινα προαιρετικὰ τῶν ψυχῶν δοχεῖα.

[4] As this doctrine stands so closely connected with Gregory's whole system of faith, it belongs among the worst examples of an arbitrary caprice, regardless of history, when Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople in the eighth century, in his ἀνταποδοτικὸς or ἀνόθευτος, endeavored to show that all the passages in Gregory's writings, referring to this doctrine, were interpolated by heretics. See Phot. cod. 233.

[5] See above p. 657.

[6] Extracts from these writings by the Nestorian bishop Solomon of Bassora, in the thirteenth century, in Assemani, T. III. P. I. f. 323, 24; comp. the fourth of Theo-

these writings they adduced many other special reasons against the eternity of punishment. "If the rewards of eternity so far exceed good works and the brief period of life, ought not the punishments much more to be overcome by the divine mercy. God would not revive the wicked at the resurrection, if they must needs suffer only punishment without reformation." They believed they found an intimation that the degree of punishment would be proportionate to the degree of sin in Luke 12 : 47 ; Matth. 5 : 26. From the fundamental principles of Theodore it also necessarily follows, though we have no distinct declaration of his own on that point, that as the antithesis of those two periods was assumed by him to embrace generally the entire rational creation, he must therefore have extended the restoration to fallen spirits as well as to mankind.

3. *Opposite Theological Tendencies which arose out of the after-workings of the Origenistic disputes.*

We have still to mention a series of controversies which are more loosely connected with the history of particular doctrines, and which form a whole of themselves, — the renewed controversies concerning Origen, respecting whose relation to the theological development of this period we have spoken already in the general introduction. We perceive in these disputes, first, the struggle of that more free theological tendency which started from Origen, with that other more narrow tendency clinging fast to the letter of the church doctrine, which from the beginning stood opposed to the Origenistic school, as the struggle of a more fleshly with a more spiritual tendency in the mode of apprehending Christianity. But the theological interest of these controversies was soon lost in contests of another kind, partaking more of a secular than of a spiritual interest ; but then these controversies gain another important significance for us, in that they exhibit to us a hero of the faith, who, unsubdued by all persecutions and sufferings, manfully contended with spiritual weapons against the corruptions of the church which grew out of the confusion of things spiritual with things temporal.

Origen, long since pronounced a heretic in the Western church, was scarcely known among the Western theologians except by name, while those of the East were forming different parties in their various judgments concerning him. He had some enthusiastic admirers, who agreed with him in all his peculiar views, while there were other blind zealots, who looked upon him in no other light than as the father of all heresies. There were others, again, holding the middle ground betwixt these two parties, who, acknowledging his merits in relation to the progress of theology, without overlooking his defects, sought with moderation and freedom of spirit to separate the true from the false in his writings and doctrines. As the Arians could find many things in

dore's excerpts in Marius Mercator. In Theodore's commentary on the gospel of John, so far as it remains to us, there are also to be found traces of this doctrine. But though such traces occurred in this commentary, yet, as a matter of course, passages of this kind were not received into the catenæ.

the works of Origen which seemed to furnish them with a foothold for their attacks against the Nicene creed; as they appealed, whether rightly or wrongly, to many of his assertions as justifying their own views; as the system of the Semi-Arians properly derived its origin from this father; all these circumstances would tend to place him in an unfavorable light. The Marcellus of Ancyra, who has already been mentioned in the history of doctrinal controversies, was the first to attack Origen on this particular side. He represented him as the author of Arianism. He accused him of having stood forth as a theological writer while he was still too crude, and after studying the writings of the Greek philosophers much more than the Bible, whence he mixed up foreign Platonic doctrines with the Christian scheme of faith.[1] He very unjustly reproaches him, for having commenced his work Περὶ ἀρχων with the same words with which Plato begins his Gorgias; though these words in Origen, owing to the connection in which they occur, receive an entirely different and decidedly Christian sense, as Eusebius, the defender of Origen, very properly remarks. He objects that Origen gave this work a title borrowed from the philosophical use of language; whence he draws the arbitrary conclusion, that the subject-matter, therefore, was derived from the same fountain-head, namely, from the Greek philosophy. The great point with Marcellus was, to preserve unalloyed the simple doctrine of scripture, which led him also to oppose, generally, the too high authority ascribed to the older fathers, and to admit of no other evidence, in matters of faith, than that of the sacred scriptures.[2] But other eminent church-teachers, as, for instance, Athanasius, endeavored to show, that the Arians wrongly cited Origen as on their side. Didymus of Alexandria defended the authority of Origen, whose whole system he had adopted, so far as it did not stand in express contradiction with that which had been settled and determined in the doctrinal controversies.[3] Basil of Cæsarea

[1] Ὅτι ἄρτι τῶν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν ἀποστὰς μαθημάτων καὶ τοῖς θείοις ὁμιλῆσαι προελόμενος λόγος πρὸ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς τῶν γραφῶν καταλήψεως διὰ τὸ πολὺ καὶ φιλότιμον τῆς ἔξωθεν παιδεύσεως, θᾶττον τοῦ δέοντος ἀρξάμενος ὑπογράφειν, ὑπο τῶν τῆς φιλοσοφίας παρῆχθη λόγων καὶ τινὰ δι' αὐτοὺς οὐ καλῶς γέγραφε. Euseb. c. Marcellum, lib. I. f. 23. Compare with this what we have said in the first volume (p. 698) respecting the intellectual training of Origen.

[2] The Arian Asterius, whom Marcellus controverted, had appealed in defense of his doctrine to the δόγμα περὶ θεοῦ, ὅπερ οἱ σοφώτατοι των πατέρων ἀπεφηναντο. There were here two things calculated to revolt Marcellus, who was so zealous in maintaining the sole and exclusive authority of the divine word: that he should call human teachers fathers and give to their declarations the honor which is due to the sacred scriptures alone, and that he should employ the term δόγμα to denote the divine doctrine. He makes a distinction between λόγος θεῖος and δόγμα ἀνθρώπινον; a distinction which, though not grounded in the use of language among the church-teachers, yet is so in the original signification of the terms. His remarkable words are: Τὸ γὰρ τοῦ δόγματος ὄνομα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐχεται βούλης τε καὶ γνώμης. Ὅτι δὲ τοὐθ' οὕτως ἔχει, μαρτυρεῖ μὲν ἡμῖν ἱκανῶς ἡ δογματικὴ τῶν ἰατρῶν τέχνη, (contradistinction of dogmatists and empirics,) μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τα τῶν φιλοσόφων καλούμενα. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὰ συγκλήτῳ δόξαντα ἔτι καὶ νῦν δόγματα συγκλήτου λέγεται, οὐδένα ἀγνοεῖν οἶμαι. In reference to the first, Eusebius opposed to him the passage in Deut. 32: 7, which, falsely applied as it was, had still become classical on this point; and in reference to the use of the term δόγμα, he opposed to him the passage in Ephes. 2: 15, where he explained the word δόγματα as referring to the doctrines of Christianity; though, in fact, it must necessarily be understood of the dogmas of the law, and hence was a testimony rather in favor of Marcellus than against him.

[3] For the rest, the remark we made on page 349 concerning the revolution of the

and Gregory Nanzianzen published, as the result of their common studies, a Chrestomathy from the writings of Origen, with a view to the diffusion of his spiritual ideas, and particulary of his principles of interpretation.[1] Origen had the greatest influence on the formation of the theological system set forth by Gregory of Nyssa, in which we meet once more with many of the peculiar ideas of the great church-father, although Gregory was a perfectly independent theologian, and reproduced, with the freshness of original thought, whatever he learnt from the labors of others.

Among the monks, especially in Egypt, there were, in the fourth century, two parties of opposite spiritual bents, who also stood opposed to each other in their judgment of Origen. One of these parties, possessed of a more limited intellectual culture, and confined to a rude, fleshly mode of apprehending divine things, hated Origen as the zealous opponent of this tendency. The venerated Pachomius[2] warned his disciples most of all against the writings of Origen, because the latter was more dangerous than other heretics, since under the pretence of expounding the holy scriptures, he introduced into them his own erroneous doctrines. The monks of the other class, who were possessed of more cultivated minds, and of a more contemplative mystical bent, entertained a high respect for Origen, in whose works they found ample nourishment for their own spiritual tendency.

Among the former class of monks an individual had received his education, who, at the time of the first breaking out of these disputes, stood in high estimation on account of the zeal for piety and orthodoxy which he had displayed for a long series of years. This was Epiphanius. He was born in the early part of the fourth century, in the village of Besanduk, belonging to the territory of the city of Eleutheropolis in Palestine.[3] He had been educated among those Egyptian monks for the monastic life, and their narrow intellectual culture was transmitted to him. After this, he returned home to his native country, where he became superintendent of a cloister which he founded near the place of his birth; and in the year 367, bishop of Salamis, then called Constantia, metropolis of the island of Cyprus. His writings show him to have been a man of extensive reading, but quite deficient in criticism and in logical arrangement, — possessed of sincere piety, but also of a very narrow dogmatical spirit; — a man who was altogether unable to distinguish essentials from non-essentials in doctrinal differences, — the letter from the spirit in modes of apprehending the scheme of faith, and who would be very ready to discern a dangerous heresy in every opinion on matters of faith that deviated from the one which commonly prevailed; — and it was a matter of course, that, to such a man, Origen, whom he was incapable of understanding, would appear as the most

Alexandrian spirit holds good also of Didymus, as he exhibits himself in his work De trinitate. He forms an important link in the development of the scheme *peculiar* to the Alexandrians, as it subsequently expressed itself in opposition to the Antiochian system; and also in the formation of the mystical theology, as it afterwards appears in the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius.

[1] The *φιλοκαλία*.

[2] See vol. II. p. 236.

[3] Sozom. VI. 32.

dangerons of false teachers; as, in fact, in his description and critique of the heresies, he considered it especially necessary to warn his readers against *him*.

A second eminent teacher of the church, who took part in these controversies, was Jerome, a person of great merit, on account of his researches in biblical literature and the pains he took to promote a more thorough study of the scriptures among the people of the West. That he was animated by a warm zeal for the cause of the gospel, is evinced by the unwearied labors of his long life, for which, during his own life-time, he was rewarded from many quarters only with ingratitude. But his better qualities were obscured by the great defects of his character, by his mean passions, his easily offended vanity, his love of controversy and of rule, his pride, so often concealed under the garb of humility. His letters and other writings testify, beyond doubt, that he knew how to bring home to the hearts of others many great truths of practical Christianity, which, from the want of Christian self-knowledge and self-control, he omitted to set before himself, and apply to his own case, on the proper occasions. Let us first cast a glance at the earlier history of the life and labors of this remarkable man, down to the time when he took part in these controversies.

Jerome was born at Stridon, on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia,[1] according to the Chronicle of Prosper, in the year 331, though other marks and evidences seem to point to a date some ten years later. At Rome, where the celebrated grammarian Donatus was his teacher, he enjoyed the advantages of a good literary education, and there, also, he at an early age received baptism. After various journies, which he was induced to undertake in part by his love of knowledge, he enjoyed for some time at Antioch the instructions of the learned Apollinaris, and then withdrew from the society of men into the desert of Chalcis in Syria. The inward conflicts which had led him to seek the life of seclusion, were in his case but rendered the more violent in this solitude. He had, until now, chiefly occupied himself with the study of the ancient authors, many of whom he had taken along with him from Rome. That he should find in them a good deal which was unsuited to his then ascetic bent of mind, may be well conceived. It is easy to explain also, how, in this disturbed, legal tone of mind, his conscience would upbraid him on account of his employing so much of his time on pagan literature. In the opinions entertained of this latter, we find in this period the most opposite errors. While some, — either through a misconceived zeal, which, especially in such transition-epochs of the inner life, wherein the might of Christian consciousness asserted itself in a decided manner, might easily arise, or through mental indolence, which sought concealment under the guise of piety, — were induced absolutely to shun all intercourse with ancient literature as something that belonged to Satan's kingdom, there were at Rome ecclesiastics who studied the ancient authors even to the neglect of holy writ.[2]

[1] According to the conjecture of some, Stridova in Hungary, on the boundaries of Stiria.

[2] As Jerome complains in his letter to the Roman bishop Damasus, ep. 146, (according to Martianay, T. III. f. 160:) At nunc sacer-

The medium between these two opposite mistakes was held by such men as Augustin, who, in his Guide to the education of the clergy, says that every thing true and good should be appropriated to the service of Christianity; and that even from the Pagans should be taken the silver and gold, which, in truth, they had not themselves created, but only brought to light out of the stores of an omnipresent providence.[1]

Now, when Jerome, in the midst of the severe ascetic discipline to which he subjected himself, felt his conscience reproach him on account of the predilection he had hitherto shown for the Pagan literature, we may easily explain how it might happen, that in a violent attack of fever brought on by his rigid austerities and his abstinence from food in the Quadrigesimal fasts, his thoughts should shape themselves into that vision, which, by his own fault and that of his later antagonist, Rufinus, became magnified to an undue importance. He thought that he appeared before the judgment-seat of God. When, to the question put to him, he answered, "I am a Christian," it was said, "thou art not a Christian, but a Ciceronean; for where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also;" and under the infliction of the lash, he made a solemn vow never to take into his hand another pagan book. This oath he assuredly did not consider himself bound strictly to keep, as is proved by the frequent accurate quotations from ancient authors in his writings; — unless we credit the solemn assurance of Jerome himself, in answer to the charge of perjury brought against him by Rufinus, that he made all these citations simply from memory. Possibly he differed in his own judgment respecting this vision in different moods of mind, passions, and situations. Where he wished to dissuade from the reading of the heathen authors, he represented this as being a supernatural vision,[2] and thus furnished Rufinus a good reason for accusing him of self-contradiction and of perjury.[3] And Jerome could adduce nothing in his own vindication, except first, that he had really read no pagan author since his conversion, and cited every thing from mere memory, — a statement against which Rufinus could urge many plausible objec-

dotes Dei, omissis evangeliis et prophetis, videas comœdias legere.

[1] Quod eorum tanquam aurum et argentum, quod non ipsi instituerunt, sed de quibusdam quasi metallis divinæ providentiæ, quæ ubique infusa est, eruerunt. De doctrina Christiana, l. II. § 60. Here belongs also the advice which Isidore of Pelusium gives to an anagnost in the course of training for the spiritual office. He would most profit himself and others, if he devoted his whole life to the study of the sacred scriptures, but at the same time also appropriated what he could make use of from the ancient literature in the service of Christianity, *ὅσον χρήσιμον ἐκ τῆς ἔξωθεν παιδεύσεως, ὥσπερ ἡ μέλιττα, δρεψάμενος, πολλὰ γὰρ ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν πεφιλοσοφήκασι.* Lib. II. ep. 3. Among the Greek church-teachers such views were by no means uncommon. The above-mentioned Isidore, however, censures an anchorite, in reference to his peculiar purpose of life, because he spent his time chiefly in reading the pagan writers. Lib. I. ep. 63.

[2] Ep. 18 ad Eustochium, where he adduces in proof of the reality of the thing the liventes scapulas, and that he plagas sensisse post somnum. Which, in case he remembers rightly, still admits of being easily explained.

[3] Rufin says in his *invectiva* against Jerome, l. II. f. 285, T. V. ed. Martianay, not without truth: Relegantur nunc quæso quæ scribit, si una ejus operis pagina est, quæ non eum iterum Ciceronianum pronunciet, ubi non dicat: sed Tullius noster, sed Flaccus noster, sed Maro. Jam vero Chrysippum et Aristidem, Empedoclem et cætera Græcorum auctorum nomina, ut doctus videatur et plurimæ lectionis, tanquam fumos et nebulas lectoribus spargit.

tions; and secondly, that the whole was but a dream, and what was done in a dream was a thing of no account.[1] This little trait is not without its importance, as opening a glimpse into the character of Jerome. Veracity or untrustworthiness of character is often indicated in the plainest manner by the merest trifles.

As other monks endeavored to occupy the lower powers of nature on various kinds of handicrafts, and thereby to escape many inward temptations, so Jerome chose, instead of these, a kind of discipline which came nearer to his calling, and from which he could gain more that would be profitable to the church. He learnt from a Jew the Hebrew language.[2] He was afterwards ordained as a presbyter at Antioch; and, between the years 379 and 380, made a journey to Constantinople, drawn by the invitation of Gregory Nanzianzen. By the latter, his attention was first particularly directed to Origen, of whose exegetical writings he from this time forward availed himself in many ways, and of whose homilies he translated several into Latin. Then he journeyed to Rome in 382, on a visit to the bishop Damasus, with whom at an earlier period he had already entered into friendly relations, and the latter availed himself of his various knowledge by making him his secretary and adviser in church matters; by which office he must have become very accurately versed in ecclesiastical affairs; as the most important passed through his own hands.[3] Here he gained many enthusiastic friends, but made also many violent enemies. As a promoter of monasticism in a country where it was as yet but little loved, in the great capital, where the rigidly ascetic tendency came into collision with the propensities and interests of many, he could not fail even on this score to incur the hatred of numbers, both of the clergy and laity; and as he induced ladies and maidens of the noblest families, by the enthusiasm for the ascetic life with which he inspired them, to forsake their worldly relations, and in some cases to retire to a life of solitude in Palestine, so by this means he vexed and irritated some of the most eminent citizens of Rome. To these occasions of offence must be added the strong contrast of his erudition with the ignorance which prevailed among many of the Roman clergy, which superiority Jerome, in his usual way, took no pains to hide, but on the other hand endeavored to make them feel; and also the peculiarly sarcastic manner in which he exposed and chastised the faults of the worldly-minded clergy in Rome, particularly in a widely circulated letter addressed to the nun Eustochium — so that Rufinus afterwards accused him of putting weapons into the hands of the Pagans against the Christians.[4] But

[1] Hæc dicerem, si quippiam vigilans promississem; nunc autem novum impudentiæ genus objicit mihi somnium meum. Sed tamen qui somnium criminatur, audiat prophetarum voces, somniis non esse credendum. Adv. Rufin. l. I. f. 385, T. IV. ed. Martianay.

[2] Incentiva vitiorum ardoremque naturæ ferre non poteram, quem quum crebris jejuniis frangerem, mens tamen cogitationibus æstuabat. Ad quam edomandam cuidam fratri, qui ex Hebræis crediderat, me in disciplinam dedi. Ep. 95 (or 4) ad Rusticum.

[3] Jerome ep. 11 (or 91) ad Ageruchiam: Cum in chartis ecclesiasticis juvarem Damasum et orientis atque occidentis synodicis consultationibus responderem.

[4] Rufinus l. II. invectiv.: Ea quæ gentiles falso in nos conferre crimina putabantur, iste verâ esse, imo multo pejora a nostris geri quam illi criminabantur asseruit. Certainly an unjust charge.

as long as Damasus lived, Jerome was sufficiently protected by his authority. But, as he died in the year 384, and his successor Siricius seems not to have been so favorably disposed towards Jerome, he saw himself under the necessity of yielding to the great number of his enemies, and he determined to withdraw from Babylon, as he was accustomed from this time forth to denominate Rome.[1]

Bethlehem, the place of resort for many monks, now became the seat of his activity, where, under his guidance, young men were educated in sacred studies, and where, by the composition of his voluminous works, relating chiefly to the exposition of the sacred scriptures, he made himself extremely useful to the whole Western church. The like services which had been rendered to the Oriental church by Origen, in correcting the original text of the New Testament and the Greek translation of the Old, Jerome rendered to the West by his corrections of the Latin version of the Bible, now become greatly distorted by the blending together of different translations, the mixing up with each other of the different gospels, and the ignorance of transcribers.[2] Summoned to the task by the Roman bishop Damasus, who perceived the need of such a correction of the text, he had already, while at Rome, emended the translation of the gospels, and completed the same task on the version of the Psalms. At Bethlehem, supported by the Hexapla of Origen, which he obtained from the library at Caesarea, he extended this work to the whole Bible. Even this was a bold undertaking; by which he must expose himself to be loaded with reproaches on the part of those who, in their ignorance, which they identified with a pious simplicity,[3] were wont to condemn every deviation from the traditional text, however necessary or salutary it might be. They were very ready to see, in any change of the only text which was known to them, a falsification, without inquiring any farther into the reason of the alteration.[4] And, yet, here he had in his favor the authority of a Roman bishop, as well as the fact, that in this case it was impossible to oppose to him a translation established and transmitted by ecclesiastical authority, or a divine inspiration of the text hitherto received.

But he must have given far greater offence by another useful undertaking, viz: a new version of the Old Testament, not according to the Alexandrian translation, which before this had alone been regarded, but according to the Hebrew. This appeared to many, even of those who did not belong to the class of ignorant persons, a great piece of impiety — to pretend to understand the Old Testament better than the

[1] Ep. 99 ad Asellum, when just ready to embark: Ora, ut de Babylone Hierosolymam regrediar. And in the preface to his translation of the tract by Didymus on the Holy Spirit: Cum in Babylone versarer et purpuratæ meretricis essem colonus.

[2] Tot exemplaria quot codices, says Jerome, ep. 125 ad Damasum.

[3] A class of men widely diffused in the Western church, against whom Jerome says many excellent things in defense of employing science in the service of the church. Piscatorum se discipulos asserentes, quasi idcirco sancti sint, si nihil scierint. Ep. 102 ad Marcellum.

[4] Jerome in his preface to Damasus: Quis enim doctus pariter vel indoctus, cum in manus volumen assumserit, et a saliva quam semel imbiberit, viderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpet in voces: me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veterum libris addere, mutare, corrigere.

seventy inspired interpreters, — better than the Apostles who had followed this translation, and who would have given another translation if they had considered it to be necessary — to allow one's self to be so misled by Jews, as for their accommodation to falsify the writings of the Old Testament![1]

At that time there was formed in and about Jerusalem a noble society of like-minded theologians, who agreed together in their zeal for the advancement of theological science. With Jerome lived, on terms of the most intimate union, the friend of his youth, the presbyter Rufinus of Aquileia, who was residing at Jerusalem with the bishop John, with whom he stood in the most friendly relations. All three shared in the same love for the writings of Origen. Jerome had indeed sought to make several of his works more widely known in the Western church by means of translations, and had in his prefaces spoken of him with the greatest admiration. The spiritual bent of Jerome was beyond all question quite different from that of Origen. Certainly, he had never made himself master of his whole doctrinal system; as, in general, he was destitute of the mental impulse to form a system. His peculiar intellectual discernment was directed rather on particulars than on the general principles. And it might be for this very reason, that in making use of Origen in his biblical commentaries, he adopted several of his expositions, which were of such a kind as to agree neither with his own other views of the faith nor with the dominant church system, without deeming it necessary to utter a word of warning until his attention had been directed by others to this opposition of views. But free and unfettered as Jerome was on this side, while he was left to himself, he could, nevertheless, easily be made narrow and confined by causes without himself, when anything was pointed out to him which was opposed to the orthodoxy of the church, and he had reason to apprehend he might be suspected of any such thing himself. Anxiously solicitous for the reputation of his orthodoxy, he was on this side extremely sensitive.

Now, it happened about the year 394, that among the many who made the pilgrimage from the West to the holy cities in Palestine, several of the zealots for the letter of the church scheme of doctrine, such as Aterbius, and still later Vigilantius, were among the number. They had always been used to hear Origen spoken of as one of the most dangerous of false teachers, without knowing anything more of him; and hence they were greatly alarmed, when they were compelled to observe that the writings of this father were here so much read, and that his name was held in such high veneration. These zealots then could not refrain from giving free utterance to their fears. The bishop John and Rufinus were not so ready to give way and indulge these people as Jerome was. It was of great importance to the latter, to take care that no suspicion of his orthodoxy should be whispered in the Roman and Western church. He was ready therefore to justify himself by join-

[1] All this Rufinus strenuously urges against Jerome in the second book of his Invective: Istud nefas quomodo expiabitur, ipsam legem pervertere in aliud, quam Apostoli tradiderunt.

ing in the sentence of condemnation against the false doctrines of Origen, which he might do without relinquishing his own convictions, though, were it not for this outward challenge, he would never, perhaps, have felt himself constrained to do any such thing. Subsequent to this time Jerome was more cautious, it is true, in expressing his judgments concerning Origen; but he still continued to declare himself respecting him with a wise moderation, saying, that, on the maxim of Paul, which directs us to prove all things and hold fast that which is good, he endeavored to make the same use of Origen as he did of other biblical expositors, appropriating what was valuable in his writings, while he avoided his errors.

Yet he makes it quite manifest, that if no mid-way course could be allowed to exist betwixt the extravagant admirers and the all-condemning opponents of Origen, he would prefer joining himself to the latter, because they were the most pious.[1] On this principle Jerome actually proceeded, yielding to the zealots for orthodoxy, and espousing their side, since they would allow of no neutrality and no middle ground. In addition to this, there were also sources of personal irritation, the influence of which, in a person of his sensitive and passionate temper, easily intermingled with the doctrinal interest.

The cry against the Origenistic heresies at Jerusalem alarmed and disturbed the aged Epiphanius, who, in respect to such matters, was as excitable as he was credulous. He came himself to Jerusalem in 394, where he was received by the populace with great demonstrations of respect, and, as was alleged against him by the bishop John, gave way perhaps too much to these respectful attentions. He strenuously insisted, in his interviews with the bishop John, that he ought to condemn Origen, the father of Arius and of all other heresies. The bishop explained that he was accustomed in reading Origen to separate the true from the false, but he avoided entering into any doctrinal investigations with Epiphanius, whose prejudices he would hardly have been able to overcome, and with whom he could hardly have come to any understanding on this matter. Epiphanius, however, preached a discourse, in which he inveighed with great warmth against the defenders of Origen's false doctrines, so that, as it was doubtless well understood whom he meant, disturbances were to be apprehended. The bishop John warned him, therefore, through his arch-deacon, during the delivering of the sermon. Afterwards John himself preached against the anthropomorphites. Epiphanius next mounted the pulpit and joined in the condemnation of anthropomorphism; but declared that it was necessary also to condemn the Origenists.

Displeased with what had taken place at Jerusalem, and still more confirmed in his suspicion that at Jerusalem the Origenistic party was dominant, he betook himself to the monks at Bethlehem, where his influence was unbounded. He warned them against having any fellowship with the erroneous doctrines entertained at Jerusalem, and subsequently often repeated this warning. A part of the monks separated

[1] See ep. 75 (26) ad Vigilantium. ep. 76 ad Tranquillinum.

themselves from all church-fellowship with the bishop John. Under these circumstances, Epiphanius took a step, which, at a time of such great excitement, he ought above all things to have avoided, and which, as the case stood, certainly exposes him to the suspicion of a set design. He ordained as a presbyter Paullinianus, Jerome's brother, — as he affirmed, without any preconcerted plan, — in a cloister belonging to his own diocese: and the latter could now perform the priestly functions for the monks in Bethlehem, so that they were no longer under the necessity of having recourse for these purposes to Jerusalem. The bishop John might very properly complain of it as a violation of ecclesiastical rules — that a foreign bishop should ordain an ecclesiastic for his own diocese. A violent controversy in writing ensued, in which John complained solely of Epiphanius' love of rule and disorderly conduct, avoiding as much as possible all mention of doctrinal matters, while Epiphanius made the latter the principal topic of his remarks, and called upon the bishop John to clear himself from the suspicion of holding to the errors of Origen. Jerome embraced with eagerness the party of Epiphanius, and thus the ancient tie of friendship was severed. The bishop John applied with his complaints to Alexandria and to Rome. Jerome wrote to both churches in defense of the common cause. In vain did the bishop Theophilus of Alexandria endeavor, through his presbyter Isidore, — who was, himself, however, as an Origenist, suspected by the party of Epiphanius and Jerome — to bring about a reconciliation. Yet near the close of the year 396, the matter had progressed so far, that Jerome and Rufinus became reconciled at the altar, and the peace of the church in this country was once more restored.

But although the friendly relations between Jerome and Rufinus seemed outwardly to be restored again, yet the communion of spirits which had once been disturbed, certainly could not be so easily renewed, especially in the case of so irritable and suspicious a person as Jerome. It needed but a slight occasion, to tear open again the slightly healed wound; and this was given by Rufinus, though without any intention on his part, yet certainly not without his fault. In the year 397, he returned from his travels back to the West, and repaired to Rome. There he was induced, as he says, by the wishes of his friend Macarius[1] (who being engaged in writing a work against the astrological fate, was desirous of learning the views of Origen on this subject) to translate Origen's work Περι ἀρχων into Latin. Now this, after what had taken place before, was manifestly a very unwise undertaking. This book, of all others, was directly calculated to stir up anew the narrow-minded zealots of the Roman church against Origen; and as the peculiar ideas of this work were so perfectly alien from the theological spirit of the Roman church, no good whatever would result from making it

[1] From this *Roman* writer (in distinction from two famous monks of the same name, belonging to the Scetic desert in Egypt) Gennadius, who represents him, however, perhaps wrongly, to have been a monk, (c. 28 de V. J.) mentions a liber adversus mathematicos, in which he had made great use of the Greek church-teachers, which agrees with the testimony of Rufinus.

known by a translation. But Rufinus did not even furnish the means for studying and understanding Origen as a historical phenomenon. He himself was too much carried away with wonder at the great man, and too much fettered by the dependence of his own mind on the dominant scheme of the church, to be able rightly to understand Origen in his theological development. He was too little acquainted with the relation of the hidden depths of the Christian life and consciousness to the progressive evolution of the conception of them in time, to be able to form any correct judgment of the relation of Origen's theology to the church scheme of doctrine in his own age. He took the liberty to modify the doctrines of Origen, especially in those passages which had reference to the Trinity, according to the decisions of the council of Nice. But he frankly confesses, also, in the preface to his translation, that in such places he has not rendered the sense of Origen according to the existing readings. Only he affirms, that he had introduced no foreign matter, but had simply restored the original reading, which had been corrupted by heretics, as the harmony with other passages required. But, then, as he did not consistently carry through even this method, but left many passages unaltered, which sounded no less heretical to these times, so he exposed himself none the less to be accused by the zealots of having found then in those passages nothing which would be considered as heretical, — in spite of his protestations, that, in this translation, it was not his design to exhibit his own views, but the original doctrines of Origen, and that nothing else was to be learned from it but these. At the same time, though perfectly aware of Jerome's excitable temper, and of the narrow and passionate spirit which characterized his principal friends at Rome, he was still imprudent enough to refer in his preface to the praise bestowed on Origen by Jerome, and to the similar plan of translating his works into Latin, which the latter had adopted.

Scarcely was there time for this translation and preface to become known in Rome, when it excited among those people the most vehement feelings of surprise and displeasure. Two noble Romans, Pammachius and Oceanus, who had kept up a correspondence with Jerome ever since the period of his residence in Rome, were extremely concerned for the reputation of his orthodoxy, and hastened to inform him of the scandal given to the Christians at Rome by Rufinus. They called upon him, by a faithful translation of that work, to exhibit Origen in his true colors, and to clear himself from the suspicion of entertaining the same doctrines of Origen, which Rufinus had cast upon him.[1] Jerome wrote back in a tone of high-wrought excitement to his two friends and to Rufinus. Even at present, however, he continued to express himself with the same moderation concerning Origen; he spoke highly of his great gifts, of his Christian ardor, of his merits as an expounder of the Scriptures: — and he pronounced those to be the worst enemies of

[1] Ep. 40. Purga ergo suspiciones hominum, et convince criminantem, ne si dissimulaveris, consentire videaris.

the great man, who had taken pains to publish those writings of his which ought to have remained concealed. "Let us not," said he, imitate the faults of the man whose excellencies lie beyond our reach." But the relations betwixt Jerome and Rufinus grew continually more hostile, and both of them in controversial, or more properly speaking, abusive tracts, full of passionate language, forgot their dignity both as theologians and as Christians; as Augustin had the frankness to tell Jerome, when he called upon him for their own sakes, and out of respect to the weak, for whom Christ died, to put an end to these revilings.[1] The influence of Jerome's powerful patrons in Rome, however, could not hinder Rufinus from being justified by a letter addressed to him from the Roman bishop Siricius. The more zealously, therefore, did they exert themselves to excite a more unfriendly feeling towards Rufinus in the mind of Anastasius, who, in the year 399, succeeded Siricius. But it was chiefly the influence of Marcella, a widow, and ancient friend of Jerome, which contributed to inspire in the mind of this Roman bishop, (who, according to his own confession,[2] had until now heard but little or nothing about Origen) great anxiety and solicitude with regard to the spread of the Origenistic heresies.[3] Rufinus was summoned before his tribunal. He excused himself, it is true, on account of his great distance, and for other reasons, from personally making his appearance at Rome. But he sent in a letter of defence and justification, containing a full and explicit confession of his faith, appealing to the fact that on the question respecting the origin of the soul nothing had as yet been determined by the church; and declaring that he, as a translator, was in nowise responsible for the assertions of the writer translated by him. Anastasius, in the public declarations which he thereupon made, expressed himself with great violence against Origen, and also unfavorably towards Rufinus. Meantime, however, the controversy respecting Origen had taken a turn which led to far more important consequences than would otherwise have followed it, and which combined with it such an interest of another sort as caused its original object to be forgotten.

We have remarked already, in an earlier part of this history, that the patriarch Theophilus, of Alexandria, had endeavored to effect a reconciliation betwixt the two contending parties in this controversy. He was at first closely connected with the Origenistic party among the Egyptian monks; as the aged presbyter Isidore, who had great influence with him, belonged to this party; and

[1] Vide Augustin. ep. 73, § 8. Heu mihi, qui vos alicubi simul invenire non possum, forte ut moveor, ut doleo, ut timeo, prociderem ad pedes vestras, fierem quantum valerem, rogarem quantum amarem, nunc unumquemque vestrum pro scipso, nunc utrumque pro alterutro, et pro aliis, et maxime infirmis, pro quibus Christus mortuus est.

[2] The words of Anastasius, in his letter to the bishop John, are beyond question very obscure, and the sense cannot be given with certainty: Origines autem antea et quis fuerit, et in quæ processerit verba, nostrum propositum nescit.

[3] Jerome, in ep. 96 ad Principiam, pronounces it the peculiar glory of the deceased Marcella: Damnationis hæreticorum hæc fuit principium.

he agreed with them in opposing that crass and sensuous mode of apprehending divine things, which prevailed among the so called *Anthropomorphites*, the monks of the Scetic desert. But on the principles of this individual little dependence could be placed; for worldly interests and passions had more power over him than principles and rational convictions; and he was unfavorably known under a name signifying a man of instability, who was wont to accommodate himself to the change of circumstances.[1]

As the bishops of Alexandria, in the programmes with which at the feast of Epiphany they made known the precise time of the Easter festival next to be celebrated, were accustomed to unfold such particular topics of Christian faith and practice as were adapted to the times; so, in the year 399, Theophilus chose for this purpose to combat the rude sensuous notions respecting that which constituted God's image in man, and,—what was closely connected with this point,—respecting the divine essence itself. Now, this certainly was by no means the best way to instruct and convince the monks who were addicted to those erroneous doctrines; for, as the case really was with them, being for the most part men wholly without cultivation, and coming from the lower ranks of society, and quite devoid of all sense for matters purely spiritual, it was impossible for them to apprehend that which was contained in their religious consciousness in any other way than in forms of conception borrowed wholly from sense; and this sensuous form of apprehension had become so fused and blended with the matter of their religious consciousness, that he, who robbed them of the one, seemed also to deprive them of the other. Hence it was, that the discourse of Theophilus met, among the Scetic monks, with a reception so expressive of violent indignation, that but one abbot, namely, Paphnutius, had the boldness to read it publicly, and this reading produced among the monks a violent ferment. At the head of the Anthropomorphites in this district, stood Serapion, a monk whose rigidly abstemious life had procured for him the highest reverence and respect. Already it had become a matter of rejoicing, that the united labors of many individuals, who entered with him into a comparison of scripture passages, had been so far crowned with success, as that Serapion seemed to be convinced his notions of the divine image and of the divine essence were not tenable. But as they were about to unite together in a prayer of thanks for this happy issue, and Serapion kneeled down for prayer with the rest, he missed the image under which he was wont to adore the God present to his heart, and felt that he was still unable to dispense with it. With the customary symbol, it seemed to him that the being whom he worshipped under this symbol, was himself taken away. Full of despondency, the old man exclaimed with tears, "Poor wretch that I am! They have taken away my God. On whom shall I now depend! To whom shall I pray!"[2]

[1] Ὁ ἀμφαλλαξ, ὁ κόϑυρνος, terms applied to one who is accustomed to wear his cloak according to the wind.

[2] See the account by Cassian, an eye-witness. Collat. 10.

A fierce troop of savage monks next hastened to Alexandria, and threatened Theophilus, whom they denounced as an atheist, with death. Theophilus, with whom prevarication and falsehoood cost but little, contrived to soothe them in a most unworthy manner, saying to them, "In you I behold the countenance of God." This appeared to the monks to be a confirmation of their notions of the divine image, and even by this remark they were somewhat pacified. Yet they required also of the patriarch, that he should condemn the godless Origen, and in this, too, he yielded to their demands.[1]

At that time, Theophilus doubtless yielded only because he was forced to do so by the frantic demands of these blind zealots, but not with any design of abiding by this forced declaration. By degrees, however, the temper and disposition of his mind underwent, through influences from without, an entire change towards the Origenistic monks. This party had its principal seat in the caverns and cells of the Salt-Petre mountain which bordered on the Scetic desert. Here for a series of years had resided the deacon Evagrius of Pontus, famous on account of his ascetic writings, which were extensively read not only in the Greek Church, but after they had been translated into Latin by Rufinus, even in the church of the West.[2] At the head of this party stood, at this time, the four brothers, Dioscurus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, well known under the name of the tall brothers (ἀδελφοὶ μακροί) — pious men, though not wholly exempt from a certain fanatical, ascetic tendency. Theophilus, who was very friendly to these men, was desirous of gaining them over to the service of the church, for which, however, they had no inclination. At length he compelled Dioscurus to assume the office of bishop of Hermopolis in Egypt; — to two others he gave the place of stewards (οἰκόνομοι) in his own church. But precisely in the administration of *this* office, they had occasion to experience so many things derogatory to the bishop's character, which filled them with disgust, while, at the same time, these honest men feared they should contract some defilement on their own souls, that nothing could prevent them from hastening back to their own beloved seclusion, under the pretext that they were no longer able to endure the city life. But Theophilus penetrated their real motive, and on this ground alone was greatly incensed. Added to this was the influence of another occurrence. The presbyter Isidore, already mentioned, a friend of those monks, and superintendent of an alms-house in Alexandria — a man now eighty years old — had received from a wealthy widow the sum of a thousand gold pieces, for the purpose of purchasing clothing for the poor females in Alexandria. In handing over the money she had made him pro-

[1] See Sozom. VIII. 11.

[2] He was a disciple of the two men who had a great influence on the monastic life as it was in this desert, and who stood in high veneration, Macarius who was surnamed Αἰγύπτιος, and Macarius, who, from being a native of Alexandria, was called πολιτικός. Under the name of the former we have fifty homilies, which indeed are not quoted by the ancient writers as his, but which harmonize perfectly with the peculiar Christian bent of this monasticism.

mise not to mention the matter to the bishop, whose all-grasping and all-expending rage for building[1] she was afraid of. The discovery of this secret aroused the whole wrath of Theophilus against Isidore.[2] Under the pretext of false charges he persecuted him with the utmost violence, deposed him from his office, and excommunicated him from the church, till at last the persecuted Isidore took refuge among the monks in the desert of Nitria. These having received their ancient friend, drew down on themselves the vengeance of Theophilus, whose feelings were already embittered towards them. For the purpose of gratifying these revengeful feelings, Theophilus took sides with the zealots against Origen, — first with the Anthropomorphites of the Scetic desert, whose fury he excited against the Origenists; and with Jerome and Epiphanius. He found no difficulty, at several synods convened in Alexandria, subsequent to the year 399,[3] to prevail upon bishops, in part already inclined, by their own narrow zeal, to stigmatize Origen as a heretic, and in part accustomed to serve as the blind tools of their patriarch, to unite with himself in pronouncing sentence of condemnation on the doctrines and the writings of Origen, and in forbidding them to be read. As the monks were not disposed to yield a blind obedience to these decrees, Theophilus seized upon this as a pretext for calling upon the Præfect of Egypt for an armed band to attack them.[4] They were fallen upon in their peaceful retreats, where for a long series of years they had lived in quiet seclusion, shamefully abused, and forced to disperse. Eighty of these persecuted men fled from their desert to one place and another, but could nowhere find a home; since Theophilus sent after them letters dictated by violent passion and malicious cunning, in which he seized upon many extravagancies of fanatical ascetism (which he had before been very ready to overlook) for the purpose of rendering them suspected as wild and dangerous enthusiasts. At length they resolved to seek redress from the imperial court at Constantinople; in hopes, too, that the well-known Christian philanthropy of the bishop of the residential city, *John Chrysostom*,[5] who was not less favorably known for his reckless zeal against all

[1] Ὁ *χρυσομανὴς καὶ λιθολάτρις* — so he is called by Isidore of Pelusium, l. I. ep. 152.

[2] Such is the account of the warm friend of Chrysostom and of the Origenistic monks, the bishop Palladius of Helenopolis in Bithynia, in his dialogical narrative of Chrysostom's life. Opp. Chrysost. ed. Montf. T. XIII. The account by Sozomen, VIII. 12, serves to confirm the former, for it seems to presuppose this as the original one. According to Sozomen's account, for instance, Theophilus demanded of Isidore part of a large sum of money which had been given him, for the purpose of expending it on church buildings. But Isidore declined to give it up, because it was better, he said, to use the money in behalf of the living temple of God. True, this account is referred back to the Origenistic monks, the same source from which Sozomen's acquaintance had heard it. But the predicates which Isidore applies to Theophilus render the thing very credible. Isidore of Pelusium also traces the whole to the hostility of Theophilus towards the other Isidore: Τὴν *περὶ τὸν ἐμοὶ ὁμώνυμον ἀπέχθειαν καὶ δυσμένειαν*. The other causes which are stated of the hostility of Theophilus, may have first given occasion for his altered tone towards Isidore.

[3] Sulpicius Severus (Dial. I. 6) mentions several synods.

[4] Sulpicius Severus, who at that time was residing in this country, says, (Dialog. I. c. 7:) Scævo exemplo ad regendam ecclesiæ disciplinam præfectus assumitur.

[5] The admiration of his eloquence soon gave him this surname.

wrong and injustice, than for his brilliant eloquence, would serve to defend them against the unrighteous fury of their adversaries. But before we proceed to the farther development of these events, we must throw a glance at the life of the great man, who was thus drawn into a participation in these disputes.

He was born at Antioch in the year 347. His pious mother, Anthusa, who, being early left a widow, devoted herself entirely to his education, was to him what Monica was to Augustin. But the seeds of faith, sown in his infant mind, were not, as in the case of Augustin, long kept in check by the predominance of wild passions; and without experiencing such violent storms and struggles in his more gentle soul, he was enabled to develop himself with a quiet and gradual progress, under many favorable influences, as we have already remarked, (p. 657.) Through a rich inward experience, he lived into the understanding of the holy scriptures; and a prudent method of interpretation on logical and grammatical principiples, kept him in the right track in deriving the spirit from the letter of the sacred volume. His profound and simple, yet fruitful homiletic method of treating the holy scriptures, show to what extent he was indebted to both, and how, in his case, both co-operated together.

By the study of the ancients he secured to himself the advanvantage of a harmonious mental and rhetorical culture, which in his case was ennobled by the *divine* principle of life drawn from the gospel. A heart full of the love which flows from faith, gave to his native eloquence, cultivated by the study of the ancients, its animating charm.

The man who had been thus educated for the office of a preacher, labored twelve years, from 386 onward, with burning zeal, as a presbyter under the bishop Flavian of Antioch; and the latter, in consideration of his distinguished gifts, had entrusted to his particular care the religious instruction and edification of the church. The sermons which he there preached show how earnestly alive he was to the duty of promoting not a formal orthodoxy, but vital Christianity; to expose the vanity of a merely outward Christianity, and to destroy all confidence in it. With a freedom and boldness which feared no consequences, he inveighed against the prevailing corruptions in every rank of society, even when they appeared under a Christian guise. In Antioch he had won the affections of many, to whom his labors had proved a blessing; and the hatred of individuals, who felt themselves too roughly handled by his discourses, could, under these circumstances, do him no injury.

But a wider and more splendid, though, at the same time, a far more dangerous and unquiet field of labor was opened for him, when Eutropius, who, at that time, possessed unbounded influence at the imperial court, and who, happening to be one of his hearers on a certain occasion, was quite carried away by his eloquence, was the occasion of his being called, in the year 397, to the bishopric of Constantinople. Peculiarly dangerous was this field for a man of his freedom

of spirit, so used to chastise every form of ungodliness without respect of persons — a man who, in his impatient indignation at wickedness and zeal for oppressed innocence, could not stop to measure his words by the rules of prudence. The way in which he diminished the pomp and state of the episcopacy, for the purpose of devoting what was thus saved to benevolent institutions, displeased the people of Constantinople, who were so fond of display, and excited the discontent of those whose selfish interests were injured thereby. Worldly-minded ecclesiastics and monks, whom he reminded of their duty, became his enemies. At a visitation of the churches, which he was obliged to make at Ephesus, in the year 400, on account of certain disputes and the difficulties which grew out of them, he greatly contributed, by the severity with which he sought to enforce respect for the ecclesiastical laws, so often violated by reason of the prevailing worldly interest, to increase the number of his enemies, especially among the higher ranks of the clergy. Doubtless it may have been the case, also, that in certain moments of vehement indignation against sin, which proceeded however from the purest motives, he allowed himself to be transported beyond measure; and too rashly undertaking to promote the right and to punish what was bad, did not always pay due respect to existing forms. Perhaps, too, he may have occasionally placed too much confidence in his arch-deacon Serapion, a passionate man, and been persuaded by him to the adoption of measures which had not been carefully weighed.

Not less surely must he in various ways have excited against him the most powerful personages about court, by the manner in which he chastised the prevailing vices and took part with the innocent against their oppressors. Eutropius himself, who in the most insolent manner abused his power to the ruin of many, was the first to become his violent enemy. But when the prophetic warnings of the man who alone dealt honestly with him, were verified, and he saw himself at the lowest ebb of fortune, forsaken by all, Chrysostom was his only protector at the altar of the church, to which he had fled for refuge from the infuriated populace.

The ambitious and covetous empress Eudoxia often fell into violent transports of rage against Chrysostom, which she vented in the most bitter threats, when she imagined herself to be aimed at by anything he had uttered in his sermons, when he protected orphans and widows from her own avarice or resentment, or from that of her favorites, when he opposed the acts of injustice of which she was the author, and addressed her conscience with the earnest sincerity of a bishop. Thus, there had grown up at Constantinople a party of ill-disposed ecclesiastics and nobles, men and women, in opposition to the man of truly pious and noble feelings; and sometimes this party was led on by the empress herself, whose superstitious fears, however, often compelled her to become reconciled again to the venerated bishop.

It happened precisely at an interval of this sort, when Chrysostom stood on good terms with the empress, that the monks above-mentioned

arrived at Constantinople. They entreated the bishop to grant them protection, declaring to him, that if he refused it, they would be forced to apply immediately to the emperor. Chrysostom knew how to unite what was required of him by Christian charity with the circumspection of Christian prudence.[1] He wished and hoped he might be able to settle the difficulty in the wisest way by offering his own mediation to bring about a reconciliation between Theophilus and these unfortunate men; and in order to this it was necessary for him to avoid any step which might offend the man whose irritable character was well known to him. He gave the monks a friendly reception; he assigned them a place of abode, and one of the pious females who were accustomed, under his direction, to devote their property or the labor of their hands to works of Christian charity, provided for their bodily wants. But in compliance with the ecclesiastical rules, he refused to admit them to the communion, since they had been excommunicated by their bishop. In a letter which he wrote in their behalf to the bishop Theophilus, he earnestly besought the latter to pardon the monks, as a favor to himself. But Theophilus, instead of paying any attention to this request, immediately dispatched certain persons to Constantinople for the purpose of lodging an accusation against the monks. The latter now proceeded, on their part, to bring a number of aggravated charges against their bishop. Chrysostom sent a report of this to Theophilus, informing him that it would be out of his power to prevent them from applying with their complaints to the emperor himself. By this Theophilus was still more excited; especially, as he had been told by persons who were very desirous of stirring up a quarrel between him and Chrysostom, that the latter had admitted the monks to the communion, and thus declared null the sentence which Theophilus had pronounced against them. In his reply, Theophilus reminded Chrysostom that according to the fifth canon of the Council of Nice,[2] every bishop was bound to recognize as valid the sentence of excommunication pronounced by another, till its injustice was proved by a new investigation, which, however, could be commenced and carried through only in the church diocese in which the difficulty had occurred. By this law, it is true, cases like the present one stood a very uneven chance; for how could the poor monks in the church diocese of Theophilus, where everything was so entirely dependent on himself, hope to find anywhere among the bishops an equitable decision? Chrysostom now endeavoured to extricate himself from the whole affair. But the monks availed themselves of a favorable moment to lay their petition before the empress Eudoxia, in which they proposed that the bishop of the imperial residence should be nominated judge in this matter, and that Theophilus should be compelled to appear before his tribunal. The empress, in whom su-

[1] If we may credit the report of Palladius bishop of Helenopolis, who wrote, indeed, as a prejudiced friend of Chrysostom, but is confirmed, however, though he reports many things alone, at least in part by the authorities of Socrates and Sozomen.

[2] Compare the account by Palladius with the words of Chrysostom himself, in his first letter to Innocent bishop of Rome, § 2.

perstition and immorality wrought in concert together, placed great store on the blessing of such monks. To obtain this she received their petition, and easily found means of persuading her husband, over whom her influence was unbounded, to comply with their request. Theodore was summoned to Constantinople, where a synod under the presidency of the patriarch was to decide his case.

From this time, the affair took an entirely different turn. The contest with the Origenists had hitherto been with Theophilus only a pretext, a means of taking vengeance on the monks; but now this object was dropped, and everything from henceforth made subservient to the main purpose, which was to avenge the imagined injury done to his honor by Chrysostom, and to bring about the ruin of the latter. For the accomplishment of this object, means would not be wanting to a person of his character, and among the description of people by whom Chrysostom was surrounded.

He entered into correspondence with the enemies of Chrysostom among the more eminent clergy and laity of Constantinople; and he endeavored to secure, as a useful instrument for effecting his designs, the bishop Epiphanius, — a man whose venerable years and whose zeal for the orthodox faith gave him great influence among the bishops. Besides the circular letter which he sent to all the bishops of the East, calling upon them to join in the decisions of that Egyptian council against Origen, he sent a particular letter to Epiphanius, for the purpose of inflaming the zeal of the old man, which was so easily excited and so credulous in regard to such matters. It is true, he allowed nothing at all tending to the injury of Chrysostom to find entrance into this letter; but he called his attention to the danger which threatened the church, when monks burning with zeal to propagate this new heresy,[1] had betaken themselves to Constantinople, hoping to gain, in addition to the older ones, new proselytes to their impious doctrines.[2] He therefore urgently advised him to assemble the bishops of his island for the purpose of condemning Origen and the Origenistic heresies, to send in connection with them a synodal letter on this subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, and also to bring the bishops of Isaurea and Pamphylia, as well as the other bishops in his vicinity, to the knowledge of this matter.

Epiphanius immediately complied with this invitation, and in the year 401 held the council for the condemnation of Origen; but Chrysostom showed no inclination whatever to take part in these measures of a blind heresy-making zeal. The cold reception which these communications met with from him was now eagerly seized upon by Theophilus as a means of rendering Chrysostom himself suspected of entertaining the Origenistic heresy. He sought to persuade Epiphanius that it was necessary to assemble a synod against the Origenistic heresy at Constantinople itself, where at all times many bishops were to be found together; and this synod was to be made the instrument of effecting the

[1] Calumniatores veræ fidei novo pro hæresi furore bacchantes.

[2] Ut et novos, si quos valuerim, decipiant, et veteribus suæ impietatis sociis conjungantur.

downfall of Chrysostom. Epiphanius came in the year 402, accompanied with bishops of his diocese, to Constantinople. Chrysostom paid him all due respect, and did everything in his power to alter his intentions. But Epiphanius refused to have any fellowship with him, unless he joined in the condemnatory sentence against Origen, and withdrew his protection from the monks. To neither of these demands could Chrysostom conscientiously yield. Epiphanius now proceeded still farther in his blind zeal, and allowed himself to be drawn into many violations of ecclesiastical law, to which in such cases he was wont to pay but little attention. But perhaps a conversation with some of the persecuted monks, besides other reasons, led him to surmise that the cause he was serving was not so very pure — and his own zeal, though utterly devoid of caution and prudence, was at least an honest one. He merely served as an unwitting tool to promote the designs of cunning, and hence he was now thrown into perplexity. He quitted Constantinople without waiting for the other bishops who were to assemble there on the like business, and in taking leave of the bishops who attended him to the place of embarkation, he said, "I leave to you the capital, the court, and hypocrisy." [1]

Theophilus, after having satisfactorily prepared the way in common concert with the party hostile to Chrysostom, and with the empress, who had once more fallen out with her bishop, so that he might confidently hope for a happy issue to his designs, came to Constantinople in the year 403, to appear not, as was originally designed, in the character of a defendant, but as a judge. As the enthusiastic love of the great majority of the church for their bishop gave his enemies no security of being able to accomplish their insidious designs in the city itself, Theophilus assembled his synod in a neighboring place, at a villa near Chalcedon, known by the name of the Oak. [2] This synod was composed of his own partisans among the bishops, some of whom had come with him, while others had been summoned by him, and others had met together on various matters of business at Constantinople.

At this synod no further mention whatever was made of the Origenistic heresies; but from the mouth of persons hostilely disposed to Chrysostom, as for example, those worthless ecclesiastics and monks who had been chastised by him, charges were received against him, which had reference to facts of an entirely different nature. These charges were in part manifest inventions, or perversions of the truth, as we are compelled to believe, when we compare them with the known disposition and habits of the man; and in part they were based on allegations redounding rather to his honor than to his shame, and which, when thus employed against him, only showed the bad disposition of his opponents. Thus, for example, because he did not provide a splendid table, like other court bishops; because he continued to observe at Constantinople a retired and simple mode of life; and moreover, on account of his feeble state of health, was in the habit of eating alone, — his enemies

[1] Ἀφίημι ὑμῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ βασίλεια καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν.

[2] Hence known by the name of the σύνοδος πρὸς τὴν δρῦν.

were not ashamed to admit against him the charge of having by his habits of solitary living, neglected the duty of hospitality, and of having led by himself a life of Cyclopean gluttony.[1] The most plausible ground of complaint may have been furnished by Chrysostom himself, when, in his zeal to preserve the strictness of church discipline, he failed of paying sufficient respect to the existing forms of ecclesiastical law, and when he often allowed a pious indignation to vent itself in too violent expressions. Only against several of the friends of Chrysostom some special use was still made of the charge of Origenistic heresy. While these things were transpiring at the council, Chrysostom found himself surrrounded by forty respectable bishops, his friends from various countries of the East, who knew what a loss the church would suffer in him, and whom he was endeavoring to console and encourage. When the deputies of the council of the Oak presented themselves here for the purpose of citing him before their tribunal, *those friends* of Chrysostom did, indeed, pronounce the court to be an incompetent one, as they were authorized to do by all the forms of ecclesiastical law as it then was; but he declared himself ready, in the consciousness of his innocence, to appear before this assembly, as before any other in the world, provided only that four bishops, who were his avowed enemies,[2] should be excluded from the number of his judges. As this very just demand was not conceded to him, he declined even after a third citation supported by an imperial notary, to obey the summons, and the synod, urged by a message of the emperor, who had become hostile to him through the influence of Eudoxia, to pass the definitive sentence, pronounced upon him, since he had by his non-appearance declared himself to be guilty, the sentence of deposition. They were mean enough to add: that, as among the charges laid against Chrysostom was contained also the accusation of high-treason, (which probably referred to the charge of his having shown disrespect to the empress,) and as it did not belong to the bishops to inquire into such matters, they left it for the emperor himself to take care that he should be removed, even if it required force, from the church, and, on account of the last-mentioned offence, be delivered over to punishment.

Yet partly religious considerations and partly the fear of movements among the people, who day and night surrounded the residence of the bishop and the church, prevented the emperor from having recourse at once to violence. And Chrysostom was resolved not to leave his office voluntarily; for he looked upon his connection with the flock entrusted to him by the Lord, as one which could be dissolved only by a force to which he must be compelled to yield. Meantime he delivered to the assembled people a fiery discourse, full of the high-hearted courage of faith, yet not with all the self-control and prudence which would have been becoming, so that many an expression escaped him which might produce, in the inflammable minds of the Constantinopolitans, still

[1] Ὅτι τὴν φιλοξενίαν ἀθετεῖ, μονοσιτίαν ἐπιτηδεύων, ὅτι μόνος ἐσθιει, ἀσώτως ζῶν Κυκλώπων βίον. See the extract from the Acts in Photius. Cod. 59.

[2] Even the unprejudiced Isidore of Pelusium, (I. 152,) says that Theophilus destroyed Chrysostom, τέσσαρσι συνέργοις, ἢ μᾶλλον συναποστάταις, ὀχυρωθείς.

greater excitement. But when this effect actually ensued, Chrysostom showed how foreign it was from his self-denying spirit to think of taking advantage of such an excited state of feeling, as he easily might have done, for his personal advantage; for as soon as he heard that it was actually intended to remove him by force, and he believed that he had done all that conscience required to prevent all tumults, he contrived on the third day at noon, without being observed by the multitude, to make good his retreat from the church, and was conveyed into exile. But a few days after he left Constantinople, a deputy from the empress came to him with a letter full of protestations, beseeching him to return; for an earthquake, which was usually interpreted as a token of the divine displeasure, and the indignation of the populace already excited by the overbearing triumph of his enemies, and which was thereby increased, had filled the empress with alarm and remorse of conscience.

Chrysostom was received back again by the church at Constantinople, with universal joy. He was unwilling, indeed, to reënter upon the functions of his office, until he had been formally justified and restored by a synod regularly assembled; but the affection of his flock compelled him at once to resume the episcopal chair, and to bestow on them from this the episcopal blessing. Yet the assembling of this synod was promised him, and he ceased not to insist upon its fulfilment, until his relations, which rested on so frail a foundation, again took an entirely different turn. It could not fail to happen, that the vain and ambitious empress would soon be incensed and irritated again by the boldness of the man who rebuked crime without any fear of the consequences. This took place after he had enjoyed a tranquility of only two months duration. The occasion was as follows: —

In front of the palace where the imperial senate held their assemblies, a magnificent silver statue had been erected to the empress Eudoxia. Its dedication was, as usual in such cases, accompanied with noisy and often indecent festivities, bordering on the customs of heathenism. The place where this occurred was so near to the great church, that the devotions of the assembly were unavoidably disturbed by it, and it happened, perhaps, on some festival day of the church. Our information respecting the course of this affair is not sufficiently authentic to enable us to determine with any certainty, whether Chrysostom was misled by his natural warmth of temper to do many things contrary to the dictates of prudence; whether it was at the very outset, when flushed by the sense of wrong, or whether it was not until after he had tried other means with the empress in vain, that in a sermon he violently inveighed against these abuses. This being doubtless reported to the empress with an exaggerated coloring, she began to enter into new conspiracies with the enemies of Chrysostom, and the latter was now hurried along by his indignation at these new plots (if indeed his language has been reported to us in its original form) to begin a discourse perhaps at a festival commemorative of the martyrdom of John the Baptist, with the words: "Once more Herodias maddens — once more she dances, and once more demands the head of John."

When this was thus reported to the empress, she abandoned herself

wholly to her resentment; and she might easily so represent the matter to the weak Arcadius, as to induce him to lend his hand in bringing about the destruction of Chrysostom. The synod which Theophilus led out from Alexandria, was employed as the instrument for this purpose. By its advice advantage was taken, without recurring to the earlier charges against Chrysostom, of a law issued by the council of Antioch, A.D. 341, but which was never put in force except at such times and to such extent as some momentary interest required, — the rule, namely, that a bishop who had been deposed by a synod, and who had been reinstated in office, not by another ecclesiastical court, but by the secular power, should remain forever incapable of administering the functions of that office. Deposed from his episcopate, Chrysostom was conveyed into exile in the June of the year 404.

In a series of trials which conducted him towards a glorious end, he had every opportunity of manifesting the greatness, power, and tranquility of a soul wholly penetrated by the faith of the gospel. After a long and painful journey, in which he was still compelled to endure much shame and persecution from the angry hatred and fanaticism of his enemies, he arrived at the place of his banishment in the desolate city of Cucusus, on the borders of Armenia, Isaurea and Cilicia. Here he had much to suffer from the rude climate and from repeated threatening invasions of Isaurean robbers; but instead of needing consolation himself, it was he whose words, full of confidence, and of the energy of faith, gave heart and courage to his friends at Constantinople. From this place, he guided the devoted flock whom he had heen forced to leave. In this remote spot, he was the soul of the pious enterprises of his friends, as for example, of their efforts to spread the gospel among the Persians and the Goths. To promote this object, he was ready to take the first step towards reconciliation with bishop Maruthas of Mesopotamia, a man who had assisted to procure his condemnation; and even when Maruthas declined coming to any accommodation, he still invited his friends to do all in their power to sustain him. By the noble example of his charity, by his spiritual counsels and instructions, he was the means of great good to the whole district where he resided. Such a light could not be put under a bushel; it would shine, wherever it might be: and Chrysostom met with the fullest sympathy, especially from the Roman church, whose bishop, Innocent, declared very strongly in his favor. This served to rekindle the jealousy and resentment of his enemies; for they had reason to fear that his friends might eventually succeed in again bringing him back to Constantinople. This they were determined to prevent; they meant to place Chrysostom at last where he would be totally forgotten. In the summer of the year 407, he was conveyed to a new place of exile, at the very verge of the Roman empire, in the waste town of Pityus in Pontus, situated in the midst of barbarians. His body, exhausted by previous sufferings, sunk under the hardships of this long and difficult journey. He died on the way, near Comanum in Pontus, in the full and peaceful consciousness of his approaching end, and with bright visions into the life eternal. Those words of Job, which in his own seasons of quiet prosperity he so

often impressed on the hearts of his hearers, and which in his times of trial he so often presented to himself and to his friends as the richest source of consolation: Blessed be the Lord for all things, (δόξα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκα!) were the last on his lips, worthily closing a life consecrated to God, and resigned to His will in all conflicts and sufferings.

But it was beyond the reach of any earthly power to extinguish the memory of this martyr from the minds of men who had felt the divine energy of his life and doctrines. There continued to exist at Constantinople a distinct and separate party of Johannites, who refused to recognize the validity of the act by which Chrysostom was deposed, and to acknowledge any one as their bishop who was appointed to succeed him. They held on Sundays and festival days their private meetings, which were conducted by clergymen who thought like themselves, and from these alone they would receive the sacraments. As among this party were to be found, also, many of the more excitable people of Constantinople, and every attempt to suppress them by force only rendered the opposition still more violent, many sanguinary tumults ensued. This schism spread more widely in the church; for other bishops and clergymen, who also protested against the injustice of the sentence pronounced on Chrysostom, and who continued to venerate his memory, came over to this party. They were sustained by the Roman church, which constantly asserted in the strongest terms the innocence of Chrysostom. His second successor, the bishop Atticus, took the first step towards a reconciliation, by introducing his name expressly into the church prayers offered in behalf of those bishops who had died in the orthodox faith. He made an agreement with the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria, to grant a universal amnesty to all the adherents of Chrysostom among the clergy.[1] A greater schism of the church was by this means prevented: but, at Constantinople, a small party of Johannites continued to hold their ground. The Patriarch Proclus first succeeded in putting a final end to the schism in that city. Having, in the year 438, prevailed upon the emperor Theodosius II,[2] to allow the remains of Chrysostom to be brought back to Constantinople, and to be buried there with solemn pomp, he persuaded the remnant of the Johannites, appeased by the satisfaction thus done to the memory of their beloved bishop, to connect themselves once more with the ruling church.

For the rest, this passionate and violent mode of proceeding to suppress the Origenistic doctrines, was calculated much rather to excite than to check the zeal for these doctrines.[3] They who, like Theophilus, opposed the Origenistic heresy only as a convenient means of gratifying their private passions, were hence more tolerant in other cases where these passions were not interested. Theophilus himself gave a remark-

[1] See Socrat. VII. 25. Synes. ep. 66 ad Theophilum.

[2] Socrat. VII. 45.

[3] As is remarked by an eye-witness of a part of these events, Sulpicius Severus, Dialog. I. c. 3: Sive illud error est, ut ego sentio, sive hæresis, ut putatur, non solum reprimi non potuit multis animadversionibus sacerdotum; sed nequaquam tam late se potuisset effundere, nisi contentione crevisset.

able exemplification of this ten years later. The church at Ptolemais, the chief city of Pentapolis, laity and clergy, in the year 410, unanimously made choice of the philosopher Synesius of Cyrene (see above, p. 103) to be their bishop — a man who had never left the silent retirement where he pursued his studies, except when his services were demanded for the good of his country. But the candid scholar frankly declared, and in such a way that the bishop Theophilus would be sure to hear of it, that his philosophical convictions did not on many points agree with the doctrines of the church; and among these differences he reckoned many things which were classed along with the Origenistic heresies, as for example, the doctrine of the preëxistence of souls, his different views of the resurrection, on which point he probably departed far more widely than Origen from the view taken by the church, inasmuch as he interpreted it as being but the symbol of a higher idea.[1] Synesius was willing, indeed, as he declared, to keep his peculiar philosophical convictions to himself; for he supposed, conformably with his Platonic mode of distinguishing between esoteric and exoteric religious doctrines, that the pure truth could never become the popular faith. But at the same time, he would never consent to teach anything himself which was at variance with his own convictions.[2] Despite of this open declaration of Synesius, Theophilus did not hesitate to follow the aged ecclesiastics in Ptolemais, who said it was to be expected that the grace of the Holy Spirit would not leave this work incomplete, but would lead still further into the knowledge of the truth the man whom he had led so far in the religious life. And he ordained him as bishop of this metropolis.

Not every ecclesiastic, however, who thus differed in his convictions from the doctrines of the ruling church, was as candid as Synesius. Notwithstanding all the efforts to preserve the churches against every deviation from the established articles of faith, it was still impossible to look into the inward principles of those to whom the offices of the church were confided.[3] At the same time, there had not as yet been expressed by any ecumenical council the opposition to the peculiar doctrines of Origen, and down to the times of the emperor Justinian, (see above, p. 538. Note 1,) no means had as yet been devised for preserving the church, by means of a prescribed confession of faith, to be acknowledged by ecclesiastics previous to their ordination, against every possible heretical tendency. Hence we find many proofs, that Origenistic doctrines continued to be propagated in the East, among

[1] Ἱερόν τι καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον.

[2] Οὐ στασιάσει μοι πρὸς τὴν γλῶτταν ἡ γνώμη. See ep. 105 ed. Basil. p. 358.

[3] In consequence of the deplorably bad manner in which spiritual offices were often filllled (see the sect. on the church constitution) it might happen, that in a time when so great stress was laid on formal orthodoxy, men attained to spiritual offices, who had made themselves suspected of no heresy, because all matters of faith generally were considered of no consequence by them; but who went so far in their infidelity, which proceeded not from any sceptical bent of understanding, but from fleshly rudeness and utter immorality, that they in fact denied the immortality of the soul; and who still did not hesitate to perform all the spiritual functions, looking upon the whole in no other light than as a means of gain. See examples of such presbyters in Isidor. l. III. ep. 235 and 295.

ecclesiastics and monks, even after this period;[1] and many were foolish enough to introduce into their sermons doctrinal opinions which had so little to do with the interests of faith.[2]

Hence, under the reign of the emperor Justinian, there arose a new and violent strife betwixt the advocates and the opponents of the Origenistic doctrines among the monks in Palestine.[3] It now so happened, owing to circumstances which we have already explained, that the emperor Justinian was drawn to participate in these disputes; that he published an elaborate edict, with extracts from the writings of Origen, aimed at the condemnation of this great church-teacher, and his peculiar heretical doctrines which were thus pointed out; and that, in consequence, a council which met at Constantinople, under the presidency of the Patriarch Mennas, in the year 541, confirmed this condemnation, and established fifteen canons in opposition to the Origenistic doctrines.

According to the old accounts, which go back to the period in which these events took place, the fifth general council also, in the year 553, (see above, p. 548,) renewed the condemnation of Origen and his doctrines; and among the canons with which the council concluded their labors in the eighth session,[4] the twelfth canon, after condemning the heretics condemned by the older ecumenical councils, does actually treat of the condemnation of Origen. In this case, we must presume that the candor of the Origenistic party, who had been the authors of the whole controversy respecting the three chapters, (see above, pp. 538–540,) allowed themselves here, as on earlier occa-

[1] See e. g. Isidore, l. IV. ep. 163. Nili epp. 188—190, II. 191.

[2] As for example, the Platonico-Origenistic doctrine of the preëxistence of souls; — that the Son was a higher intelligence created after the image of God. See the epistles of Nilus just referred to. The latter says to a preacher of this sort: Τί ἂν διαφέροι καπηλείας τὸ σὸν διάγγελμα, τὸ στασιωτικὸν τε καὶ ἀκερδές. The abbot Isidore, a man distinguished for his practical bent of mind, shows this also, in his judgment of the controversy respecting the origin of souls. The advocates of the doctrine of preëxistence — he supposes — must agree with their opponents at least on this point, that the moral conflict is required for the purification of the soul, for its return to its original state; and hence he concludes: Ἀφεμένοι τοίνυν τοῦ ζυγομαχεῖν περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητησίμων, ἐις τὸ ὁμολογούμενον ἑαυτοὺς συνελάσωμεν.

[3] See above, p. 476. There were then forming among the Origenists two parties, respecting whose distinctive views we can only derive some probable conclusions from the names given to them, compared with the doctrines of Origen. One party (see Cyrill. Scythopolitan. vita S. Sabæ, § 89, in Coteler. monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, t. III.) were called πρωτόκτισται or τετραδῖται; the other, ἰσόχριστοι. The former, as it may be conjectured, gave special prominence to the Origenistic doctrine respecting the preëxisting soul of Christ, (see vol. I. p. 638.) That soul with which the Logos had condescended to enter into union, they supposed to be exalted above all other created beings, to be the πρῶτον among the κτιστοῖς. Their opponents accused them of placing this soul, by their apotheosis, on a level with the three persons of the Trinity, and of introducing a τέτρας in place of a τρίας. The others, on the contrary, gave prominence to the Origenistic doctrine concerning an original equality, with only a numerical difference, of all created intelligences; and they looked upon it as the final end, that all should be once more restored back to that original unity; and hence they said, that as originally the souls which, by reason of their loyalty of will, had been received into indissoluble communion with the Logos, had nothing in preference over the others, who were intelligences of the same order, so all would ultimately attain to the same unity. Hence they were accused of placing themselves on a level with Christ. Against this last tenet the thirteenth among the canons against the Origenistic doctrines is directed.

[4] See Harduin. Concil. III. f. 198.

sions, to be driven by circumstances to the denial of their own expressed convictions. Yet the course of proceeding at this council, and the silence of other important documents of the same period, stand opposed to the supposition, that the council in question had any *particular* action on the subject of renewing the sentence of condemnation against Origen.[1] The confounding together of the synod held under Mennas with the fifth ecumenical council, which undeniably took place at an early period, as well as the wish to have a solemn condemnation of Origen from some general council, occasioned and promoted this transfer; and in case Origen was really mentioned, though but cursorily, along with the older heretics, by the fifth general council, this would furnish a convenient foot-hold for the above supposition. But, at the same time, it is not impossible that the name of Origen itself was but a later insertion. Along with Origen, the council in question is in fact said to have pronounced sentence of condemnation also on Didymus and Evagrius, (see above, p. 679;) and in the age of Justinian, it might indeed very easily happen, that the anathema should be pronounced on names hitherto never mentioned by the majority but with reverence and respect. But the credibility of this account depends on the credibility of another, namely — that the council in question was occupied particularly with Origen. At all events, it had great influence in bringing about the later more general practice of treating Origen as a heretic, that a decree of this sort was ascribed to an ecumenical council.

APPENDIX TO THIS SECTION.

History of Sects.

We shall conclude the history of this period with some account of the minor sects which presented themselves in conflict with the dominant church, without having arisen, like those which have been mentioned, out of the doctrinal controversies. They were partly sects which sprung up afresh out of germs existing already in the previous periods, and partly such as arose for the first time out of the peculiar state of the church in the present period.

Such phenomena of the Christian life are often very significant symptoms of disease in the life of the church: they betoken deeper wants of the Christian consciousness, which are seeking after their satisfaction. Opposite errors, or tendencies bordering on error, by which they are called forth, lend them a partial justification. As reactions of the Christian consciousness, although they may be in many ways disturbed reactions, they point to a purer reaction reserved for the future, which shall some time or other push its way victoriously through.

We have already remarked, that worldly-minded bishops and ecclesiastics, instead of endeavoring to cherish and promote serious, vital Christianity, did every thing in their power to suppress it, because it presented such a strong and to them vexatious contrast to their own

[1] Comp. Walch Geschichte der Ketzereien und Spaltungen, B. 8, S. 286, u. d. f.

mode of life. (See above, p. 226.) Serious and piously disposed laymen were persecuted by such clergymen, as dangerous censors of their conduct.[1] Often they were excommunicated from the church, or they separated of their own accord from such spiritual guides, because they could not believe it possible that men so polluted with every vice, should serve as instruments for the work of the Holy Spirit.[2] Others of like persuasion joined with them; and they became the founders of minor sects, in which, after the separation had once taken place, there arose, out of the opposition that had reference at first only to matters of practice, certain doctrinal differences also, which sometimes had no other ground than in the more sensuous mode of apprehension among uneducated laymen.

In this way arose the sect of the Audians.[3] Audius, or, as the name stood in his native Syrian, Udo,[4] was a layman, of a pious and austere life, who lived in Mesopotamia, near the beginning of the fourth century. He often objected to the worldly-minded ecclesiastics of this country their want of spirituality, particularly their devotion to gain, in seeking to enrich themselves by the practice of usury, and their gross immorality.[5] As his own strict and exemplary life probably gave him great influence among the laity, his reprimands of the clergy would be so much the more dangerous. He was persecuted by them, and at length excommunicated from the church. Others, who were dissatisfied with the corrupt clergy, now joined with him, and they held separate meetings for common edification. The clergy then had recourse to the secular power, and Audius with his adherents were obliged to suffer many wrongs. This only roused them to more decided opposition to the dominant church, and the spread of the sect was promoted. Many discontented spirits united with Audius, and among these some bishops and ecclesiastics. He himself was now ordained as a bishop in his own sect, and all the others placed themselves in subordination to him. They refused to have spiritual fellowship with any that belonged to the dominant church. They even declined uniting with them in prayer. The antagonism which now existed between the Audians and the dominant church led their opponents as well as themselves to be more attentive to certain differences of opinion, and to lay greater stress upon those differences. Thus, to their opponents, the anthropomorphic mode of conception among the Audians, which, from the earlier times, still lingered in these districts among the more uncultivated, appeared an important heresy; and many of their peculiar opinions, respecting which we have no exact information, may in like manner have had

[1] Comp. also Isidor. l. V. ep. 131. *Αντιοῦσι οἱ κυνῶν καὶ χοίρων βίον ἔχοντες κατὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν τὸν βιόν.*

[2] That doubts had arisen, whether ecclesiastics, known to be vicious men, could administer the sacraments in a valid manner, is apparent from l. I. ep. 37; l. III. ep. 340.

[3] The most credible and distinct accounts of the origin and character of this sect is given by Epiphanius, since he appears here to have been less infected than others with the blind heresy-hunting zeal. He judges more mildly of this sect, partly because, owing to his whole bent of mind, he might not be inclined to attribute so much importance to the errors of sensuous anthropomorphism, partly because he was disposed to place a high value on ascetic austerities.

[4] See Ephraëm. Syr. Sermon. 24 adv. Hæres. T. II. ed. Quirin. f. 493.

[5] Comp. Theodoret. h. e. l. IV. c. 9.

their ground in a deficiency of mental cultivation.[1] Furthermore, the Audians returned back to the ancient usage with regard to the determination of the time of the Easter festival, which had been discarded by the council of Nice, (see page 302;) and they accused this council of having otherwise settled the time of the Easter festival, out of flattery to the Emperor Constantine, and so as to make it coincide with the day of his birth.

Audius, when now quite advanced in years, was banished to the country on the Black sea, (Scythia,) where the Goths had at that time established themselves. He found followers among the Christians of this race, and he labored also to convert the pagan Goths. The monastic life gained entrance among them by means of the Audians, who encouraged a rigidly ascetic tendency. This sect, which had not within it the basis of any long duration, and which had attained to a distinct subsistence only by means of the persecution waged against it, gradually disappeared towards the close of the fourth century.

As one extreme is ever wont to call forth another, so, as a matter of course, the one-sided doctrinal tendency, which placed the essence of Christianity in distinctions of the understanding, called forth the opposite extreme of a one-sided ethical tendency, which overlooked the connection between theory and practice and the importance and significancy of the doctrines of faith in their bearing on Christian life. While, through the strife of opposite systems of doctrine, many, after having abandoned themselves sometimes to this system and sometimes to that, became at last skeptical or perplexed with regard to Christian truth itself;[2] others, on the contrary, were by the same means led to believe that matters of doctrine generally were of no great importance, since in fact the attaining to any certainty on matters of this sort transcended the powers of human knowledge; that every thing depended on conduct, and all who led a good life might be saved, notwithstanding their differences of opinion in other respects. At Alexandria, where the speculative spirit on matters of doctrine chiefly prevailed, such an opposite tendency would also be most likely to spring up.[3] A certain Rhetorius, in the fourth century, is said to have created a party which professed this principle, and who were known afterwards under the name of *knowledge-haters*, (*γνωσίμαχοι.*)[4] But

[1] It is uncertain what truth lies at the bottom of the charge laid against them, (Theodoret. hist. eccles. IV. 9, and hæret. fab. IV. 10,) that they had asserted God was not the creator of fire and darkness, or that, in short, both were eternal. We are here reminded, indeed, of the view of the Jewish Theosophy, which is to be found in the Clementines, that fire is the element of the Evil One. Such views might easily have passed over to the Audians.

[2] See Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. I. f. 18: *Πρὸς πάντα λόγον ὡμοίως δυσχεραίνουσι.*

[3] Thus Alexander of Lycopolis in Egypt opposes to the dogmatizing of the heretics, the principle that the essence of Christianity, inasmuch as it is designed for the training of the people as well as others, consists in a popular system of ethics, (*παραγγέλματα παχύτερα.*) See the introduction to his tract against the Manichæans in Combefis. bibliothecæ Græcorum patrum auctarium novissimum. Pars II.

[4] Athanasius mentions first (l. I. contra Apollinarem, § 6) a certain Rhetorius, (*Ῥητόριος,*) whom he seems to accuse of the "godless" assertion, that all heretics were right according to their way. Next Philaster (Hæres. § 91) has a special section relating to the Rhetorians: Alii sunt in Ægypto et Alexandria a Rhetorio quodam, qui omnes laudabat hæreses, dicens omnes

it may be a question, whether there was ever a regularly constituted sect professing such indifference to doctrines; whether the fact ever amounted to any thing more than this, that individuals at different times and in different places were led by the same opposition and the same tendency of mind to entertain these views; — of which individuals, the above mentioned Rhetorius may have been one.[1]

The sects which arose from the intermingling of Oriental theosophy with the opinions of certain sects of Christian origin, the Gnostic, and particularly the Manichæan, which in the last times of the preceding period began to spread mightily in the Roman empire, continued to propagate themselves also in the present period; and they were probably invigorated by coming into fresh contact with the remains of old Oriental systems of religion on the borders of the Asiatic provinces of the Roman empire, and also from Persia, the native country of Manichæism, where the relationship of its doctrines with those of the dominant religion must have furthered its spread, until about the year 525, when its great influence even in the royal family excited a violent and bloody persecution against it.[2]

The law of Diocletian, of which we spoke on a former occasion,

bene sentire. But Philaster gives no further explanation of this opinion, and it is quite possible that the whole account of this sect had been only made out of an obscure passage of Athanasius. To Augustin, p. 72, it appeared incredible — as it would not fail to appear in case the theory was not any more distinctly set forth — that this person should have taught things so absurd. The theory is more distinctly set forth by the author of the Prædestinatus, h. 72, to wit, as follows: All worship God as well as they are able; we are bound to maintain Christian fellowship with all who call upon Christ as him who was born of the Virgin. Doubtless it may be, that this author had really heard of people who thought thus, and perhaps, without sufficient reason, called them Rhetorians, tracing their origin, without cause, to the Rhetorius, of whom he knew nothing except from Philaster. Those people of whom the Prædestinatus speaks, might have in their minds the passage in Philip. 1: 18. Chysostom, in a special discourse, (T. III. opp. f. 300,) endeavors to guard this passage against any such application; but Chrysostom is here controverting not those who seriously maintained a doctrinal indifference of this sort, but those heretics, to whom their own peculiar scheme of faith seemed sufficiently important, and who were only desirous of establishing this principle for the catholic Christians, in order that they might assert their own claims to Christian toleration. Theodoret, on the other hand, where, in expounding this passage, he says: Τοῦτο τινὲς τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ περὶ τῶν αἱρέσεων ὑπειλήφασιν εἰρῆσθαι, may actually have had in his mind such a class of *indifferentists*. Finally, John of Damascus (hæres. 88) mentions the γνωσίμαχοι. Οἱ πάσῃ γνώσει τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ ἀντιπίπτοντες, ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι περισσόν τι ποιοῦσιν οἱ γνώσεις τινὰς ἐκζητοῦντες ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ζητεῖ ὁ θεὸς παρὰ χριστιανοῦ, εἰ μὴ πράξεις καλάς.

[1] Here would be the proper place to mention certain other minor sects little known to us, which seem to have sprung out of a religious eclecticism, if they did not belong rather to the general history of religion than to the history of christian sects. The *Euphemites*, so called after the hymns addressed to the supreme God, the Almighty, (whom alone they worshipped,) which they chaunted together in their prayers, — a sect which seems to have arisen out of that spritualized, refined polytheism, which was connected with the recognition of one absolute essence; the *Hypsistarians*, (the worshippers of the θεὸς ὕψιστος,) perhaps identical with the former, or perhaps differing from them by the mixing in of Jewish with pagan elements, known to us through the father of Gregory Nazianzen, who was at first a member of this sect, (comp. the writings of Böhmer and Ullmann on this sect;) the Θεοσεβεῖς in Phœnicia, who either sprung likewise out of that later eclecticism, or were the offshoot of a still older form of religion, which subordinated Sabæism to Monotheism; the *Cœlicolæ*, predominantly of Jewish origin, originating perhaps from the proselytes of the gate. The rite of baptism among this last mentioned sect may not have been the Christian ordinance, but may have sprung out of the Jewish baptism of the proselytes.

[2] See Theophanes Chronograph. and Cedren. ad. h. a.

(vol. I. p. 506) would certainly tend to injure them. But when Constantine was endeavoring to put an end to the religious persecutions generally, which had arisen under Diocletian, and to introduce a universal religious toleration, he was naturally desirous of obtaining more exact information with regard to the character of the different and less known religious sects, and particularly of the Manichæans, respecting whom so many unfavorable reports were in circulation, in order to determine by the result of his inquiries what course of conduct he ought to pursue. He committed this investigation to an individual named Strategius, who, by his equal familiarity with the Latin and the Greek tongues, was admirably well fitted for such a business — the same who afterwards, under the name of Musonianus, rose to the dignity of a prætorian Præfect of the East.[1] The accounts which Constantine obtained in this way, were probably favorable to the Manichæans: and he found nothing in their tenets to hinder him from extending his toleration to the Manichæan sect. But as the principles of toleration by which he was guided at first, gradually passed over to those of an opposite kind, the Manichæans, who were specially hated, became once more objects of persecution, even before any new laws had been enacted against them. The rhetorician Libanius interceded with the governor of Palestine in behalf of the Manichæans in that province, praying him to grant them security, and not suffer every man to insult them at pleasure. Without designating them by name, he yet sufficiently indicates whom he means, by mentioning them as those who worshipped the Sun, as the second divine being,[2] without offerings, (since, according to the Manichæan idea, that one and the same soul is fettered in all animate bodies, such offerings could not properly be made;) and who led a rigidly abstemious life, and counted death a gain.[3] He says of them, they are scattered over many countries of the earth, but are every where few in numbers; that they injured nobody, but were themselves obliged to suffer injuries from many.[4] After the year 372, new laws appeared against the Manichæans, which grew more and more severe. Like other heretics they were deprived of their civil rights, and their assemblies were forbidden under severe penalties.

At Rome they had secretly propagated their sect down from more ancient times; and, moreover, they had congregated there in greater numbers, after being driven away from North Africa and other countries by the inroads of migratory tribes.[5] And here they sought to find admission into the church, but that very vigilant bishop, Leo the Great, with the aid of the civil magistracy, entered upon a rigid system of inquiry to find them out. He succeeded in discovering many even of their presiding officers.[6] By means of these he ascertained the

[1] See Ammian. Marcellin. hist. l. 15, c. 13.

[2] The Sun, in fact the manifesting, redeeming spirit of light, who is the medium of connection between the visible world and the supreme God. See vol. I. p. 493.

[3] It being a release of the soul of light from the bonds of the ὕλη.

[4] See ep. 1344.

[5] Leo Sermo 15. Quos aliarum regionum perturbatio nobis intulit crebriores.

[6] Leo appeals before his own flock to the fact (p. 15,) that the practice of dissolute conduct in their meetings had been absolutely proved by the confessions of Mani-

names of the other presiding officers of a sect every where dispersed and still closely connected in its dispersion; and he could now make use of this discovery for the purpose of assisting, by his correspondence with foreign bishops, in the detection of the Manichæans in every place.[1] Leo made it strictly incumbent on the members of his own community to inform him where Manichæans dwelt, where they taught, whom they visited, in what society they were wont to reside.[2] Those of the arrested Manichæans who would not consent to recant, were banished, and there appeared a new, severer law of the emperor Valentinian III. against this sect. Under the emperor Justinian, death was the established punishment for being a Manichæan.

Though a part of the Manichæans had at an earlier period been driven away by the political storms from the districts of North Africa, yet many still remained behind in this quarter of the world, which, from the fourth century, constituted the principal seat of Manichæanism; and the ignorance of the Vandal ecclesiastics made it easy for the Manichæans to gain proselytes among them. King Hunerich, who acceded to the government in 477, sought to display his zeal for the orthodox faith by persecuting them, and his anger was especially aroused at finding among them so many of the Vandal, Arian clergy. Some of the Manichæans he caused to die at the stake: others he shipped away out of the country.[3] In this way, again, many of them probably came into Europe, and these transmitted the doctrines of the sect, amidst the disturbances of these times, down to later generations.

The repeated persecutions prove how little could be effected by them. They rather served to promote the spread of the sect. The Manichæans gloried in martyrdom for the truth. Their presiding officers, the *elect*, compared themselves, persecuted, poor, and living in the most rigid abstinence, with the clergy of the catholic church, who lived an easy life in the abundance of earthly comforts; and they asserted that they might thus be known as the genuine disciples of Christ.[4] Being rigid ascetics, they might, too, often conceal them-

chæans themselves; and, moreover, the law against the Manichæans enacted, in consequence of this investigation into the character of the sect, by Valentinian III., is evidence of the same thing. We are not warranted, it is true, to declare these charges directly to be false. In individual cases of excrescence, this combination of mysticism with dissoluteness of conduct may have existed, although altogether foreign from the original character of Manichæism. In an old form of condemnation against sects of this kind, which Muratori has published in his *anecdota* from the Ambrosian library, T. II. Mediolan. 1698, p. 212, a trace of the doctrine is certainly to be found, that the principle of several of the older Gnostic sects, according to which every thing that relates to the body which sprung from the evil principle, is a matter of utter indifference to the soul, and that the former, therefore, might be given up, without injury to the soul, to every species of lust, was brought into vogue again by later sects. L c.: Si quis peccatum carnis non dicit pertinere ad animam, anathema sit. Still we have not sufficient knowledge respecting the manner in which these investigations were conducted, to enable us to decide whether the result of them is deserving of confidence.

[1] See the chronicle of Prosper ad a. 443.

[2] See Sermo 15, c. 5.

[3] See Victor Vitensis hist. persecut. Vandal. l. II. init.

[4] So says the Manichæan Faustus, comparing himself with the catholic clergy: Vides pauperem, vides mitem, vides pacificum, puro corde, lugentem, esurientem, sitientem, persecutiones et odia sustinentem propter justitiam, et dubitas, utrum accipiam evangelium? August. c. Faustum, l. V. c. I.

selves under the mask of monasticism, and indeed procure for themselves respect, while their heretical tendency remained undiscovered.[1] They might join in the divine service of the catholic churches, since there was no other means of detecting them except by their scrupling, on account of their ascetic principles, to partake of the consecrated wine. Many among them might adopt the current church terminology, giving it another and a mystical sense, after the manner of Agapius,[2] who demonstrated his orthodoxy even in an encounter with Eunomius. Faustus of Mileve in Numidia[3] successfully employed his skillful eloquence and brilliant wit, which was not accompanied, however, with solid judgment, for the extension of the sect. He, as well as other Manichæans, knew how to promote his cause by taking advantage of the weak spots which the catholic church exposed in its matters of faith and practice. The mysterious element in the symbols and doctrines of the Manichæans ; the promise they held out of a special solution of difficulties by means of a loftier wisdom, in opposition to the blind and implicit belief which they censured in the dominant church ; the close fraternization in which they lived with each other; all this was attractive to a great many. Men eagerly enrolled themselves in the class of *auditores*, longing after the higher mysteries in which they were to be initiated as the *elect*.

Many new combinations of Oriental theosophy with Christianity were also formed, either proceeding from Manichæism or independent of it. Thus, for example, a certain Aristocritus wrote a work under the title of *θεοσοφία*, in which he sought to show that Judaism, Hellenism, and Christianity were but different forms of one and the same revelation of the Divine, thus taking his stand in opposition to Mani.[4]

A new offshoot of this theosophic tendency made its appearance in Spain towards the close of the fourth century, in the sect of the Priscillianists, a sect which professed many tenets closely related to Manichæanism, but not to such a degree, however, as that their origin may be traced with certainty to the Manichæans. The first seed of their doctrines came from a man of Memphis by the name of Marcus. He travelled to Spain, and is said to have disclosed his doctrines to Elpidius, a rhetorician, and to his wife Agape. From them, it is said, these doctrines were communicated to Priscillian, a respectable and wealthy man in Spain, respected for his pious and austere life, who had perhaps for a long time before already

[1] This is apparent from the law of the year 381. Cod. Theodos. l. 16, Tit. 5, l. 7. Nec se sub simulatione fallaciæ eorum scilicet nominum, quibus plerique, ut cognovimus, probatæ fidei et propositi castioris dici ac signari volent, maligna fraude defendant, cum præsertim nonnulli ex his Encratitas, Apotactitas, Hydroparastatas, vel Saccophoros nominari se volent et varietate nominum diversorum velut religiosæ professionis officia mentiantur. Many other indications are to be found of the spread of Manichæism among the monks. See e. g. Theodoret. hist. religios. T. III. p. 1146. *Εὐχῖται ἐν μοναχικῷ προσχήματι τὰ Μανιχαίων νοσοῦντες.* Isidor. Pelus. I. 52.

[2] Concerning his writings, see Phot. cod. 179.

[3] From his work in defence of the Manichæan doctrines against the catholic church, Augustin has preserved important fragments in his reply.

[4] *Ἀριστοκρίτου βίβλος, ἐν ᾗ πειρᾶται δεικνύναι τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμὸν καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνισμὸν καὶ τὸν Χριστιανισμὸν ἓν εἶναι καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δόγμα καὶ καθάπτεται καὶ τοῦ μανέντος.* See the anathemas in Jac. Tollii insignia itinerarii Italici, p. 142.

busied himself a good deal with matters of this sort,[1] and by embodying them in a systematic form and giving them spread, he became the founder of the sect. The eloquence of Priscillian, and his ascetic austerities, which acquired for him the more respect as contrasted with the worldly life of many ecclesiastics, procured for him numerous followers, and among these some bishops, as, for instance, Instantius and Salvianus. The bishop Hyginus of Cordova first came out against them, and by him the bishop Idacius of Emerita (Merida) was instigated to persecute the sect. But, by his rough and violent mode of proceeding, the latter rather promoted the spread of the sect, and Hyginus himself became afterwards dissatisfied with the manner in which the Priscillianists were treated, and turned round to be their protector. Upon this, an important synod assembled at Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa) in the year 380, which pronounced sentence of condemnation on the Priscillianists, and sought to take measures to prevent the further spread of the sect. They committed to the bishop Ithacius of Sossuba the business of seeing that their decrees were put into execution. They could not have made a worse choice than they did in this man, who was a mere voluptuary, and utterly destitute of all sense for spiritual things.[2]

Excluded from the church, the followers of Priscillian now took more thorough measures for establishing their party; and they had the boldness to make Priscillian himself bishop of Avilla. But Idacius and Ithacius, conformably with their character, sought by various artifices to make use of the secular power against the Priscillianists, and thus to crush them.[3] They actually succeeded in procuring an imperial rescript whereby Priscillian and all his adherents were condemned to exile. The latter hoped, through the influence of the two most eminent bishops of the West, to procure a rescindment of this decision: and the leaders of the sect repaired to the bishops Damasus of Rome and Ambrose of Milan for the purpose of vindicating themselves before these prelates; but in this, of course, they could not possibly succeed. They succeeded better in an attempt to bribe, with the money of Priscillian, a civil officer of rank, Macedonius, the master of offices, (magister officiorum,) and through his influence it was brought about, that the first rescript was revoked, and the order given that the churches of which the Priscillianists had been deprived, should be restored back to them.

Ithacius did not cease persecuting them; and being complained of himself as a disturber of the peace, he fled to Gaul. Already, it is said, was he conducted back to Spain, and there arraigned before the tribunal, when a great political change gave a different turn to the whole affair. The news came, that Maximus, who had proclaimed himself Cæsar in Britain, would soon arrive at Triers. There Ithacius waited

[1] Multa lectione eruditus. Sulpic. Severi hist. sacr. l. II. c. 46.

[2] So he is described by Sulpicius Severus, hist. sacr. l. II. c. 50. Nihil pensi, nihil sancti habuisse. Fuit enim audax, loquax, impudens, sumptuosus, ventri et gulæ plurimum impertiens.

[3] Sulpicius Severus pronounces this parum sana consilia.

for him, and on his arrival placed in his hands a formal accusation against Priscillian and his followers. The new emperor received the complaint, and perhaps in the outset was only intending to show his zeal for pure doctrine, since he glories in this, in his letter to the Roman bishop Siricius. He treated the affair as one purely ecclesiastical; — he ordered that all who were suspected of participating in the spread of these false doctrines, should appear before a synod to be assembled at Burdelaga (Bordeaux) in the year 384. Instantius and Priscillian were the first to appear before it. After the former had been deposed from the episcopal dignity, because what he said in defence of himself was not found to be satisfactory, Priscillian forestalled the sentence which he might expect, by appealing to the emperor, by which infatuated step he prepared the way for his own destruction. The bishops, partly from their own weakness, partly out of hostility to Priscillian, forebore to protest against this proceeding, by which, contrary to the existing theory of rights in the Western church, a purely spiritual offence was brought and tried before a secular tribunal.

Accordingly, all that were complained of, or suspected, were cited before the emperor's tribunal. Idacius and Ithacius appeared as the accusers; and Ithacius, it is said, was for fixing the suspicion of Priscillianism on all who led a strict and serious Christian life, for which he had no liking himself, all who were much given to the study of the Bible, or who often fasted.[1] A truly pious man, however, who then resided at Triers, declared very strongly against this *un*spiritual mode of proceeding. It was the bishop Martin of Tours.[2]

He declared it to be an unheard of thing, that an ecclesiastical matter should be judged by a secular court on principles of the civil law. He entreated Maximus to spare the lives of the unfortunate men; — it was enough that by the decision of the bishops, they had been declared false teachers, and deprived of their churches. As long as Martin was present, the trial was actually delayed, and before his departure, the emperor promised him there should be no shedding of blood. But when Martin was gone, the emperor, through the influence of two bishops, Magnus and Rufus, was led to change his mind, being the more readily disposed to follow the advice of these two bishops, who recommended severity, because the property of the rich Priscillian and of his followers excited his cupidity.[3] He committed the trial of the

[1] The words of Sulpicius Severus: Hic stultitiæ eo usque processerat, ut omnes etiam sanctos viros, quibus aut studium inerat lectionis aut propositum erat certare jejuniis, tanquam Priscilliani socios aut discipulos in crimen arcesseret.

[2] Although descended from heathen parents, yet he had already when a child received the seeds of Christianity into his heart. Against his own will he became a soldier, and showed the evidence of Christian piety in the military service. Then he became a monk, finally, a bishop. The veneration of his period denominated him a worker of miracles. See his biography by Sulpicius Severus, one of his enthusiastic admirers, who had known him personally, but losing himself in exaggerations, has given us too little of the genuinely historical and characteristic facts relating to his life. See also the dialogues of Sulpicius.

[3] Sulpicius Severus, who would fain excuse Maximus, says (Dialog. III. c. 9) that most people at that time suspected the emperor of covetousness, si quidem in bona eorum inhiaverat; and the pagan Pacatus Drepanius says in his panegyric on the emperor Theodosius the Great, c. 29, concerning the cause of Maximus' inclination in favor of these bishops, whom he calls no-

cause to a severe judge, the prefect Euodius. Priscillian was condemned not only as a false teacher, but also as a violator of the laws. He was accused of disseminating doctrines, the tendency of which was to countenance and encourage unnatural lusts. In the secret assemblies of the sect, it was asserted abominations of this kind had actually taken place. Maximus appealed in his letter to the Roman bishop Siricius, to the fact, that the crimes of Priscillian had been disclosed by his own confession.[1] But it is easy to see, that everything depends on the question how this confession was drawn forth. An admission extorted by the rack, as this most probably was,[2] wants the force of evidence; and the very circumstance, that the emperor felt it necessary to justify his conduct before the Roman bishop, may betray the consciousness of his guilt.

The result of this judicial process was, that Priscillian and several of his most important adherents were executed with the sword.[3] Others, after the confiscation of their goods, were banished to the island of Syllina, (Scilly.)

There was one individual, however, of the bishops assembled at Trier, namely, Theognist, who declared in the most emphatic language, without fear of the emperor's anger, against this whole proceeding, and he renounced the fellowship of all those who had taken any part in it. The voice of this individual by itself, was of little avail; but he was now to be sustained by a powerful ally. The bishop Martin was on the point of returning to Triers, for the purpose of imploring the mercy of the emperor in behalf of numbers who had been engaged or implicated in the recent political strifes. The bishops, who heard of this, dreaded his great influence. Moved by their representations, Maximus caused Martin to be informed before he came into the city, that he could not be permitted to enter unless he promised to keep peace with the bishops. Martin answered, he would come with the peace of Christ.

When he arrived at Triers, he attached himself to Theognist; and fruitless were all the efforts of Maximus to make him satisfied with the conduct of the bishops — fruitless all his representations, to bring about a reconciliation betwixt him and the party of Ithacius. Finally he dismissed him in anger.

Meantime, the emperor had resolved to send to Spain a military commission with unlimited powers, for the purpose of continuing the trials and the punishment of the Priscillianists. Had this purpose been executed, others doubtless, besides the Priscillianists, whose property

minibus antistites, revera autem satellites atque carnifices: a quibus tot simul votiva veniebant avaro divitum bona.

[1] In this letter, first published by Cardinal Baronius from the Vatican library, Maximus says: Cæterum quid adhuc proxime proditum sit, Manichæos sceleris admittere, non argumentis, neque suspicionibus dubiis vel incertis, sed ipsorum confessione inter judicia prolatis, malo quod ex gestis ipsis tua sanctitas, quam ex nostro ore cognoscat; quia hujuscemodi non modo facta turpia, verum etiam fœda dictu, proloqui sine rubore non possumus.

[2] Pacatus Drepanius mentions expressly, in connection with this investigation, the gemitus et tormenta miserorum.

[3] Among the persons executed was also the noble and rich widow Euchrotia, of whom Pacatus Drepanius says, (l. c.:) Exprobabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio et diligentius culta divinitas. Quid hoc majus poterat intendere accusator sacerdos?

was coveted, or who might be looked upon as belonging to the sect merely on account of the cast of their countenance or their ascetic dress,[1] would have fallen victims to the persecution. Martin, ever since his first interview with Maximus, had been laboring to persuade him that he ought not to execute this decree; but the latter had given only evasive replies. At length Martin heard, all at once, that tribunes, commissioned with full powers, had been actually sent to Spain. He hurried immediately, though it was night, to the palace, and promised the emperor, that he would admit the bishops to church fellowship, if the emperor would recall the tribunes; and by this compliance he rescued, for the time being, several unhappy creatures from ruin.

Though many, influenced by the blind zeal against heretics, and by the perverse principle of Augustin, (see above, p. 212–217,) carried out to the extreme, that it was right to bring back the erring to the truth and to salvation by the fear of bodily sufferings,[2] were induced to approve of those oppressive measures, or at least to wink at them; yet influential voices declared against them. When, at a later period, Ambrose of Milan came to Triers, on business of the young emperor, Valentinian II., he was not deterred by any fear of the displeasure of Maximus, from refusing the fellowship of the church to those bishops who had taken part in those proceedings;[3] and he compared them with the Pharisees, who questioned Christ respecting the punishment which according to the civil laws was due to the woman taken in adultery.[4] Siricius, bishop of Rome, took the same ground with Ambrose.[5] Ithacius was afterwards deposed from his episcopal office, and the schism lasted for some time between these two parties of bishops, the party that approved, and those who condemned the proceedings against the Priscillianists.

For the rest, the death of Priscillian and his friends could not effect the suppression of the sect; on the contrary, it served to give it a new access of enthusiasm.[6] Priscillian and many of those who had been executed with him, were adored by the sect as martyrs.

[1] Sulpic. Sever. Dialog. l. III. c. 11, cum quis pallore potius aut veste quam fide hæreticus æstimaretur.

[2] Leo the Great, taking for granted, indeed, that Priscillian set forth doctrines totally destructive of good morals, says of this mode of proceeding against heretics, ep. 15 ad Turribium: Profuit diu ista districtio ecclesiasticæ lenitati, quæ, etsi sacerdotali contenta judicio cruentas refugit ultiones, severis tamen Christianorum principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad spiritale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale supplicium.

[3] As Ambrose himself relates, ep. 24 ad Valentinianum: Me abstinere ab iis qui aliquos, devios licet a fide, ad necem petebat.

[4] Ep. 26 ad Irenæum: Quid enim aliud isti dicunt, quam dicebant Judæi, reos criminum legibus esse publicis puniendos, et ideo accusari eos etiam a sacerdotibus in publicis judiciis oportuisse, quos adserunt secundum leges oportuisse puniri.

[5] We must infer this from the VI. canon of the council of Turin. Harduin. I. f. 959, where the decisions of Ambrose and of the bishop of Rome are placed together as one and the same.

[6] With what suspicion Christians, and especially monks, coming from Spain, were regarded in the beginning of the fifth century, (since, in fact, Priscillianism often put on the garb of Monachism,) from the dread of the Priscillian heresy, which was there so widely diffused, is seen in the instance of the monk Bacchiarius, who in his tract de fide, and in his exhortation to a fallen monk, (ad Januarium de reparatione lapsi,) discovers, as a teacher of faith and morals, a moderate and gentle spirit. Driven, perhaps by the political disturbances, from Spain, he betook himself to some other district of the West, where he might hope to

As to the doctrines of Priscillian, we find, so far as we can gain any knowledge of them from the meagre accounts of their adversaries,[1] that Dualism and the emanation theory were combined together in them — elements related to Gnosticism and Manichæism. He supposed a kingdom of light, which developed itself in manifold gradations, by emanation from the original source, and opposed to this, a kingdom of darkness or chaos, out of which, as an emanation from it, proceeded the powers of darkness, at the head of whom stands Satan.[2] The souls which emanated from the divine essence, are sent forth to combat the powers of darkness; — they vow in the presence of God to contend with firmness and constancy, and the angels stimulate them with exhortations. They descend through the seven heavens, perhaps the kingdoms of the seven star-spirits,[3] forming the boundary betwixt the kindoms of light and of darkness, in order to attack this latter; and probably it was Priscillian's notion, that from each of these sidereal regions the souls appropriated and brought along with them a correspondent sidereal vehicle.[4] But now the powers of darkness succeed in drawing down the souls to themselves, and of enchaining them in bodies.[5] This result, however, is not a mere accident, but the powers of darkness are destined thus to subserve the purposes of the divine wisdom in bringing about the destruction of their own kingdom. The heavenly souls were des-

enjoy more tranquility, (whether to Rome, as we might infer from the account of Gennadius, c. 24, remains uncertain, as this account contains several other statements which are manifestly incorrect.) As it seems, no one was willing, however, to receive him in any of the cloisters, and the bishops also hesitated to grant him the fellowship of the church, because they suspected him, on account of the country he came from, of heresy. This led him to draw up in his own defense his confession of faith, which was first published by Muratori in the second volume of the above-cited collection of *ἀνεκδοτα* from the Ambrosian library, and again by Galland. bibl. patr. T. IX. The manner, then, in which he here justifies antithetically his orthodoxy, particularly in respect to the doctrines of the Trinity, the humanity of Christ, the resurrection, the origin of the soul; in respect to marriage, the ascetic life and the canon of the sacred scriptures, shows clearly that it was against the suspicion of being tainted with the Priscillian doctrines, so widely diffused in his own country, he had chiefly to defend himself.

[1] Especially the Commonitorium of Orosius to Augustin, (Augustin. hæres. 70,) and the answer of bishop Leo the Great to Turribius, bishop of Asturica, (Astorga,) in which he for the most part joins in accepting the report of the latter respecting the doctrines of this sect, in order to their confutation.

[2] Satanam ex Chao et tenebris emersisse. Leo ad Turrib. c. VI.

[3] Comp. the doctrine of the Ophites.

[4] If we consider, however, that Priscillian used the Ascensio Isaiæ, which has come to our knowledge in the Ethiopic translation, (ed. Lawrence. Oxon. 1819,) it becomes, perhaps, more probable that by the seven heavens he understood seven graduated classes of the higher world of spirits following one after the other, — seven stages of the higher world of emanation, according to the Cabbalistic theology. It may be questioned, also, whether the sidereal world, according to his theory, belongs wholly to the kingdom of evil, or rather answers to the Gnostic kingdom of the Demiurge.

[5] According to Leo's representation, c. 10, Priscillian supposed an earlier guilt preceding birth; but the representations of Orosius and of Augustin, which we have followed, manifestly bear more of the character of originality, and expressions from a letter of Priscillian confirm this representation. If we must suppose that Leo's exposition must harmonize with that of Augustin, the harmony, in the sense of Priscillian, might be sought for simply in this, that the submitting to be overcome by the powers of darkness was represented as a contraction of guilt, which Leo was at fault in only not understanding in the right way, in conformity with Priscillian's train of ideas.

tined to destroy the kingdom of darkness in its own seat, and this was actually brought about by the redemption.[1]

Over against the twelve sidereal powers, the twelve signs of the Zodiac, to which man is supposed to be related and subjected by means of his *body*, (whose several parts and members Priscillian assigned to the different constellations of the Zodiac,) he placed the twelve heavenly powers, represented under the name of the twelve patriarchs, to whom the *souls* of men are supposed to be related, and under whose guidance they stand. Hence man, representing in his soul and body the universe in miniature, unites in himself the higher and the lower worlds, heaven and earth.[2] By virtue of the inherent dependence of the body, in which the soul has been imprisoned by the powers of darkness, man continues to be subject to the influences of the stars, until the soul, which is related to God, obtains, through its fellowship with that higher world from which it has sprung, power to deliver itself from those lower influences. In order to the deliverance of these souls, the Redeemer appeared on earth. It cannot be determined with certainty, what Priscillian thought of the divine and the human natures of Christ. It is certain, that he entertained Monarchian notions respecting the relation of the Son of God to the Trinity, as well as respecting the Trinity generally. According to his theory of the body, as being the seat and origin of evil; of birth, as a work of the powers of darkness, he could not admit the fact of the birth of Christ with a true human body of earthly stuff. If, then, the testimony of Leo is to be relied on,[3] that the Priscillianists attributed the predicate "only begotten" to the Saviour only in the sense that he alone was born of a virgin, yet this certainly is not to be so understood as if Priscillian had wholly adopted the church notions respecting the birth of Christ. He might be the more induced to dwell on the predicate in this sense, if he reckoned among the extraordinary facts connected with Christ's birth, his having brought with him a body of etherial mould; and thus the being born denoted, in his case, something entirely different from what it does in the case of other men. From the antithetic dogmas, however, which the council of Toledo, in the year 400, opposed to the Priscillianists, it is evident that the latter represented Christ as one who was incapable of being born, (innascibilis,) and maintained that Christ's divine and corporeal nature were one and the same. This seems to involve the Manichæan form of conception;—the one divine light-nature exhibited itself to the eye of sense under the semblance merely of an object of sense. Leo says, moreover, that they could not join with the church in celebrating the festival of Christmas, because they held the Docetic notions respecting Christ's appearance on earth. If Priscillian gave

[1] Here we recognize Priscillian's general principle, which is to be found also in the Manichæan system; arte, non potentia Dei, agi omnia bona in hoc mundo. The kingdom of light, by its victorious wisdom, forces the princes of darkness, on the very spot where they seem to be insolent and to conquer, to subserve its purposes and prepare the way for their own downfall.

[2] Priscillian's words, in a letter, are: Hæc prima sapientia est, in animarum typis divinarum virtutum intelligere naturas et corporis dispositionem, in qua obligatum cœlum videtur et terra.

[3] L. c. c. III.

particular prominence to the suffering of Christ, in accomplishing the work of redemption, this circumstance would, it is true, seem not quite consistent with his Docetic views. But the way in which he expresses himself on this point admits of being explained also, even if we suppose that, like Mani, he attributed to the sufferings of Christ only a symbolical meaning.[1] As the twelve signs of the Zodiac have influence on the birth of the outward man, so the twelve celestial powers, opposed to them, influence the new birth, whereby the inner man is to be restored to fellowship with the divine substance from which it emanated.[2] What is affirmed of Christ, that he was born of a woman, but conceived of the Holy Ghost,[3] the Priscillianists applied to all the sons of the promise. It may be questioned, however, whether they understood this of the birth, so far as man's inner essence is derived from God, or of the new birth as contrasted with the natural. The Priscillianists, as may be gathered from what they affirmed concerning the Patriarchs, acknowledged the authority of the Old Testament. They appropriated it to their purpose by resorting to the allegorical method of interpretation. But it still might be the case that in so doing, they distinguished the God of the Old Testament from the God of the Gospel.[4] Besides the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament, however, they made use of several apocryphal writings, as for example, the hymn of thanks sung by Christ on his last visit to the mount of Olives, Matth. 26: 30, which they said was handed down among the initiated alone.[5]

The moral system of the Priscillianists was, as their doctrine concerning the origin of the body required, rigidly ascetic. It enjoined austerities of all sorts, and, in particular, celibacy. The charges laid against them of dissolute conduct, are, to say the least, not sufficiently well authenticated. But it must be owned, that, in common with most of the theosophic sects who were in the habit of distinguishing an esoteric and an exoteric doctrine — they were extremely loose in their principles of veracity. They affirmed that a falsehood might be allowed for a holy end, — for example, to promote the spread of their own mysteries; and that it was right to conceal from the multitude, by affecting to agree with them in their fleshly notions, that which they were as yet incapable of understanding. There was no obligation to speak out the whole truth, except to the enlightened; that is, to the members of the sect: and to give some shadow of foundation for this view respecting the limit to the obligation of truthfulness, they made use of the passage in Ephes. 4: 25, distorted to their own meaning. Their bishop Dictinnius, who, at the council of Toledo, in the

[1] Christ by his sufferings — said Priscillian — annulled the bond, Col. 2: 14, by virtue of which the soul was held imprisoned in the body by the powers of darkness and was made subject to the sidereal influences.

[2] Leo c. 13. Duodecim virtutes, quæ reformationem hominis interioris operantur, ut in eam substantiam de qua prodiit, reformetur.

[3] Leo c. 9 Filios promissionis ex mulieribus quidem natos; sed ex spiritu sancto conceptos.

[4] As is implied in the genuine antithetic proposition of the council of Toledo.

[5] See Augustin. ep. 237 ad Ceretium.

year 400, came over to the Catholic church, had written a work, entitled "the Scales,"[1] in which these principles were expounded and defended. But it is plain, from this very principle of theirs, that their own sayings respecting the character of the sect and its doctrines, as well as the declarations in the recantations of its members who returned back to the Catholic church, deserve little confidence.

Hence, many Catholic ecclesiastics were of the opinion that, in order to draw from the Priscillianists a true account of the subject-matter of their doctrines, it was right to adopt the same method of dissimulation. But Augustin composed an excellent treatise for the express purpose of exposing the immorality of this method, and of setting forth the absolute universality of the obligation to veracity.[2]

By following out this principle, the Priscillianists found it, of course, comparatively easy to propagate their sect, in spite of all the persecutions; and as accessory to this purpose came in also the political agitations, occasioned by the migration of wandering tribes over Spain, amidst which movements the oversight of the church could not be so constantly and strictly maintained. The council of Braga, in the year 563, found it necessary to enact new laws with a view to the detection and suppression of the Priscillianists; and from this circumstance, we see how long they were enabled to maintain themselves, and how easily[3] they might scatter the seeds of their doctrines far down into the succeeding periods.

Although these later influences of the old Oriental sects, in their relation to the development of this particular period, may appear unimportant, yet they were propagated to the following centuries, and proved an important means in the hand of God, whereby a lively opposition was first aroused to the adulteration of the gospel by the intrusion of human dogmas, and to the slavery of the spirit which thence resulted; and whereby the laity was brought back to a consciousness of the rights pertaining to the universal priestly office of Christians at large, and to the pure well-spring of the truth in the divine word.

[1] Libra.
[2] His work de mendacio ad Consentium.
[3] Concilium Bracarense I.

END OF VOL. II.

NOTES AND ADDITIONAL REMARKS FROM THE SECOND EDITION.

Page 5. *A few scattered hints.*] As Constantine had ever risen to greater power in his contests with princes who were zealously engaged in the defence of Paganism; as his political importance had regularly increased in proportion as his declarations became more decided in favor of the Christian religion, there seem to be some grounds for the assertion, that it was not a religious, but a purely political interest, which first induced him to espouse the cause of Christianity, though he might afterwards have really felt the religious interest, which in the beginning he did but outwardly assume; since religion, and above all Christianity, is possessed of a power to master and govern the soul of the individual whose intention at first is simply to use it in subserviency to his own ends. And examples to illustrate this statement are certainly not wanting in the period before us. Or even if we suppose Constantine had no set purpose and design of thus using Christianity, yet owing to his connection with the times, he might, under the sure guidance of a certain instinctive feeling, be led to perceive that Paganism had now lost its power in the life of the people, while Christianity had attracted the whole of that power to itself. Or it might be said, that without being conscious on his own part of any particular religious interest, he was gradually drawn into the current which the times themselves had set in motion. It might be asserted, with Gibbon, that some portion of the religious enthusiasm which attached itself to Constantine, and to which he yielded in the first place merely for the sake of compassing his own ends, finally got possession of his feelings, and became with him a matter of personal conviction.[1] But though in all this, and particularly in what was last stated, there may be some truth at bottom, still there is no *good* reason for regarding the conversion of Constantine to Christianity as having been a mere outward change; but, on the contrary, we find many grounds for presuming that religious convictions which had originated in his own mind, were gradually unfolded in him under various influences from without, and that he passed by degrees from a certain species of religious eclecticism, to the sole recognition of Christianity as the true religion; — by a transition, for instance, somewhat like that which we might suppose would have taken place in the case of an Alexander Severus, or a Philip the Arabian, had either of them lived in the same juncture.

P. 7, *indebted for his good fortune to the protection of a god.*] Perhaps to Apollo, or the sun-god, Helios. Julian intimates as much in that mythical account, (orat. vii. f. 228, ed. Spanheim,) where he represents Jupiter as saying to Helios, that Constantine, by abandoning the latter — with whom, therefore, he must be supposed to have previously stood in some special

[1] In an age of religious fervor, the most artful statesmen are observed to feel some part of the enthusiasm which they inspire.—*Gibbon.*

relation — had been the cause of every evil to himself and to his family. *Ὃς σε ἀπολείπων αὐτῷ τε καὶ γένει καὶ παισὶν αἴτιος ἐγένετο τῶν τηλικούτων παθημάτων.* In confirmation of this, we find the god of the sun represented on coins as the patron god of Constantine. See those with the inscription: "Soli invicto comiti." Eckhel doctrina nummorum veterum. Vol. viii. p. 75.

P. 14, *secure to us through all time.*] It is evident, then, that by restoring back to the Christian churches the property of which they had been deprived, he believed himself doing what would be well-pleasing to God.

P. 35. *Addition to note* 2.] The mad assaults of the Bishop Georgius on the temples, his influence over the emperor Constantius, and through him over all the civil and military authorities, are also noticed by Julian in his letter to the people of Alexandria: *Τὸν Κωνστάντιον ἐρεῖτε ὅτι καθ' ὑμῶν παρώξυνεν, εἶτα εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν στρατόπεδον, καὶ κατέλαβεν ὁ στρατηγὸς τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸ ἁγιώτατον τοῦ θεοῦ τέμενος, ἀποσυλήσας ἐκεῖθεν εἰκόνας καὶ ἀναθήματα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κόσμον· ὑμῶν δ' ἀγανακτούντων εἰκότως, καὶ πειρωμένων ἀμύνειν τῷ θεῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ κτήμασιν, ὅδε ἐτόλμησεν ὑμῖν ἐπιπέμψαι τοὺς ὁπλίτας ἀδίκως καὶ παρανόμως καὶ ἀσέβως· ἴσως Γεώργιον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν Κωνστάντιον δεδοικώς, ἑαυτὸν παρεφύλαττεν, εἰ μετρώτερον ὑμῖν καὶ πολικώτερον, ἀλλὰ μὴ τυραννικώτερον προὔρρωθεν προσεφέρετο.* See ep. 10, Juliani epistolæ, ed. Heyler. Moguntiæ, 1828, p. 14.

P. 36, *a direction hostile to Christianity.*] Athens, then the most flourishing school for the study of ancient literature, was also a central spot for the secret dissemination of Paganism. The Pagan and Christian youth here formed two opposite parties. Gregory of Nazianz, in the funeral discourse upon his friend Basil of Cæsarea, describes how by the influence of a Christian education they were kept safe from the contagious spirit of the place while studying together at Athens; and how all the pains taken to recommend Paganism served but to confirm them in their faith. And in this connection, he remarks: *Βλαβερὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἀθῆναι τὰ εἰς ψυχὴν τοῖς εὐσεβεστέροις. Καὶ γὰρ πλοῦτον τὰ εἴδωλα μᾶλλον τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος, καὶ χαλεπὸν μὴ συναρπασθῆναι τοῖς τούτων ἐπαινέταις καὶ συνηγόροις.* Orat. xx. ed. Lips., 1690, f. 331.

P. 40, *the destined instrument to achieve it.*] True, the political interest could not, in this case, have had any influence in modifying the religious. The former, under the existing relations of the parties to each other, would much rather have determined Julian to exhibit a great show of zeal for the church orthodoxy. His being connected with the oppressed, and on the whole, feeble Pagan party could not prove otherwise than injurious to his political interests. But there can be no doubt that, in his own case, as in that of Constantine, the political motives came to be united with religious ones; but in the opposite order. The political interest was in his case stimulated by the religious. As Constantine, with whom the political interest predominated at first, was from this led to the conviction, that he was destined by God to make his worship the prevailing one in the Roman empire, so Julian, with whom the interest for the fundamental principle of the old world gradually became the predominant one, finally convinced himself that he was destined and called by the gods to restore their ancient dominion.

P. 40, *to entrap a youth like Julian.*] The Platonic school was then divided into two parties. The first consisted of those who, true to the spirit

of Plotinus, despised magic as something belonging to an inferior stage of the spiritual life, where that life was still under bondage to the sidereal world, still held fast under the dominion of nature; and considered it as alone worthy of the philosopher to consecrate his life, in contemplation, to the purely spiritual and godlike objects which are exalted above all reach of the powers of the sidereal world, those powers which are under the control of the magic art, (the Goëteia.) The other party consisted of such as did not disdain to intermeddle with magic and divination, and who endeavored by these arts to produce an impression on men's minds, so as to gain proselytes for the ancient religion. Maximus belonged to this latter party, and the young Julian was peculiarly susceptible to such impressions.

P. 41, *he became the secret hope of the whole Pagan party.*] In like manner, the hopes of the Christian party were fixed on the young men Basil, afterwards bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Gregory, afterwards bishop of Nazianzus, who were then students in the same school.

P. 42. *Their influence is diffused down to the earth.*] This whole process of evolution, from the Absolute to the ultimate limit of all existence, appeared to him to be a necessary one. Creation and redemption, as free acts of the divine will, were here quite out of the question. Such notions were to be attributed to the rude anthropomorphism of Judaism and Christianity!

P. 44. *The priest was not to read any improper poet.*] In the instruction to a high priest, already cited on page 42, Julian directs that "the best men, and above all the most devout [1] and benevolent, should be selected for such offices." Though it was not his principle to pay no regard to differences of rank and property in religious matters, yet the force of circumstances would constrain him to overlook such considerations, for it sometimes happened that zealous Pagans were to be found only in noble and wealthy families, and at others, only among the lower ranks. Hence, after stating the qualifications above mentioned, as requisite for the sacerdotal office, he adds,—"No matter whether they be rich or poor. No regard should be had to the circumstance whether the candidate was of noble rank or otherwise." Yet he must have been highly gratified when he could obtain priests from the better class: for these, in fact, would be the most suitable ministers of a Paganism spiritualized by the neo-Platonic philosophy, and well qualified to uphold the former by means of the latter.

P. 45. *They were not to engage in any unsuitable occupation.*] In his instruction to a priest, he distinguishes the different positions of the priest in his life within, and in his life without the temple. He then goes on to say: "When the priest returns to the ordinary life of men, he may visit his friends, and accept invitations to banquets, though not from every body, but only from the better sort. He may also visit, though not often, the public places; confer with the governor of the province; and by interceding with the magistrates, assist, so far as it is in his power, those who really need it. The priestly attire should be different within from what it is when he is without the temple. Within the temple, it should be rich and gorgeous; without, more simple. He should keep away from the fights of wild beasts in the circus, and from the indecent theatrical shows." Julian wished to restore the theatre, as an institution connected with the Pagan cultus, to its original purity in correspondence with the worship of Bac-

[1] Φιλοθεωτάτος, which therefore means, in his own sense, those, of whom but few were still remaining, that were greatly distinguished for the zeal in behalf of the ancient religion.

chus. But as this was impracticable, he meant at least that the priests should keep aloof from it. No theatrical singer or dancer, no player of mimes, no charioteer was to be admitted into the house of a priest. Here, too, we may perceive a plain imitation of the ecclesiastical laws relative to the conduct of the clergy. In the same instructions, he requires of candidates for the priestly office, as an evidence of their piety, that they should succeed in persuading all their relatives to join in the worship of the gods.[1]

P. 50, *the Jews had confounded their Demiurge with the Supreme deity.*] He would also probably ascribe the contradictions and inconsistencies which he supposed he found in many parts of the Old Testament, to the literal interpretation of those accounts, which, like the Hellenic myths, had a more profound, mystical sense. "The Jews — said he[2] — did not agree with the Christians, but they agreed with the Pagans. They differ from us only in the exclusive worship of one God. Every thing else, they have in common with us: temple, sacred groves, altars, lustrations, and a variety of other observances, wherein we differ but little or not at all."[3] "If the God proclaimed by Moses — he says, addressing the Jews[4] — is the universal framer of the universe, presiding immediately over the world, then *we* have the more correct notions of him, who regard him as being the universal Lord of the Universe, and the others as governors of individual nations, and standing under him, as governors under the king, of whom each has to administer his own particular province; nor do we make him a rival of the gods that stand under him. But if Moses worships a particular subordinate God, and attributes to him the government and direction of all things, then it is better to follow us, and to recognize the God who *is* indeed over all, without failing to recognize that other being also, and to worship him as a god who has received the rule over the smallest province, but not as one who is the framer of all."[5]

P. 57, *gained over by Pagan teachers to embrace their religion.*] Perhaps he would not have scrupled to take the part of the children against their parents, where the latter sought to keep away their children from these schools; for he says: "It is not right to try to keep children from the best ways before they know which direction they should take, nor to lead them by addressing their fears and against their will to the religion of their elders," — which could only be meant to apply to those parents who were endeavoring to keep their children away from Paganism.

P. 69, *free from the constraint of authority.*] Themistius also praises the emperor, as knowing how to distinguish the true from the false use of sacrifices. He speaks highly of the law which had been enacted against using sacrifices for the purposes of magic. He praises the emperor for this, *μάλιστα δὲ οἷς οὐκ ἐφίησι μόνον τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς θεσμοὺς ἐξηγεῖται οὐ φαυλοτέρου Ἐμπεδοκλέους, οὐ μὰ Δία, ἐκείνου τοῦ παλαιοῦ.* (With the latter *οὐ* the *φαυλότερον* should be repeated: he is truly not infe-

[1] *Δεῖγμα δὲ τοῦ φιλοθέου μὲν, εἰ τοὺς οἰκείους ἅπαντας εἰς τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν εἰσαγάγοι.* Opp. f. 305. In this respect, also, we find similar laws of the church relative to the choice to spiritual offices; e. g. the law passed subsequently to this time by the third council of Carthage, c. 18: Ut episcopi, presbyteri et diaconi non ordinentur, priusquam omnes qui sunt in domo eorum, Christianos catholicos fecerint.

[2] Cyrill. c. Julian. l. IX. f. 306.

[3] *Τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰουδαῖους, ἔξω τοῦ νομίζειν ἑνα θεὸν μόνον· ἐπεὶ τὰ γὲ ἄλλα κοινά πως ἡμῖν ἐστι, ναοὶ, τεμένη, θυσιαστήρια, ἁγνεῖαι, φυλάγματά τινα, περὶ ὧν ἢ τὸ παρύπαν οὐδαμῶς ἢ μικρὰ διαφερόμεθα πρὸς ἀλλήλους.*

[4] L. c. l. IV. f. 148.

[5] L. c. l. IV. f. 148.

rior to that ancient Empedocles.) And he says afterwards, the emperor well understands how fraud and corruption intermingle with everything good; — that *ὑποδύεται μεγαλοπρέπειαν μαγγανεία καὶ εὐσέβειαν ἀγυρτεία καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰς μὲν προάγει, τὰς δὲ κολύει καὶ ἱερὰ ἀνοίγων ἀποκλείει μαγγανευτήρια καὶ θυσίας ἐννόμους ἀφιεὶς οὐ δίδωσιν ἄδειαν τοῖς γοητεύουσιν.* Ed. Dindorf, p. 83.

P. 70, *the educated and higher classes.*] It was to be attributed in some degree to the indifference or the selfishness of Christian land-holders, that Paganism maintained itself for a longer time among the country people. In some cases, they gave themselves no concern about the religious state of their peasantry; they avoided the expense of erecting churches, and of supporting clergymen capable of giving religious instruction to the people; and sometimes their covetousness choked the feeling of all higher interests to such a degree, that they were anxious to let the Pagan temples stand for the sake of the additional income they derived from the taxes on them.

Thus Zeno, bishop of Verona, says in a sermon, where he is speaking of the spiritual sacrifices of Christians: "Ask here, ye Christians, whether *your* sacrifices can be well-pleasing to God; — you who know every clod of earth, every little stone and plant on the estates around you, but take no note of the temples everywhere smoking with incense on your own lands, — you, who, to tell the truth, think yourselves to be acting a very prudent part in ignoring this matter. The proof is not far off. You every day go to law, that nobody may deprive you of your income from the temples."[1] And Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, addresses his flock as follows: "Believe ye, that the lukewarm and negligent Christian loves God; he who allows idols to be worshipped on his estate, and leaves standing the temples of idols and altars of devils, to the dishonor of the living God?"[2]

P. 83. *Whenever discovered, they were called apostates.*] The same thing was done in the case of the Huguenots under the reign of Louis XIV.

P. 83. *Life of Proclus, written by his disciple Marinus.*] When the general agreement of all, as against heresies, so also against Paganism, was adduced in evidence of the side of truth, Proclus, on the other hand, held, that the agreement only of those gifted with knowledge, possessed the weight of authority; but the general agreement in the disavowal of the gods arose from ignorance. "Nor — said he — *can* there be any real agreement among persons so ignorant; for real agreement springs from man's reason. As the unreasonable man is not in harmony with himself, still less can he be in agreement with others."[3] The doctrinal oppositions among Christians might serve to confirm him in this position. To the Christian idea of the creation, and the Christian doctrine concerning an approaching final end to be answered by the earthly course of the world, he opposed eighteen arguments, drawn from the fundamental principles of a consistent neo-Platonism. Although he did not attack Christianity by

[1] Lib. I. Tract. X. c. 6: Hic quærite, Christiani, sacrificium vestrum an esse possit acceptum, qui vicinarum possessionum omnes glebulas, lapillos et surculos nôstis, in prædiis autem vestris fumantia undique sola fana non nôstis, quæ (si vera dicenda sunt) dissimulando subtiliter custoditis. Probatio longe non est. Jus templorum ne quis vobis eripiat, quotidie litigatis. Ed. Ballerin. Augustæ, 1758, p. 120.

[2] Sermo XIII. in veterum Brixiæ episcoporum, opp. Brixiæ, 1738, f. 319.

[3] *Ἐν τῷ παρόντι χρονῷ περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι θεοὺς ὁμολογοῦντες οἱ πολλοι δι' ἀνεπιστημοσύνην τοῦτο πεπόνθασι. Πῶς γὰρ τοῖς ἐκτος ἑαυτοῦ τις ὁμολογήσειεν, ἀυτὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν στασιαστικῶς διακείμενος; καὶ οἱ ἀθεοι δὴ οὐν κτλ. οὐκ ἂν ποτὲ ἁρμονίως ἔχοιεν ἀνεπιστήμονες ὄντες.* Commentar. in Platonis Alci-

name, yet this polemical work manifestly has reference to the most important and general points of difference between the neo-Platonic and the Christian way of thinking — to the opposition between a *monoistic* doctrine of necessity and the teleological doctrine of freedom.

For the rest, there can be no doubt that the religious atmosphere of the period had an influence also on Paganism; and many things among Christians and Pagans differed only in their particular shape. While among the Christians we hear of help bestowed in time of need by the visitation of martyrs, we find the same thing among the Pagans, in the shape of visitations of the gods. Restorative dreams and miraculous cures in the churches of the martyrs, stand side by side with the dreams and cures in the temples of the gods. Pagan philosophers, no less than Christian devotees, won reverence from their party by the rigid austerity of their lives.

P. 84, *the renowned Simplicius.*] This noble philosopher, the last champion of the Hellenic religion, which was now fast approaching to its final overthrow, and author of the commentary on the Enchiridion of Epictetus, united to a strong interest in matters of philosophy, a deep and lively sense of the religious need, which led him to seek communion with an invisible world. Though the religious element of his philosophy may betray an unconscious influence of Christianity, yet his entire philosophical position was one which inclined him more to the Hellenic polytheism than to Christian theism. But, at the same time, it may be said of him, even with more propriety than of Julian, that the distorted exhibitions of Christianity which were presented to him in actual life, contributed in a great measure to confirm his prejudices against it.

He maintained, that no contradiction was involved in recognizing one primal essence and original principle of everything that exists, who is incapable of any adequate designation, and in worshipping those principles of being which have flowed from this essence, and in which what was one in the highest of all, has been unfolded into manifold forms of being. Each of these higher essences represents the Supreme in its own peculiar way; in each of them, man worships the Supreme Being himself, who reveals himself in them.[1] If Christianity redeems the spirit from the forces of nature, and bestowing freedom on minds which had been separated by natural limitations, unites them together through the medium of a divine life, Simplicius, on the contrary, defended the old principle of nature-religion against Christianity, together with the limitations which are grounded therein. "God — he supposes — is, indeed, everywhere present with all his divine powers; but as men are separated one from the other by time and space, and dependent on these conditions of time and space, so too, under these conditions, they can partake but in a partial degree of the divine influences. Hence each people has its own peculiar religious institutions, which have come from the gods themselves; and these holy national institutions men must observe, in order to draw the divine powers to themselves, according to these laws ordained by the gods. When divine

biadem. Pars II. Opera ed. Cousin, T. III. Paris, 1821, p. 125, 26.

[1] He says in defense of Polytheism: Εἰ δέ τις δυσχεραίνει τῷ αὐτῷ καλεῖν ὀνόματι τάς τε μερικάς καὶ τὴν ὅλην, πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ εὐλόγως δυσχεραίνει, καὶ πράγματι δοκοῦντος εἶναι κοινοῦ τοῦ ἀρχικοῦ (since even from the nature of the case the idea of the principle, from which all being proceeds, is something in common between the gods and the supreme original essence) ἔπειτα τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς καλείταν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀρχῶν. The principle: Τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὸ σέβας διὰ τῶν μερῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ὅλον ἀναπέμπεσθαι χρή. See v. 38, ed. Schweighäuser, p. 376.

things are conducted according to the order originally appointed by God, such an influence of divine illumination is manifested on the appointed day, as is not to be experienced on other days at all; for then the sick are healed and many salutary things are foretold. So important a bearing has difference of times and seasons on union with the gods. The same holds true also of the right relation of place, of words spoken, of actions performed, and offerings made to the gods." [1]

Thus in all these outward regulations, he perceives a higher necessity in the relation of divine things to earthly, which ought to be held sacred. "As man is composed of soul and body — he argues — it is not enough that we purify the soul by the intellectual knowledge of divine things, and a life in harmony with nature; we need also those means of purification which the gods have appointed for the body, the soul's organ. Let then the purified soul offer to the gods, through its purified organ, in cleanliest raiment, the first fruits of the outward gifts which God has bestowed: for it is befitting that we should present the first fruits to those beings who have given us all we possess. It betokens our readiness to consecrate everything to them." Should it be objected, that God needs not such gifts, he replies: "That, indeed, is true; but neither does he need our good life, or our correct notions of him. But *we* have need of these things, as the means of uniting us with the gods, so that we may receive the deity, as each of these divine beings is prepared to reflect upon us, according to his measure, the divine illumination in the same degree in which each one among us may be found worthy of it." He refers to particular instances, in which, by such holy acts, men had been restored from epilepsy, and in which hail-storms and inundations had thus been averted.

As Simplicius was very far from holding to an abstract religion of reason, as he was deeply possessed of the faith in a living relation between man and the gods, so he received, along with all the rest that was to be found in the old religious traditions of the Greeks, their oracles and prophecies. In treating the question, how and when men ought to resort for counsel and direction to prophecies, he lays it down as a principle, that it should be done only with regard to matters not dependent on the will of man, and where reason and experience furnish no means of coming to the truth. It should be done with that equanimity with which the wise man is wont to contemplate everything which is independent of his own will. If divinations were resorted to on all questions, the tendency would be to make men timid and inactive, and ready to attribute great importance to mere trifles.

Now it was a case of no unfrequent occurrence, for men to seek in revelations from the gods an answer to their queries, with regard to general religious and philosophical truths, especially in those times of wide-spread scepticism, and of the deep-felt need of a new revelation, which preceded the appearance and triumph of Christianity. Hence, Simplicius was led to ask, whether it was proper to resort to divinations on subjects such as the question respecting the immortality of the soul. And he decided against it. In all questions capable of being resolved by rational investigation, men were bound to confine themselves to this alone. "To be informed by some god that the soul is immortal, was no doubt suited to produce firm faith, but not a scientific conviction. If a man is so favored by the Deity, as to obtain the knowledge of causes and scientific truth, this is but another proof of the divine goodness, and does not belong to the province of divina-

[1] L. c. p. 352.

tion. If some have consulted the gods respecting the nature of things, still these have been but few, and not the first among the philosophers — and such persons have commonly possessed not a scientific conviction, but a conviction of faith; for it was God's will that the soul, which is endowed with the free power of self-determination, should come to the knowledge of the truth by its own efforts."

It is evident that Simplicius could not have had any leaning to Christianity, even according to his own views of the relation of philosophy to religion. He was looking for something different, in communications from heaven, from that which was to be given to man by divine revelation; and what faith was destined to attain by means of Christianity, he expected to find in his philosophy.

Though the false notions of religious things which he found prevailing among a large portion of Christians, contributed much to prejudice him against a religion which he had not studied and did not understand, yet at the bottom of it lay, at the same time, the real opposition which existed between his own fundamental principle and that of Christianity. To his Platonic apprehension of the idea of God, the biblical doctrine of God's holiness, and everything founded on it and connected with it, was utterly foreign. Thus, for example, all punishment appeared to him to be nothing, other than a means of reformation and purification. Perhaps he might acknowledge the necessity of various kinds of lustration for fallen man, but the idea of a redemption, in the Christian sense, of a divine forgiveness of sins, of a new birth, could find no point of entrance into his way of thinking. Whenever the need in which human nature stands of redemption and reconciliation with God, came into question, he must have believed that in all this there was a confounding of the subjective with the objective point of view. To him it *could* not appear *otherwise*. As it is in very truth a need of man's soul to be delivered from the breach with God, which has its foundation in sin, and true repentance on man's part sufficed for this, man gave to this thought an objective existence, as if, on the part of God, some special thing was required for this purpose. That Simplicius must needs have judged in this way, we may infer from what he says respecting the false notions of the Christians of his time.

In inveighing against those who denied a divine Providence, he thinks it necessary to attack next what he calls the third species of atheism.[1] This he makes to consist in supposing that the Deity is capable of being bribed by gifts, (oblations,) votive offerings, (*ἀναθήμασι*,) and distributions of money,[2] (the merit of alms-giving,)[3] as people now believe;[4] where he evidently alludes to the Christians; — so that evil-doers, those who have practised robbery and oppression, if they do but expend a small portion of their booty in such gifts, and make presents to those who pretend to pray, and to make prevalent intercession with God in behalf of such persons, may be allowed to go on in this way, and sin without danger of punishment. "Many now living — he says — even consider it as worthy of the divine goodness, that sinners should be forgiven — understanding this in a vague and indeterminate way."[5]

Having with slight labor succeeded in overthrowing this sort of superstition, he proceeds next, however, to inquire after the fundamental truth, lying at bottom of the opinion that God was capable of being persuaded

[1] Ὁ *τρίτος τῆς ἀθείας λόγος.*
[2] Κερματίου *διαδόσεσιν.*
[3] Παρατρεπεσθαι.
[4] Ὡς *οἱ νῦν οἴονται.*
[5] See v. 38 p. 392, seq.

by gifts, by good actions, or by prayer. Wherever, he says, there is true remorse for sin, these things contribute to promote the man's conversion to God, if they are done to preserve the sense of remorse, if the bodily prostration on the knees corresponds to the humiliation of soul, if the money is applied to purposes which are well-pleasing in the sight of God. "For — says he — God, when we sin, does not turn from us; he is not angry; he does not leave us: nor does he return to us when we repent. All this is human, and quite alien from the immediate divine blessedness. But *we* separate ourselves from God, in departing from that course which is in harmony with nature; and in restoring our original nature, *we* return back to fellowship with God. And we describe the act of our own return to God, as if God returned back to us."[1] He employs the following comparison to illustrate this habit of confounding our subjective feelings with an objective action. "Just as when a boat is drawn towards the shore by a rope let down from a rock, and the people in the boat, who are not aware of what is going on, imagine, that instead of approaching the rock themselves, the rock is gradually approaching them. Repentance, prayer, and everything else which is connected therewith, may be compared with this rope."[2]

Simplicius alludes probably to the persecutions which the few Pagans in his own time encountered, when he speaks of the tyrannical violence which would force men to atheism.[3] These persecutions moved him and some of his fellow-believers to escape to Persia. (See text.)

P. 85, *the requisitions of the original doctrine of Christ.*] When he came to perceive the opposition, then, betwixt primitive Christianity and the religion of his times, the conviction of this might have resulted in a tendency to reform, rather than in one hostile to Christianity, had he possessed a mind open to the reception of its essential doctrines.

P. 87, *it was able to purge away all the sins of the soul.*] His fundamental views of religion were limited and confined by the intuition of nature. His gods encompassed him with their splendor in the sensible world. When he looked up to the heavenly orbs, he saw his divinities beaming down upon him with their light. The regular courses of the planets, moving after eternal and immutable laws, was to him the symbol of a world exalted above decay, of a loftier region belonging to the life of the gods. The fountain of all light to nature, was to him the fountain also of spiritual light for mankind. Helios was the mediator between the invisible and the visible worlds; between the *κόσμος νοητὸς* and *αἰσθητὸς*; between ideas and the world of manifestation. He viewed himself as a soul related to Helios.[4] Recollecting how singularly, when a boy, he had been attracted by the sunlight, he imagined that he discerned here the unconscious longing which already, in that time of darkness, was implanted within and radiated through him, after the god to whom he was related.[5] Theism, therefore, would appear to him to be a religion too abstract, too

[1] Ταύτην τὴν ἡμῶν ἐπιστροφὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγομεν.

[2] Μεταμέλεται δὲ καὶ ἱκετεῖαι καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀναλογοῦσι τῷ κάλῳ. L. c. p. 398.

[3] Τυραννικὰς βίας, μέχρι καὶ τοῦ ἀσεβεῖν ἀναγκαζούσας. See c. 13, p. 131.

[4] Ὀπαδὸς θεοῦ ἡλίου.

[5] In his discourse in praise of Helios, Orat. IV. f. 130: Ἐντέθηκέ μοι δεινὸς ἐκ παίδων τῶν αἰγῶν τοῦ θεοῦ πόθος καὶ πρὸς τὸ φῶς οὕτω δὴ τὸ αἰθέριον ἐκ παιδαρίου κομιδῇ τὴν διάνοιαν ἐξιστάμην. So nature taught him, though no book had as yet come into his hands, from which he could learn the nature of the gods. Λήθη δὲ ἔστω τοῦ σκότους ἐκείνου, says he. I am indeed well aware, that in Julian a great deal is mere rhetorical sound; but I do not see why what he here says might not be psychologically true.

lifeless. And in one view of it, Christianity must have presented itself to him as such a religion — a religion which repelled the divine element in man too far off; and in another view of it, as a religion in which it was brought too near, in which it was too much humanized. He was seeking for a revelation of the godlike, which should dart its splendor into the sensible world. He was destitute of the sense to appreciate the spiritual majesty of the appearance and life of Christ. The same thing happened here which is always found to occur, wherever the secret feelings of man's heart may openly express themselves, that he who does not feel himself attracted, will of necessity feel repelled by the appearance of Christ. How poor and despicable appeared to him the person who could style himself the light of the world, compared with the ever-enduring, ever-present revelation of Helios, shining forth to the eyes of all! How insignificant the person who invites to himself the heavy laden, — who presents himself in the group of those oppressed with spiritual and bodily distress, in comparison with the old mythical and historical heroes, and the conquerors of the world. We need but hear how Julian expresses himself on this matter in his own characteristic language. (See the quotation cited on page 86.)

P. 87, *a national character once existing appeared to him incapable of change.*] He could not distinguish here that which is founded in the laws of creation, in the original character of nations, from that which has sprung out of the disturbance of the original element by the intrusion of sin; as, indeed, he was a stranger to all distinctions between nature, sin, and grace. Hence, on these grounds, the union of all nations in one kingdom of God, — in other words, a religion of humanity, — must appear to him nonsense. "In the Father — says he — all is perfect, and all is one; but in separated existence, some one power or another predominates. Thus Mars leads the warlike individuals of a people; Minerva, the warlike endued with understanding; Mercury, those who possess more cunning than boldness." In evidence of this, he alleges the undeniable difference of character which actually existed, for example, between the Germans, Greeks, and Romans. To explain this as an accidental thing, would be to deny the existence of a Providence. The question returned then, what is the cause of it? and this was to be found in what has just been said.[1] The different codes of law — he supposes — did not first give its stamp to the national character, but the diversity of the latter expressed itself in these. The law-givers, he maintained, had added but little by their guidance to the primitive natures and characters of the people.[2] He refers for proof to the fact, that although the influence of the Roman dominion had already endured for so long a period, yet the western nations had only adopted the language, and, at most, something of the rhetoric, but had remained total strangers to the philosophy and the scientific culture of Rome.[3] On this ground, the Hellenic culture seemed to him a thing strictly cohering with the worship of the Hellenic deities, with the Grecian cultus; — a thing foreign from Judaism and Christianity. And inasmuch as he made no separation of the human element from the divine, by which human culture is to be ennobled in all its branches; as he paid no regard to the circumstance, that revelation is only given for the purpose of communicating the divine life as a principle of refinement for all human culture, so he charged it as a reproach upon the sacred writings and upon Christianity, that every

[1] Opp. f. 115.
[2] Οἱ *νομοθέτεις μικρὰ ταῖς φύσεσι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιτηδειότησι διὰ τῆς ἀγωγῆς προσέθεσαν.*
[3] L. c. f. 131.

species of culture could not be communicated by means of them; that they needed to supply their own defects from some other quarter.

P. 88, *to foist in the doctrine of Christ's divinity.*] Contemplating the relation of the Old and New Testament, the relation of the several writings of the New Testament, and of the several apostles to one another, with the eye of an enemy, Julian could no where find any thing but antagonisms, and must overlook the higher unity, where those who allowed themselves to be determined in their views by nothing save the immediate practical and religious interest, saw every where nothing but sameness and uniformity, and were unconscious of the differences and of the several stadia in the gradual development of the kingdom of God in history. Thus what was true and yet not true in the attacks of opponents, might have conducted to a more profound and liberal investigation of the developing process of divine truth. He maintains, that when the Christians taught the laws of the Old Testament were given only for a certain determinate period, they asserted what stood in direct contradiction with the plain declarations of the Old Testament, by which these laws were declared to be of eternal validity.[1] He supposes, moreover, that the Christians departed from the doctrine of Christ himself; for the latter had expressly disclaimed any wish to annul the Mosaic ceremonial law. He had commanded that it should be exactly observed, in the well known passages in the sermon on the Mount. Then addressing the Christians, Julian says: "If Christ, therefore, threatened such punishment to those who transgressed but a single precept, what excuse will you find, who have trampled upon all the commandments?"[2]

The apostle Paul, ever since his times, had been a special object of scorn to those who were incapable of comprehending his lofty, profound, and *many-sided* mind; and Julian also can perceive in that freedom of spirit and wisdom which led Paul to become all things to all men, to speak and to act differently under different circumstances and relations, nothing but self-contradiction and intentional fraud.[3] He endeavors to show how Paul contradicts the Old Testament, Christ, and himself, — how he alters his doctrine concerning God according to circumstances, sometimes asserting that the Jews alone are God's inheritance; sometimes, to gain the Gentiles, teaching that God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. While the church-teachers sought to bring together proof passages for the divinity of Christ from the Old and New Testament and all the writings of the New Testament alike, without distinguishing what had been said implicitè and explicitè, — different stadia of development; — Julian, on the other hand, was for demonstrating that this doctrine was one altogether foreign from the Old Testament, and that even in the New Testament it was not an original one, but that John had first contrived to smuggle it in. He said the worship of the Son, no vestige of which was to be found in the Old Testament, conflicted with the command given there, forbidding the worship of all but the one only God.[4] By Moses, one God exalted above all others was named, whom alone men were bound to worship, and there was none second to him, neither one which was like him, nor which was unlike him.[5] Let them but show, he says, a single expression in Moses

[1] L. c. l. IX. f. 319.

[2] Cyrill. l. X. f. 351.

[3] Τὸν πάντας πανταχοῦ, τοὺς πώποτε γοήτας καὶ ἀπατεῶνας ὑπερβαλλόμενον Παῦλον. L. c. l. III. f. 100.

[4] Εἰ γὰρ οὐδένα θέλει προσκυνεῖσθαι, τοῦ χάριν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦτον προσκυνεῖτε, καὶ δν ἐκεῖνον οὐδ' ἡγήσατο πώποτε ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ὑπόβλητον αὐτῷ προστίθετε. L. c. l. V. f. 159.

[5] Allusion to the different doctrinal parties, which had arisen during the controversies of the fourth century.

which warranted any belief of this sort. The passage in Deuter. 18: 18, quoted as a prophecy relating to the Messiah, had no reference to the son of Mary. But even were such a reference conceded, still Moses asserts that the promised person should resemble himself, not that he should be like God: he spoke of a prophet, such as he was; one who should proceed from among men, not one who should come forth from God.[1] "So ill-fated are ye — says he to the Christians — that ye do not even stand fast to what has been taught you by the apostles. Indeed, that doctrine has progressively deteriorated, and has been carried to a worse species of atheism by your later teachers.[2] Neither Paul, nor Matthew," &c., (see quotation in text.) Julian intimates that John himself was afraid to call Jesus, in direct terms, God, and he imagines that he sees a piece of artifice in John's passing so gradually, and as it were, imperceptibly from the Logos to the historical Christ. At first, he says, John spoke only of God and the Logos, — said that the latter became man and dwelt among us; but was ashamed to say a word as to the *how*. He no where made any mention of Jesus or Christ; and thus insinuating what he would have understood, he next introduces John the Baptist, and makes him testify that Jesus is the one on whom men must believe, as the being who is God and Logos.[3]

Had Julian contemplated the character of the apostles with less prejudice, he would after having once missed the simplicity of John and become suspicious of surreptitious dealing and sly deception, instead of charging this on the apostle, much rather felt obliged to regard this gospel as the production of some later impostor. But he was very ready to welcome every opportunity of exhibiting the apostles themselves in this unfavorable light.

We have already had occasion to remark that Julian, when he speaks as an opponent, of the nature of Christianity, was forced, without being aware of it, to be a witness of those very things which marked its superiority over every other religious standing ground. Among the cases of this sort, we reckon the way in which he couples Judaism with Paganism, and places both in a common relation over against Christianity; in so far, namely, as the theistic principle was first freed by Christianity from the constraints of outward forms, and that particularity of application within which it still remained confined at the position of Judaism. To the same class belongs also his remark, that Christianity is on one side akin to Judaism, and on another to Paganism; — in the theistic element, opposed to Paganism and one with Judaism; in combatting the legal ground, and in freedom, though on a different foundation, one with the Hellenic principle; all which he so interpreted, indeed, as to make the Christians adopt what was bad and let go what was good in the two religions. From the Jews, they had taken nothing but the renunciation of the gods, but they had rejected the severe discipline of the law and the various kinds of lustration; from the Pagans they had adopted the free mode of life, but renounced their pious respect for every thing divine.[4] "Had you adopted," says he to the Christians,

[1] Cyrill. l. VIII. f. 253.

[2] Οὕτω δέ ἐστε δυστυχεῖς, ὥστε οὐδὲ τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῖν παραδεδομένοις ἐκμεμενήκατε, καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον καὶ δυσσεβέστερον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιγενομένων ἐξειργάσθη. L. c. l. X. f. 327.

[3] Καὶ ὁ λόγος, φησὶ, σὰρξ ἐγένετο κτλ., τὸ δὲ ὅπως λεγειν αἰσχυνόμενος, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ αὐτὸν οὔτε Ἰησοῦν οὔτε Χριστὸν ἄχρις τοῦ θεὸν καὶ λόγον ἀποκαλεῖ. Κλέπτων δὲ ὥσπερ ἡρέμα καὶ λάθρα τὰς ἀκοὰς ἡμῶν, Ἰωάννην φησὶ τὸν Βαπτιστὴν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ταύτην ἐκθέσθαι τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ὅτι ἄρα οὗτος ἐστὶν ὃν χρὴ πεπιστευκέναι θεὸν εἶναι λόγον. Cyrill. l. X. f. 327. Σκοπεῖτε, ὅπως εὐλαβῶς ἡρέμα καὶ λελῃθότως ἐπεισάγει τῷ δράματι τὸν κολοφῶνα τῆς ἀσεβείας, οὕτω τε ἔστι πανοῦργος καὶ ἀπατεών. L. c. f. 333.

[4] Τὸ εὐλαβὲς πρὸς ἅπασαν τὴν κρείττονα φύσιν. Cyrill. l. VII. f. 238.

"the religious doctrine of the Jews, it would indeed have fared worse with you than if you had remained with us; — still, you would have met with a more tolerable lot, since you would have worshipped one God instead of several, nor would you have worshipped a man, or rather many unfortunate men.[1] You would have received a harsh and rude law, deformed by many defects which are peculiar to the barbarians, instead of our mild and philanthropic laws — in other respects you would have been worse off, but yet holier and purer." So he compares them with leeches, which imbibe all the impure blood, but leave that which is good.[2]

The religious system of Julian consisted, as the case usually was with the later Platonicians, of a mixture of rationalist and supernaturalist elements. On the one hand, he says, in opposition to supernaturalism, which doubtless came to his knowledge in some extreme and exaggerated form, — "It is not enough to say: God spake and it was done, but the commands of God must harmonize with the nature of things. God being eternal, his commands must correspond to his eternal being; hence they can be no other than the nature of things themselves, or something that harmonizes with it. How can nature possibly be opposed to the commands of God, or how be at discordance with them?"[3] But still Julian was for looking to the revelations of the gods, for the resolution of questions which he supposed human reason by itself was incompetent to resolve. Thus, he says, in asserting the immortality of the soul: "We here depend on the authority of no man, but only of the gods, who alone doubtless have knowledge of this; for on such matters, it behooves man to express only his conjectures — but the gods must have certain knowledge."[4] The excellence and authority of the old religions and their sacred institutions he traced to their supernatural, divine origin. "I avoid," said he in writing to an *ἀρχιερεὺς*[5] — "I avoid novelty in every thing; but above all in that which relates to the gods; since I am of the opinion, that from the beginning and always, the laws of one's country must be observed, because it is plain that the gods have given them; for if they were given by men, they would not be so beautiful."[6] While Christianity teaches that, in place of the earlier isolated and fragmentary communications of divine powers, the quickening of redeemed humanity by the divine Spirit has entered in as a permanent thing; Julian, on the other hand, adhering firmly to the older point of view, supposes only rare and transcient communications of the spirit which comes from the gods to have taken place, and that by certain conditions of nature these divine powers had at length every where been lost. "The spirit that comes from the gods to men," says he, "appears seldom, and to but few, and not easily

[1] The multitude of saints.

[2] *Ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν τὰς παραπεπηγυίας τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὥσπερ τινὰς κῆρας ἀρεπόμενοι, τὴν ἀθεότητα μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ραδιουργίας, φαῦλον δὲ καὶ ἐπισεσυρμένον βίον ἐκ τῆς παρ' ἡμῖν ῥαθυμίας καὶ χυδαιότητος.* L. c. l. II. f. 43. *Νῦν δὲ ὑμῖν συμβέβηκεν ὥσπερ ταῖς βδέλλαις, τὸ χείριστον ἕλκειν αἷμα ἐπεῖθεν, ἀφεῖναι δὲ τὸ καθαρώτερον.* L. c. l. VI. f. 202.

[3] *Τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀϊδίου, καὶ προστάγματα τοιαῦτα εἶναι προσήκει. Τοιαῦτα δὲ ὄντα, ἤτοι φύσεις εἰσὶ τῶν ὄντων, ἢ τῇ φύσει τῶν ὄντων ὁμολογούμενα. Πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἡ φύσις τῷ προστάγματά μάχοιτο τοῦ θεοῦ; πῶς δ' ἂν ἔξω πίπτοι τῆς ὁμολογίας;* Cyrill. l. IV. f. 143.

[4] *Πειθόμεθα δὲ τῶν μὲν ἀνθρώπων οὐδενὶ, τοῖς θεοῖς δὲ μόνον, οὓς δὴ καὶ μάλιστα ταῦτα εἰκὸς εἰδέναι μόνους, εἴ γε χρὴ καλεῖν εἰκὸς τὸ ἀναγκαῖον· ὡς τοῖς μὲν ἀνθρώποις ἁρμόζει περὶ τῶν τοιούτων εἰκάζειν, ἐπίστασθαι δὲ αὐτὰ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀνάγκη.* Ep. 63, p. 131. Yet he knew of nothing else to say to one who wanted to be consoled for the early death of his wife, than that he must resign himself to a necessity inseparable from the condition of human nature. Ep. 37.

[5] Ep. 63.

[6] *Φεύγω τὴν καινοτομίαν ἐν ἅπασι μὲν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, οἰόμενος χρῆναι ἂν πατρίους ἐξ ἀρχῆς φυλάττεσθαι νόμους, οὓς ὅτι μὲν ἔδοσαν οἱ θεοὶ, φανερὸν, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν οὕτω καλοὶ, παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ἁπλῶς γενόμενοι.* Ep. 63.

can every man, at any time, be a partaker of it. Hence the communication of the spirit has ceased with the Jews, and even among the Egyptians it has not been continued down to the present times. The spontaneous oracles themselves seem to give way to the changing periods of time."[1] Hence he was of the opinion, that in place of these by-gone supernatural communications of the gods, had come in the continuous intermediation of the fellowship with them by means of the holy arts; as he says next after the words before cited: "Our father Zeus, the lover of mankind, has, in order that we might not be wholly deprived of the fellowship with the gods, given us those holy arts, (as for example the auspici, horuspicia,) which furnishes us with such sufficient help for our needs."[2] Furthermore, he looked upon the healing art, coming from the appearance of Esculapius, as an abiding after-influence of the revelation of the gods, and that this god every where reveals himself for the cure of diseases, bodily and mental:[3]— referring to those incubations to which so many cures were ascribed in the first centuries after the birth of Christ. He affirms, that Esculapius had often cured him (Julian himself) by remedies suggested to him in dreams.[4]

Julian, thus contemplating history with hood-winked eye, could see in the old Hellenico-Roman religion something indestructibly divine, and believe that in renouncing it, the Roman world was rapidly passing to barbarism and ruin. In Christianity, he could see nought else than a work of man, which was indebted for its extensive spread to sundry cunning artifices; while the decline of the old religion and manners, for which the Christians were chargeable, promoted the extension of their faith;— ignorance and credulity opening the way for it. Accordingly, in the introduction to his work against Christianity, which he wrote, as he avows, for the purpose of giving the world an account of the reasons which induced him to renounce Christianity, he observes: "Christianity is a figment, put together by the wickedness of men, in which there is no particle of the godlike, but which has merely taken advantage of human folly, and the propensity to what is marvellous and wonderful, to procure credence for its pretensions."[5] And so he might suppose that he was himself destined by the gods, by restoring the old religion and suppressing the new, which had been raised to eminence only by human caprice, to save the Roman state from ruin.

P. 89, *called Philopatris.*] Many things are to be found in this dialogue, hardly reconcilable with the hypothesis by which it is ascribed to the times of Julian. It is easy to see that it sets up Paganism and Christianity alike, as objects of ridicule. A certain species of deism seems to lie at the basis of the whole work. But the Pagans of this period were for the most part zealous adherents of the old doctrine of the gods; and a

[1] Τὸ γὰρ ἐκ θεῶν εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἀφικνούμενον πνεῦμα, σπανιάκις μὲν καὶ ἐν ὀλίγοις γίνεται. Καὶ οὔτε πάντα ἄνδρα τούτου μετασχεῖν ῥᾴδιον, οὔτε ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ. Ταύτῃ τοι καὶ τὸ παρ' Εβραίοις ἐπέλιπεν, οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ παρ' Αιγυπτίοις εἰς τοῦτο σώζεται. Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ τὰ αὐτοφυῆ χρηστήρια ταῖς τῶν χρόνων εἴκοντα περιόδοις. Cyrill. l. VI. f. 198.

[2] Ὁ δὴ φιλάνθρωπος ἡμῶν Ζεὺς, ἐννοήσας ὡς ἂν μὴ παντάπασι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀποστερηθῶμεν κοινωνίας, δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τεχνῶν ἐπίσκεψιν, ὑφ' ἧς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἔξομεν τὴν ἀποχρῶσαν βοήθειαν.

[3] Cyrill. l. VI. f. 500.

[4] Ἰατρικὴν τὴν ἐξ Ἀσκληπιοῦ, οὗ πανταχοῦ γῆς ἐστι χρηστήρια, ἃ δίδωσιν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μεταλαγχάνειν διηνεκῶς. Ἐμὲ γοῦν ἰάσατο πολλάκις Ασκληπιὸς κάμνοντα, ὑπαγορεύσας φάρμακα. L. c. l. VII. f. 235.

[5] Πλάσμα ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ κακουργίας συντεθὲν, ἔχουσα μὲν οὐδὲν θεῖον, ἀποχρησαμένη δὲ τῷ φιλομύθῳ καὶ παιδαριώδει καὶ ἀνυήτῳ τῆς ψυχῆς μορίῳ, τὴν τερατολογίαν εἰς πίστιν ἤγαγεν ἀληθείας. Cyrill. lib. I. f. 39.

production of this sort seems not to answer to their way of thinking. But even were we disposed to believe that the author of this dialogue was given to none of the commonly prevailing theories, but had constructed a peculiar theory of his own, yet there still remain many other difficulties in the way of the hypothesis that the dialogue was composed in the times of Julian, or, according to the theory of the pastor M. Ehemann, (in the Studien der evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, Bd. XI. Heft 2, J. 1839,) in the times of the emperor Valens. What is the meaning of such a promise as that Egypt should be subjugated? It could not be set forth as a promise for the future under any one of the Roman emperors, down to the time when the country was conquered by the Saracens. It was then only that the recovery of this country could be reckoned among the happiest prospects of the Roman empire. It may also be questioned, whether the manner in which the doctrine of the Trinity is spoken of in § 12, does not betray an author who wrote after the second ecumenical council. And if a good deal is to be found in the historical writings of Leo the deacon, from which the allusions in the dialogue may be most easily explained, the opinion which was first broached by the lamented Niebuhr, and which was afterwards adopted by Hase, in the edition of the Script. Byz. T. XL, deserves a more careful examination.

P. 104, *these hostile machinations.*] An insulated narrative[1] has come down to our times, from which we learn how mightily Christianity wrought in Persia at the commencement of the fourth century. Under the reign of Hormisdas II., (from the year 301 to 308,[2]) one of the first of the Magians, named Mobed, a man who stood in the highest veneration,[3] embraced Christianity, and wrote a work against the doctrine of Zoroaster, and in defence of the Christian religion. This work, widely disseminated in Persia, seems to have accomplished much for the spread of Christianity. As it was found impossible to put him down by disputation, he was stoned to death. The Armenian bishops, in their reply to the proclamation of Mihr-Nerseh, allege that any one might learn what Christianity was from the writings of this Mobed.[4]

P. 105, *everything that transpired in the East.*] Yet the persecution certainly did not arise in the first place out of mere political interests; but religious fanaticism and the influence of the Magians contributed in no small measure to excite it. Indeed, one of the most honored and learned of that body, Mobed, had embraced Christianity. The multiplication of splendid churches had excited the jealousy of the Magians; and they declared that everything must be sacrificed rather than suffer Christianity utterly to suppress the worship of Ormuzd.[5]

P. 106, *and thereby punished men.*] Such a doctrine seemed to the Persians, a confounding of Ormuzd and Ahriman. It seemed ascribing to

[1] We are indebted for this account to the history of the religious wars in Armenia, very recently published, and written by the Armenian bishop Elisæus.

[2] Unless we are to understand Hormisdas I. who reigned from 272 to 273.

[3] According to the version of Neumann: Whom you held to be something more than a man. According to the Italian translation of Cappelletti, Venezia, 1840, the communication of which I owe to my friend and colleague Petermann: "Che voi reputavate piu sublime dell' umana natura."

[4] See Neumann's English translation of Elisæus, p. 14; Italian translation, p. 38.

[5] A remarkable expression of this kind is ascribed to king Jezdegerdes II. in the historical work of Elisæus, (p. 30, l. c.:) I have heard from my ancestors, that when, in the times of Sapor II. this doctrine was propagated through the whole empire, the teachers of our faith prevailed on the king to issue a severe edict for the suppression of Christianity, that the faith of the Magians might not utterly perish.

God what could be said of no one but Ahriman. "Such fury — says the edict cited in the text — never got possession of any man against his fellows; how much less could it exist in God against man. The man who uses such language, is deaf and blind, — deceived by that serpent, the devil."

Same page, 106, *were objects of worship with the Persians.*] Thus the Persian king said to the Christians in Armenia: "I have sworn by the sun, the great god, whose beams enlighten the whole world, and whose warmth gives life to all creatures, that if, at his wonderful appearance in the morning, every knee does not bow in worship before him and acknowledge him as god, I will abandon you to every species of persecution."[1]

P. 107, *to God, the Creator of all things.*] The spirit of Oriental despotism among the Persians, as elsewhere, required that the subject should have no other religion than his king had. Accordingly, in the proclamation so often cited, we find it said: "Know, that ye are bound to adopt the faith of your sovereign; especially, as we have to give an account of you to God."

P. 110, *had permission to leave the country.*] King Sapor was at length forced to see himself, that by the violence which he employed for the suppression of Christianity, nothing could be accomplished; and the unhappy issue of all his sanguinary edicts induced him to grant a general tolerance to all religious denominations in Persia. In the history of the religious wars, written by the Armenian bishop Elisæus, the Persian king, Jezdegerdes II., gives a report of the end of this persecution, which, although it cannot have been expressed in these terms by the prince himself, is yet worthy of notice, and may contain some truth. "When the King (Sapor II.) had shut up all the churches throughout Persia, the Christians next converted every house into a church, and performed their religious rites in every place; nay, they even supposed themselves to be temples, and regarded themselves as more and better than mere earthly creatures. They endured the severest persecutions, nor did their necks grow weary. Their goods were plundered, but still there were always more to plunder. The king was greatly incensed, and the executioners in despair; but the Christians were full of joy, bore all their sufferings with equanimity, and submitted patiently to the spoiling of their goods. When the king saw that they mocked at death, and looked upon it as nothing other than a way to their heavenly home, he commanded all the Magians and Mobed to disturb no man, but to suffer each to follow without fear his own faith."[2]

P. 113, *he desired an interview with the bishop.*] The first years only of the reign of Varanes were so unfavorable to the Christians. At a later period — and the noble conduct of this bishop, Acacius, may have contributed to bring about the change — he became their friend. He declared Christianity to be next after the doctrine of Ormuzd, better than all other religions. He showed great respect for the bishops. But the successor of Varanes, Jezdegerdes II., was again a violent enemy of the Christians.

P. 114, *they preferred to die as martyrs rather than to deny their faith.*] Their *manifesto* concluded with the following declaration: "From this faith, no power, no angel nor man can remove us; — no fire, no sword, no death in the waves of the sea, no violence of tortures, whatever they may be. Decide as you please, provided you do but leave us our faith, we will

[1] See Elisæus' history of the Armenian religious wars, translated by Neumann, p. 82.

[2] See the work so often cited above, p. 90, and the following.

seek here below for no other lord but you; as we will have in heaven no other God than Jesus Christ, for there is no other God besides him. But if you would rather hear something else from us than this great witness, then learn our determination. Our bodies are in your power; do with them according to your good pleasure. In your power is the rack, in ours is patience. You possess the sword, we have necks to offer you. We are no better than our fathers, who gave up property and life for the sake of the faith. Propose to us, then, no further questions on these matters; for our faith comes not from men. We are not to be taught like children. We are united inseparably with God, from whom nothing, either present, or in the future, or in all eternity, shall be able to separate us."[1]

Same page, 114, *they were prevailed upon to give in their denial.*] It is true, that many of the nobles, on this occasion, were induced to deny: but the attempt of the Persians to extirpate Christianity by force, and to introduce the religion of Zoroaster, stirred up a universal movement among the people, and a religious war. And this happened repeatedly. Some were betrayed into denial of the faith and treason to their country. But on the other hand, there was shown also a zeal for the faith which sacrificed all things and was ready to suffer all things for the holy cause, and a heroic courage in contending for the highest good.[2]

P. 117. *Indicopleustes.*] The Persian church then seems to have been active in promoting the extension of Christianity. Their commercial relations, and even the persecutions they endured, which led Christians to emigrate to other countries, might be the occasion of this. We find it stated, that as early as the fourth century, under the reign of Sapor II., Christianity had been diffused by the churches, which were so flourishing in this country previous to the outbreak of the persecution, to the Eastern countries lying on the Caspian sea, and thence south, even to East India.[3] Here conclude the accounts which Cosmas gives respecting the Christians in India.

P. 117, *where there was a Persian bishop.*] From the accounts of Cosmas, it can by no means be inferred that Christianity was spread among the native inhabitants of the country.

P. 125, *bishop of the Goths.*] Ulphilas was born A. D. 318,[4] and prob-

[1] History of the religious wars, by the bishop Elisæus, p. 20.

[2] Memoires sur l'Arménie, T. I. p. 323. Comp. also the work of Elisæus.

[3] See Elisæus, l. c. p. 30. According to Neumann's translation: This doctrine began to spread through the land and thence to the countries towards the East: it came into the land of the Kushanians, and thence it spread itself South, even unto the Indies. Neumann explains the name Kushanians as belonging to a people in the neighborhood of the Caspian sea. According to the Italian translation: Sino al pæse dei Tartari e di là si estese alle parti meridionali sino alle Indie. A remarkable testimony concerning the route by which Christianity spread from Persia to the East Indies.

[4] We are indebted to Professor Waitz, in Kiel, for the publication of a very important fragment from a polemical tract, composed, as it should seem, by the Arian bishop Maximin, in which is to be found an essay on the life and labors of Ulphilas, by one of his disciples, the bishop Auxentius of Dorostorus, (Silistria.) This piece, edited by Professor Waitz, from a Parisian manuscript, has first made it possible to clear up the chronological confusion, and to throw more light on this obscure subject; and the editor himself has already made good use of it for this purpose. This fragment must henceforth be the basis of all future inquiries into the present subject. Ueber Leben und die Lehre des Ulphila. Bruchstücke eines ungedructen Werkes aus dem Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Herausgegeben und erlautert von Seorg Waitz. Hanover, 1840. Now as it may be gathered from this work, that Ulphilas entered the episcopal office in his thirtieth year, and having administered that office forty years, died in 388, when the law cited in Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. IV. l. 2, was enacted, (see the work above mentioned, p. 21, 23,) it follows, that he was born in the year 318.

ably educated in Christianity. He administered the office of church-reader in the little community which had already been formed among his people, till he was consecrated as a bishop in the year 348. And he labored partly for the further extension of Christianity, and partly for the promotion of Christian knowledge and Christian life among those who, being until now destitute of teachers, had but a very scanty and imperfect knowledge of Christianity.[1]

Christianity having, through the zealous efforts of Ulphilas, found a wide door of entrance among the Goths, the fury of the Pagans was excited against it the more; and perhaps the ruler of the Goths, who is called a violent enemy of Christianity in this period, was the same Athanaric[2] who still later appears as a persecutor of the Christians.[3] The persecution proves how deeply Christianity had struck root in the hearts of this people, for multitudes of men and women suffered as martyrs;[4] so that, as the bishop Auxentius, who reports this fact, expresses it, the persecutors themselves were abashed, while those who suffered the persecution obtained the crown.[5] By reason of this persecution, Ulphilas, having now administered his episcopal office seven years, was induced, with a large number of his countrymen, in the year 355, to cross over the Danube and seek after a place of refuge within the Roman empire.[6]

By the negotiations of Ulphilas, for whom the emperor Constantius entertained a high respect, places for settlement were provided for these Goths in Mœsia. Men were fond of comparing Ulphilas with Moses, since, under his guidance, the Goths had accomplished this exodus from the midst of heathens, and delivered from the wrath of that other Pharaoh, Athanaric, had been conducted to a land where they could enjoy their religion securely and without disturbance.[7] By this successful enterprize,

[1] The following is said respecting his appointment as bishop, by Auxentius, in the tract of Maximin, p. 20: Hic, Dei providentia et Christi misericordia, propter multorum salutem in gente Gothorum, de lectore triginta annorum episcopus est ordinatus, ut non solum esset hæres Dei et cohæres Christi, sed et in hoc per gratiam Christi imitor Christi et sanctorum ejus; ut quemadmodum sanctus David triginta annorum rex et propheta est constitutus, ut regeret et doceret populum Dei et filios Israel, ita et iste beatus tanquam propheta est manifestatus et sacerdos Christi ordinatus, ut regeret et corrigeret et doceret et ædificaret gentem Gothorum, quod et Deo volente et Christo auxiliante per ministerium ejus admirabiliter est adimpletum; et sicuti Joseph in Ægypto triginta annorum est manifestatus, et quemadmodum Dominus et Deus noster Jesus Christus, filius Dei, triginta annorum secundum carnem constitutus et baptizatus, cœpit evangelium prædicare et animas hominum pascere; ita et iste sanctus, ipsius Christi dispositione et ordinatione, et in fame et in penuria prædicationis indifferenter agentem ipsam gentem Gothorum, secundum evangelicam et apostolicam et propheticam regulam emendavit et vivere docuit, et Christianos vere Christianos esse manifestavit et multiplicavit.

[2] This we may infer, with Prof. Waitz, from the fact that he is styled by Auxentius, in the tract of Maximin, (p. 20,) "judex Gothorum;" and Themistius says of the Gothic prince (Athanaric) with whom Valens had a war, (de pace, p. 160:) Τὴν μὲν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπωνυμίαν ἀπαξιοῖ, τὴν τοῦ δικαστοῦ δὲ ἀγαπᾷ,

[3] Socrates, l. IV. c. 33.

[4] On this point, says Auxentius, (l. c. p. 20:) Ubi et ex invidia et operatione inimici tunc ab irreligioso et sacrilego judice Gothorum tyrannico terrore in barbarico Christianorum persecutio est excitata, ut Sátanas, qui male facere cupiebat, nolens faceret bene, ut quos desiderabat prævaricatores facere, et desertores, Christo opitulante et propugnante, fierent martyres et confessores.

[5] Ut persecutor confunderetur, et qui persecutionem patiebantur, coronarentur; ut hic qui tentabat vincere, victus erubesceret, et qui tentabantur, victores gauderent.

[6] The words of Auxentius (l. c.) are: Ubi et post multorum servorum et ancillarum Christi gloriosum martyrium, immininente vehementer ipsa persecutione, completis septem annis tantummodo in episcopatu, cum grandi populo confessorum de barbarico pulsus in solo Romaniæ a Constantio principe honorifice est susceptus.

[7] Philostorgius, who reports after a manner which accords with Auxentius this migration of the Goths under the guidance

he could not fail to have won upon the confidence of his people. He preached with great fervor; and to this end, had made himself master of the Gothic, Greek, and Latin languages.[1] In this first bishop from the midst of the German race, we see thus early a representative of that tendency, which is said always to have distinguished the German people, and by virtue of which the greatest revolution in the development of the church was brought about — love for the sacred scriptures, leading to the effort to make it accessible to the people. To this end, he invented for the Goths an alphabet, and made use of it to give them a translation of the Bible in their own tongue. He is said to have composed theological and devotional tracts in all the three languages above mentioned.[2]

It is unknown whether all the Christians among the Goths emigrated with Ulphilas, or whether many still remained behind, and continued to labor for the spread of Christianity. The seed sown by him produced an after-harvest in various ways; but Christianity was also introduced among the Goths from other quarters, as indeed it might have been by those bishops who resided in the adjacent provinces of the Roman empire. One of these, Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, we find afterwards in intimate correspondence with the church among the Goths who dwelt beyond the empire of the Romans. But the fresh spread of Christianity provoked once more a violent persecution from its old enemy, Athanaric. This took place in the year 370, and onward. Among the Gothic Christians of this time, we find men possessed of an ardent zeal, which led many of them to encounter martyrdom. Distinguished among these was Sabas, of whose history we have a very particular account from the church to which he belonged. This report is, moreover, an important one, as it gives a very precise statement of the character of the persecution against the Christians among the Goths. It is plain from this narrative, that it was not so much the people who were inflamed with fanaticism against Christianity, as the prince and chief men, who, influenced perhaps by political rather than religious motives, were seeking to suppress a foreign religion.

Sabas was a pious layman, of Gothic descent, who, from his early childhood, seems to have had no other object before him than to be a devout Christian. He got himself enrolled among the regularly-appointed church-singers, and in this vocation discharged his duty with great diligence and care. He led a rigidly abstemious life; he was a bold and decided witness for the truth and against idolatry, but without unnecessarily obtruding himself into notice. His zeal for the faith had already exposed him to many dangers. When the chief men among the Goths first began to persecute Christianity, they commanded the Christians, as had been done in the first centuries, to prove their abjuration of the faith by partaking of the meat

of Ulphilas, is right when he asserts that this expedition did not take place, as other writers asserted, in the reign of Valens, but places it too early, viz., under the reign of Constantine. It must have been not Constantine but Constantius, who is said to have called Ulphilas, "the Moses of our time," (ὁ ἐφ' ἡμῶν Μωσῆς.) This title is also given to Ulphilas by Auxentius, l. c.: Sicuti Deus per Mosen de potentia et violentia Pharaonis et Ægyptiorum populum suum liberavit et rubrum mare transire fecit, et sibi servire providit, ita et per sæpe dictum Deus confessores sancti filii sui unogeniti de barbarico liberavit, et per Danubium transire fecit, et in montibus, secundum sanctorum imitationem, sibi servire decrevit.

[1] As Auxentius says: Græcam et Latinam et Gothicam linguam sine intermissione in una et sola ecclesia Christi prædicavit.

[2] As Auxentius says: Qui et ipsis tribus linguis plures tractatus et multas interpretationes, volentibus ad utilitatem et ædificationem, sibi ad æternam memoriam et mercedem, post se dereliquit. He may perhaps here have had in his mind the Gothic translation of the bible above mentioned.

offered in sacrifices. Now, the Pagans of the village where Sabas lived, were for resorting to an artifice, in order to deceive the Pagan authorities and save the Christians, who were their neighbors. Instead of meat which had been actually offered in sacrifice, they proposed to set before them, on the day of trial, other meat, which they pretended was such, of which the Christians might partake without scruple, while the magistrates supposed the terms of the law had been complied with. But Sabas could not consent to this deception, and pointed out the wrong of it to his fellow-believers. The Pagans, therefore, drove him from the village, when they found their trick had been frustrated by his means: but after a time they recalled him.

Some time afterwards, the Pagan magistrate directed another similar examination to be held in the same place, for the purpose of ascertaining whether there were no apostates from the old popular religion. On this occasion, certain persons presented themselves with offerings, and declared themselves ready to take oath before the magistrate who managed the trial, that there were no Christians in their village. But Sabas came forward and said openly, "So far as it concerns myself, let no one swear, for I am a Christian." Upon this the inhabitants of the village, who had removed the Christians from their houses to a place of concealment, declared on their oath, that "there was but *one* Christian in the village." The person who conducted the examination, caused Sabas to be brought before the assembly, and asked the by-standers whether he owned any property. Being assured that he owned nothing but what was on his back, the Pagan contemptuously exclaimed, "Such a fellow can do neither good nor hurt," and ordered him to be cast out.

It must have become very evident, that by such repeated examinations, the object had in view, which was to extirpate Christianity, could not be accomplished; and the less so as the Pagan people, instead of sharing in the fanaticism of their superiors, were quite willing to protect the Christians. The persecution of course became more violent when this was remarked. Soon after the Christian community of the village had celebrated the festival of Easter, Athanaric himself fell upon the place with a troop of armed men. The village preacher and Sabas were seized in the tents where they slept, bound in chains and carried off, suffering much ill treatment on the way. The faith of Sabas, which triumphed over all his sufferings, irritated the fury of his persecutors. By the strength of his faith, which imparted even to his body an unusual power of endurance, enabling him to suffer without sinking, he went firmly through the whole, and nothing could disturb his cheerfulness. During great part of the night he was subjected to various kinds of torture, till at length his tormentors fell asleep and left him bound upon the ground. A woman of the house, who arose in the night to make bread for the family, took pity on him and released him from his chains. He fearlessly remained on the spot, and assisted the woman in her work. The next morning, when Athanaric heard of this, he caused him to be bound again, and hung to a beam of the house. Then came certain persons in the name of Athanaric, and placing meat from the sacrifices before the priest and Sabas, told them to eat it and save their lives. Said the priest: "We are forbidden to partake of such meat. Tell Athanaric he may order us to be crucified, or to die in whatever way he pleases." But Sabas, whose pious feelings were not wholly unmixed with passionate excitement, asked: "From whom comes this message?" And being told, "From our lord Athanaric;" he exclaimed, "There is but one Lord, the God in heaven; but Athanaric is a godless

man, and under the curse of God, — and this food, like Athanaric who sends it to us, is unclean." One of Athanaric's people, incensed at these words, struck him with a club so severely on the breast that the beholders supposed the stroke would be fatal. But he uttered no word of pain, and to the smiter he said triumphantly: "Believe me, I felt it as little as if you had thrown upon me a lock of wool." He was now condemned to death by drowning. During the whole of the way, as he was led to the river where he was to die, he praised God that he had been pleased to bestow on him the privilege of dying as a martyr. Having arrived at the river, those who conducted him began to consult with each other about letting him go, as he had been guilty of no crime. Athanaric would probably never find it out. But Sabas, who already, with the eye of faith, saw heaven open before him, and wished not to exchange it for the earth, said, "Why do ye not execute your orders? I behold what you cannot see; already they wait in glorious apparel, who are come to take me hence." And while he was shouting praise and giving thanks to God, with his neck fastened to a piece of wood, he was thrown into the water. His body was then drawn from the stream and left to lie on the bank. But a Roman commander on the border, the Dux Soranus, caused the bones of the martyr to be conveyed to the other side, and sent them as precious relics to the church of Cappadocia, his native province, in compliance with the request of his kinsman, the bishop Basil, of Cæsarea.[1]

The Christian communities among the Goths sent, on this occasion, a circular letter, embodying a report of all these facts, to the communities of Cappadocia, and to all the churches in Christendom. The letter began with these words: "What was said by the apostle Peter, that in every nation he that feareth the Lord and worketh righteousness is accepted with him, has been verified in a powerful manner also at the present time; for we have in proof of it the life and sufferings of the blessed Sabas, who is a witness of God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ." And the letter concludes as follows: "Let a solemn festival be held, then, on the day in which he received the crown of martyrdom; and mention it to the more distant brethren, that so in the entire church a festival may be observed, and the Lord, who chose his servant, may be praised. Greet all the saints; — all the persecuted with us greet you. Praised for ever be He, who can conduct us all by his grace to the kingdom of heaven.[2]

The bones of Sabas, accompanied with the letter of the communities, a letter also from Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, and from the Dux Soranus,[3] arrived in that unhappy season for the churches of Cappadocia, when these communities were so rent asunder by the disputes and schisms which the supremacy of the Arian party, under the emperor Valens, had occasioned. Basil of Cæsarea, comparing the then state of the church with that of which he was reminded by the bones of the martyr and by the description of the conflicts endured by the Gothic Christians, wrote to the bishop Ascholius:[4] "When we received your letter, and read it over and

[1] For the conjecture is probably not unfounded, that Basil's ep. 155 was directed to this Dux Soranus. Basil writes: Καλῶς δὲ ποιήσεις, ἐὰν καὶ λείψανα μαρτύρων τῇ πατρίδι ἐκπέμψῃς, εἴπερ ὡς ἐπέστειλας ἡμῖν, ὁ ἐκεῖ διωγμὸς ποιεῖ καὶ νῦν (it is presupposed, therefore, that this had been the case before) μάρτυρας τῷ Κυρίῳ. T. III. b. pag. 354, ed. Paris, 1839.

[2] This letter, which we have had occasion to quote before, is printed, in the Greek original, in the Actis Sanctorum, T. II. mens. April. Appendix f. 967.

[3] Letter 165 among those of Basil seems certainly much more to have been intended for this Dux, than for the bishop Ascholius of Thessalonica, to whom it was addressed in the superscription.

[4] Letter 164.

over, we imagined ourselves transported back to those ancient days, when the churches of God prospered, being grounded in the faith and united together in love; when harmony prevailed as among the manifold members of one body; when it was manifest who was the persecutor and who were the persecuted; when the churches attacked increased continually in numbers; when the blood of the martyrs only served to multiply the champions of the faith. Then we Christians maintained peace among each other,—that peace which our Lord left as a legacy, but of which at present not a single vestige remains."

Ascholius having mentioned in his letter a certain Eutyches, a Cappadocian, who, as we may infer from some expressions of Basil, had in earlier times labored abundantly among the Goths,[1] and having spoken in praise of their common country Cappadocia, whence all these blessings had come, Basil replied: "By reminding us of the past, you have rejoiced our hearts, while at the same time we are pained by the signs which we now see before us: for no one of us is to be compared with Eutyches. Indeed, so far are we from being in any condition to lead barbarians by the power of the Spirit and the efficacy of his gracious gifts to gentleness of manner, that by the superabundance of our sins the very civilized themselves have much rather been made barbarians."[2]

It is a noble trait in the church-historian Socrates, that he finds reason, notwithstanding their want of correct knowledge, to respect the love of Christ which led the Arian Goths to encounter martyrdom, and that he acknowledges them as genuine martyrs.[3] Yet the fact which he assumes, is certainly not correct with regard to all the martyrs among them; for, although Arianism was propagated in the school of Ulphilas, yet the seeds of Christianity came also among the Goths from other quarters, by means of teachers sent from orthodox communities; and hence with them had been introduced another form of doctrine than the Arian. This was no doubt the case with regard to the martyrs last named, as is shown by the circular letter of the Gothic Christians which we have quoted.[4]

Ulphilas himself labored as a bishop among his people forty years. The last ten years of his life brought with them much that was a source of pain to him; when the form of church doctrine to which he was warmly opposed, the creed drawn up by the council of Nice, became more and more dominant even in the Eastern church, and was favored by the civil power. He himself was, in the year 388, called, with other bishops agreeing with him in doctrine, by the emperor Theodosius to Constantinople, for the purpose of holding there a new conference on the matters in dispute. By the ruling doctrinal party, however, this negociation, which indeed under the existing circumstances could have done no good,[5] was prevented; and an imperial law was enacted, which forbade all new proceedings of this sort with regard to matters of controversy.[6] Ulphilas and those associated

[1] His words are (§ 2.:) Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου ἀνδρὸς Εὐτυχοῦς εἰς μνήμην ἡμᾶς ἤγαγες.

[2] Οἱ γε τοσοῦτον ἀπέχομεν βαρβάρους ἐξημερῶσαι τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ χαρισμάτων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἡμέρως ἔχοντας τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐξηγριῶσθαι. From which words, we may infer what had been done by Eutyches the Cappadocian among the Goths.

[3] His words are, (l. IV. c. 33:) Οἱ βάρβαροι ἁπλότητι τὸν Χριστιανισμὸν.

[4] This may be inferred from the doxology, in contradiction to Arianism, with which the letter concludes: Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ (God the Father) δόξα κτλ., σὺν παιδὶ μονογενῇ [εἴ] καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

[5] See onward, doctrinal controversies.

[6] The law which, since the time of its enactment is certain, affords an important chronological landmark. The law which is printed in the above cited work of Maximin, p. 23. Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. IV. 1, 2.

with him, looked upon this regulation as only a proof of the want of confidence of their opponents in the goodness of their cause, and a token that the doctrine which they deemed to be the truth, was to be suppressed by force.[1] This was the last painful event which the worthy bishop, who had grown gray in the cause of Christianity, and in laboring for the Christian education of his people, experienced. He died at Constantinople, A.D. 388, after having drawn up a statement of his faith as a legacy for his flock, and laid down, in the prospect of death, a confession of the doctrines which he preached and ever maintained.[2] He left behind him disciples who labored on the foundation he had laid. One of these was the bishop Auxentius, to whom we are indebted for the account of his life from which we have so largely drawn. The latter says of him: "The man, whom I cannot praise as he deserves, and of whom I dare not be wholly silent, to whom I am more indebted than all others, as he bestowed more pains on me than on others; for he took me as his disciple from my earliest years, when my parents gave me to him, taught me to study the holy scriptures, opened to me the truth, and by the mercy of God and the grace of Christ, brought me up bodily and spiritually as his son in the faith."[3]

P. 129, *to the common participation in the communion.*] While Themistius, taking his view from the position of the ancients, held the chasm which separated the Goths, as barbarians, from the cultivated Hellenico-Roman world, to be one grounded in an original difference of nature, and, therefore, never to be filled up; — and wholly in accordance with the spirit of Plato, applied what the latter had said respecting the relation of the passions to reason in individuals, as in the state, so to the relation of the nationality of the barbarians to that of the Greeks and Romans;[4] the church-fathers, on the contrary, point out in what Christianity had already begun to effect among these tribes, the same power of the gospel to transform man's nature, which that gospel uniformly carried along with it. Thus, Athanasius testifies, in the passage before cited, where he speaks, in connection with the Persians, of the Armenians, and the nations dwelling beyond the ocean, the Goths: "Who could overthrow, in all these tribes of men, the worship of idols, and plant virtue? Who, except our Lord Jesus Christ, who not only preached by his disciples, but by his efficacious influence on the minds of men, induced them to lay aside their rudeness of manners, and, abandoning the worship of the gods of their country, to acknowledge him? Who is it, that unites together in harmony those who had been used to hate each other? Who else could effect this, but the

[1] Maximin says, (p. 23:) Præfati præpositi hæretici, — so appeared to be the adherents of the Nicene Homoousion — omnibus viribus institerunt, ut lex daretur, quæ concilium prohiberet.

[2] Auxentius says of Ulphilas, p. 21: Qui et in exitu suo usque in ipso mortis momento per testamentum fidem suam scriptam populo sibi credito dereliquit. The first words of this testament are: Ego Ulfila, episcopus et confessor, sic credidi; et in hac fide sola et vera, testamentum facio ad Dominum meum.

[3] Quem condigne laudare non sufficio et penitus tacere non audeo, cui plus omnium ego sum debitor, quantum et amplius in me laboravit, qui me a prima ætate mea a parentibus meis discipulum suscepit, et sacras literas docuit, et veritatem manifestavit, et per misericordiam Dei et gratiam Christi et carnaliter et spiritaliter ut filium suum in fide educavit. P. 20.

[4] De pace, p. 157: Εἶναί τι καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ βάρβαρον φῦλον, λίαν αὐθαδες καὶ δυσπειθὲς, τὸν θυμὸν λέγω καὶ τὰς ἀπλήστους ἐπιθυμίας, ἀντικαθήμενα γένη τῷ λογισμῷ, καθάπερ Ρωμαίοις, Σκύθαι καὶ Γερμανοί. As reason is not wholly to destroy the passions and desires implanted by nature, but to bridle them; so, too, the barbarian tribes, answering to these lower powers in relation to the reason which is destined to rule, are not to be destroyed, but compelled to obedience.

beloved Son of the Father, the common Saviour of all, Jesus Christ, whose love led him to suffer everything for us? Yes; it had been predicted, even from the beginning, what empire of peace he was to found — for the holy scriptures announce, (Isaiah 2: 4:) 'Then they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' Nor is this any longer incredible; for even now the barbarians, to whom the rudeness of manners is innate, so long as they still offer to idols, rage against one another, and cannot rest a moment easy without the sword; but no sooner do they receive the doctrine of Christ, than they turn from the pursuits of war to agriculture, and instead of arming their hands with the sword, lift them up in prayer; and, in a word, from henceforth, instead of waging war with each other, enter the lists against Satan and the spirits of evil; and, by self-command and the virtues of the soul, seek to gain the victory over them. This is an evidence of the divine power of our Saviour — and the wonderful thing is, that they remain faithful unto death, and die as witnesses for Christ." [1]

P. 132. *This theory was the prevailing one in the time of Constantine.*] There were three different ways, one crossing the other, in which the emperor Constantine was used to consider his relation to the church. The first, and that to which he was most inclined, since it had sprung out of his earlier eclecticism, and besides was ever and anon recommended anew by the influence of moderate bishops, or of philosophers given to Platonism, was the principle of religious tolerance, which made him respect the rights of individual conviction. And sometimes, also, we see him led back to this his original principle by his own sad experience of the evils resulting from mixing up politics with religion. Next to this, was the *theocratic* theory, which naturally found its way into his mind from the previous development of the church. The third principle was the religioso-political, by which he was led to suppose, or to pretend, that, as head over the state, he was authorized to exert an influence on the affairs of the church.

P. 135. *Occasion for the interposition of a foreign power.*] As all the elements which had a disturbing influence on the progressive development of Christianity, grew out of those principles of the old world, which, overthrown by the gospel, had again asserted their validity and contributed to modify the shaping of Christianity itself, so we see the same thing repeated in the present case; — on one side, in the Roman church, the Jewish principle of an outward theocracy; on the other, in the Greek church, the Pagan principle of a state-religion, or the political element, subordinating every other development to its own.

P. 139. *No further appeal could be made from it.*] This was nothing foreign from the constitution of the Roman law. The bishops only had conceded to them the power which was allowed to arbitrators, (arbitris,) chosen *a compromisso* by the two contending parties.

P. 143. *Addition to note* 1.] The collectors of the taxes in Cappadocia had been in the habit of exacting from the peasants an oath; thus exposing them to the temptation of committing perjury. Basil of Cæsarea, who had often protested in their assemblies against this abuse, finally wrote to the governor of the province, as follows: "We have one way left, which is by this letter, to adjure you before God and men to forbear exposing the souls of men to death, and to devise some other method of collecting the

[1] De incarnatione verbi, § 51, 52.

taxes, but leave to men their souls unharmed. For the exacting of oaths is of no use or advantage towards collecting the taxes, and it is certainly harmful to the souls of men. Let them but once learn to regard taking a false oath as a trifle, and they will no longer be compelled honestly to pay their taxes, but will suppose that in the oath they have found a convenient means of deception and of evading their obligations." [1]

P. 146. *Receive him back without inflicting any further punishment.*] The civil power acknowledged this influence of the church, in promoting the interests of humanity, and strove to uphold it. By a law enacted in the year 409, it was made the duty of judges to inquire every Sunday of the prisoners, whether they had been kindly treated, and it was assumed, as a matter of course, that it belonged to the vocation of the bishops to admonish the judges to the humane treatment of prisoners.[2] A law of the emperor Justinian, passed in the year 529, made it incumbent on the bishops to visit the prisons on Wednesdays and Fridays, (on these particular days doubtless in memory of Christ's passion,) to inquire carefully into the crimes for which each prisoner was confined, and about the treatment which he received, and to report whatever they observed contrary to good order to the superior magistrates. They were also to see to it, that no person was confined elsewhere than in the public prisons.[3]

P. 177. *Opposition to new forms of error.*] Vincentius, a monk, belonging to the cloister of Lerina, an island in Provence, reduced these ideas, dispersed through the writings of Augustin, to systematic form, in a book which constitutes an epoch in the history of the notions respecting tradition. He published this work in 434, some years after Augustin's death, under the title of Commonitorium, or Tractatus peregrini adversum hæreticos. We find here, how, in forming his conception of tradition, he had struck on the conservative element — that of progressive evolution, without which the preservation of the original truth is impossible in the impure current of time. The true element in Montanism, but wrongly applied by it, inasmuch as it considered the progressive evolution as one to be effected by means of new revelations introduced from without, had passed over into the church, and had been transferred to the evolution grounded in the very essence of Christianity, and proceeding out of itself. Respecting this, Vincentius pertinently remarks: "Beyond doubt, we ought to hold to a progressive evolution of Christian truth; for everything in the world advances from one stage to another as it grows older.[4] But this progressive evolution presupposes the existence of an abiding principle in the peculiar nature of the thing itself. The contrary to this would not be a growth, but a change to something else. The original doctrines of heavenly wisdom must, with the progress of time, needs become more exactly defined; but they should not be altered or curtailed. They must be unfolded in greater clearness and distinctness, but they should lose nothing of their pure and complete individual nature.[5] The antagonism of new errors has brought out this more precise determination and clearer exposition of the truth. By means of this antagonism, what had before been a matter of tacit tradition, came to be fully expressed in the letter.

[1] See epist. 85.

[2] Nec deerit antistitum Christianæ religionis cura laudabilis, quæ ad observationem constituti judicis hanc ingerat monitionem. Cod. Theodos. l. IX. Tit. III. l. 7.

[3] Cod. Justinian. l. I. Tit. IV. l. 22 et 23.

[4] Nullusne ergo in ecclesia Christi profectus habebitur religionis? Habeatur plane et maximus. Nam quis ille est tam invidus hominibus, tam exosus Deo, qui istud prohibere conetur? C. 28.

[5] Accipiant licet evidentiam, lucem, distinctionem, sed retineant necesse est plenitudinem, integritatem, proprietatem. C. 30.

But instead of the Montanistic way of rendering the thing outward, is substituted another. According to the view here taken, the progressive evolution is necessarily confined to a determinate organ. It expresses itself through the general councils; and to the progress thus expressed, all individuals must submit their judgment. Thus the exposition of the sacred writings, acknowledged to be the only and perfect source of the knowledge of the truths of faith, and the deduction of the doctrines of faith from them, were made to depend on a church authority of this kind. This authority alone is the sure guide to what is right, amid the different shades and oppositions of human opinion.[1] The absence of an art of interpretation, founded on scientific principles, which might be a safe-guard against arbitrary conjectures, was to be supplied by the constraining authority of an outward rule. And instead of trusting in the intrinsic power of the truth and the free working of the Holy Spirit in the church, men were to rely on an outward church guidance of this sort, which was calculated to check and cramp the free, individual development. This human government of the church, it was maintained, is the necessary means by which the ever-abiding influence of Christ is secured.

P. 269. *Jovinian, the protestant of his time, &c.*] Out of the depths of the Christian consciousness, silently unfolding itself in monasticism, proceeded forth here — a foretoken of what long afterwards took place by means of Luther — the reaction against the ordinary monkish morality, and the doctrinal errors connected therewith.

While it was customary, in Christian morals, to make the distinction of a higher and a lower position, the latter consisting in an observance of the "precepts," the former in a fulfilment of the "evangelical counsels," Jovinian opposed to this distinction the unity of the divine life grounded in faith on the Redeemer and flowing out of the new birth. This he considered to be the highest and principal thing — and he knew of but one antithesis, that between redemption and perseverance in the estrangement from God; between a life devoted to this present world, and a life rooted in the fellowship with God: compared with this, all other differences, in his estimation, sunk into insignificance.

P. 270. *Hence he continued to live as a monk, &c.*] Take whatever course he might, however, he could not escape the hateful charge of being actually guilty of all such consequences as his opponents chose to derive from his doctrines. If, in accordance with his principles, he led a life of more freedom, though he continued to be a monk; if he made no outward show of monkish asceticism in his dress, this was construed as an abandoning of the holiness of monachism for the elegance of common life, and he was accused of luxury.[2] And Jerome bids him either to marry, and so testify by that fact, that he placed the married life on a parity with the life of celibacy; or else cease to contend in words against those with whom in practice he agreed.[3] It would seem that, on account of the false reports which, owing to the misconstruction put upon his conduct, had got abroad concerning him, he was led to publish a tract in

[1] See c. 2: Multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris amfractus, ut propheticæ et apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensus normam dirigatur.

[2] Iste formosus monachus, crassus, nitidus, dealbatus, et quasi sponsus semper incedens. Hieron. c. Jov. Lib. I. § 40.

[3] Aut uxorem ducat, ut æqualem virginitatem nuptiis probet, aut si non duxerit, frustra contra nos verbis agit, cum opere nobiscum sit. L. c.

explanation of his principles.[1] Indeed, he had been urged to do this by others.[2]

P. 271. *He attended the marriage feast at Cana.*] And — he added, in opposition to the tortuous expositions of holy writ, in which men allowed themselves to indulge so as to bring them into harmony with their own opinions — it is quite another thing, if, in the foolish spirit of dispute, you affirm, that he attended a feast for the purpose of fasting, and that, after the manner of false teachers, he said: "This I eat; that I do not eat. I will not drink of the wine which I have made out of water."[3]

P. 273. *Had not as yet been really renewed.*] He held the baptism of such persons to be no better than a hypocritical one. Hence he could not assent to the distinction, so commonly made in those times, between sins committed before, and sins committed after baptism; for a baptism after which men might again fall into sin, was to him the same as no baptism at all. If persons who had thus fallen, afterwards came to true repentance and faith, he supposed that they then received, for the first time, the baptism of the spirit, of which before they had received only the outward sign. Hence, he would not admit that there was any difference between those who remained faithful to their baptismal vows from the first, and those who, after having received the outward baptism, had fallen into sin, and had then first, by means of true repentance, been really converted. Accordingly, addressing himself to such, he says: "Though you have fallen, repentance will restore you; and you who were hypocrites in your baptism, will with your repentance obtain genuine faith."[4] Now, if we consider that Jovinian did not admit that there were different degrees of sin, we are obliged to conclude from these remarks, that in his opinion the regenerate were incapable of falling into any actual sin whatever.

P. 294. *The prevailing spirit of the times.*] We see that pictures or images of Christ, of the Apostles, of martyrs, and other saints were then widely diffused; and that people were in the habit of prostrating themselves before them: but that instead of representing Christ on the cross, against which a certain feeling of propriety revolted, they adhered to the ancient custom, and employed the sign of the cross as a memorial of Christ's passion.

P. 337. *Was the thought which Jerome here makes so prominent, actually present to the consciousness of the people?*] He evidently has respect only to the Christian truth lying at the ground of the veneration paid to the saints; but not to the popular notions in which this truth became continually more and more obscured. And yet, in opposition to Vigilantius, he brings forward the example of the emperor and the enthusiastic devotion of the multitude.[5]

[1] From which Jerome often cites passages in his work against Jovinian; and this is the source from which we derive our account of Jovinian's doctrines.

[2] This we take from his own words as quoted by Jerome, lib. I. § 2: Satisfacio invitatis (it should read invitatus) non ut claro curram nomine, sed a rumore purgatus vivam vano.

[3] Porro aliud est, si stulta contentione dicitis, eum isse ad prandium jejunaturum, et impostorum more dixisse: hoc comedo, illud non comedo, nolo vinum bibere, quod ex aquis creavi. Lib. II. § 5.

[4] Quod etsi ceciderit, redintegrabit vos pœnitentia, et qui in baptismate fuistis hypocritæ, eritis in pœnitentia solidæ fidei. Lib. II. § 37.

[5] As characteristic of the times, take the following passage: Sacrilegus fuit Constantius imperator, qui sanctas reliquias Andreæ, Lucæ, et Timothei transtulit Constantinopolim, apud quas dæmones rugiunt et inhabitatores Vigilantii illorum se sentire præsentiam confitentur? Sacrilegus dicendus est nunc Augustus Arcadius, qui ossa beati Samuelis longo post tempore de Judæa transtulit in Thraciam? Omnes

P. 339. *Miracles ought, among Christians, no longer to be admitted.*] In comparing together these two men, who were in many respects so opposed to each other, Vigilantius and Jerome, we perceive, in the one, an indulgent recognition of the Christian spirit ever lying at the ground of the erroneous expression of Christian feelings; but this, without a right earnest zeal for the preservation of Christian truth in its purity: — while in the other, we do indeed discern this earnest zeal, but look in vain for that mild indulgence of the religious feelings, even in their aberrations, which should never be separated from the zeal for reformation.

P. 344. *Introduction.*] It might seem that the case would be quite different with the course of the development of Christian doctrines, from what we found it to be with regard to the matters treated of in the other sections of this period of our history. It might seem that revolution brought about by the conversion of the Roman emperors to Christianity would not have the same importance in its bearing on doctrines as on the other branches of Christian development. In looking back on the conflict which had been gone through with Gnosticism; on the position occupied by the school of the great Origen; on the antagonisms and conciliations introduced by means of this school; we cannot fail to perceive that, independent of all external agencies, a new stadium of development must now necessarily commence. When Christianity had once asserted and distinctly expressed its own peculiar nature in the conflict with Judaism, Hellenism, and Orientalism, this opposition to that which was extraneous to itself would naturally relax; and the more inward antagonisms between different doctrinal tendencies, which had in the meantime been forming, would now make their appearance, in order, by their mutual adjustment and conciliation with each other, to prepare the way for a higher unity. Next after the stage of development, the distinctive character of which we may designate as the predominantly *apologetic* stage, would follow a new one, which we may call the *systematizing period.* The school of Origen forms the transition from the apologetic to the systematizing tendency; as, in fact, Origen constitutes, on the one hand, the highest point of the apologetic tendency, and on the other, the starting point of the new systematizing development. The termination of the first and the commencement of the second stage of development meet together in him. A great and important turning-point had, then, in the natural course of things, here occurred.

P. 348. *Augustin, who bore the most distinguished part in the controversy above mentioned.*] Augustin has himself described the common centre alluded to in the previous paragraph, in language which we may compare with that of Gregory Nazianzen. (Note p. 348.) "The whole essence of the Christian faith — says he — reposes in the opposition and contrariety between two men, of whom the one is he through whom we were brought into the bondage of sin, and the other He by whom we are redeemed from sin; as in truth the one ruined us in himself, in that he did his *own will*, the other redeemed us in himself, in that he fulfilled not his own will, but the will of Him who sent him. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."[1] And from this cen-

episcopi non solum sacrilegi, sed fatui judicandi, qui rem vilissimam et cineres dissolutos in serico et vase aureo portaverunt? Stulti omnium ecclesiarum populi, qui occurrerunt sanctis reliquiis, et tanta lætitia, quasi præsentem viventemque prophetam cernerent, susceperunt.

[1] In causa duorum hominum, quorum per unum venumdati sumus sub peccato, per alterum redimimur a peccatis; quorum

tral point of the Western system of faith may also have proceeded the reäction of the Christian consciousness in purifying the Christian church by means of the German reformation. So it was not the spirit of the Oriental, but that of the Western church, which alone could give birth to such an event.

P. 351, line 18th from the bottom. *Thus foisting into, or implying in, the Bible, what really was not there.*] But it is evident also, how, with the intention of thus showing the highest reverence for the sacred writings, by regarding everything they contain as alike divine, and everywhere looking in them for mysteries of divine revelation, men were driven, in applying these principles to particular cases, to sacrifice that true respect for the scriptures which is only to be preserved by inquiring honestly into their true meaning and contents; and we are here reminded of what we observed proceeding from the same cause in the period previous to this, viz. a tendency to convert the historical portions of scripture into myths.

P. 352. *As was the case, for instance, with Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Chrysostom.*] Thus Theodore of Mopsuestia distinguishes the principle of actuation by the Holy Spirit, which is always one and the same, from the diversity of its forms of manifestation, which is conditioned on the different ends to be attained. "It was — says he — one and the same Spirit who communicated his grace to those that were accounted worthy of receiving such influences; but the effects were manifold, according to the necessities of each particular case" — in proof of which he cites 2 Corinth. 4: 13.[1] The retirement of all consciousness of self and of the outward world — the ecstatic state — he explains as owing to the necessary abstraction of the mind from present and temporal things in order to be prepared for receiving the revelation of divine realites.[2] "For — says he — if we cannot fitly receive the instructions of our teachers, unless our minds are wholly withdrawn from all other subjects, and are intent on that which is taught, then how could those men receive such exalted revelations without calling away their thoughts from present things at the time of those revelations?"[3] He attributes it to the essential character of an extasy of this sort, that the subject-matter of the divine revelation should be presented in the form of a voice heard, or of a vision to the mental perception of him who received the revelation.[4]

That erroneous view of the Bible as a book absolutely divine — a mere codex of divine revelation — made many unwilling to receive the epistle to Philemon into the canon of the New Testament, because everything in this was only human — no trace of divine revelation seemed to be found in this

ille nos in se perdidit, faciendo voluntatem suam, non ejus a quo factus est; iste nos in se salvos fecit, non faciendo voluntatem suam, sed ejus, a quo missus est; in horum ergo duorum hominum causa proprie fides Christiana consistit. Unus est enim Deus, et unus mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus. De peccato originali, § 28.

[1] Πολύτροποι δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν χρείαν ἐνεγίνοντο αὐτοῖς αἱ ἐνέργειαι, καθ' ἃς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐδέχοντο τῶν ἀναγκαίων. Commentar. in Naum. c. 1, in Wegnern Theodori quæ supersunt omnia, vol. I. Berolin. 1834, p. 397.

[2] Ἐκστάσει ἅπαντες ὡς εἰκὸς τῶν ἀπορρητοτέρων ἐδέχοντο τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐπείπερ ἐχρῆν αὐτοὺς ταῖς ἐννοίαις πόρρω που τῆς παρούσης καταστάσεως γεγονότας, οὕτω δυνηθῆναι τῇ τῶν δεικνυμένων θεωρίᾳ προσανέχειν μόνῃ. L. c. p. 397.

[3] Μὴ τῷ λογισμῷ πρότερον κατὰ τὸν τῆς θεωρίας καίρον ἐξισταμένοις τῶν παρόντων;

[4] The διδασκαλία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὥστε δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ τινὸς λαλοῦντος ἀκούειν· ἔστι δὲ ὅτι καὶ τινα ὀπτασίαν ὁρῶντες μετ' ἐκείνης ἤκουον τῶν λεγομένων. Thus he explains the vision of Peter in the Acts, the vision of John the Baptist at the baptism of Christ. See the fragment in the Catena to John published by the Jesuit Corderius.

epistle.[1] Many falsely applied the correct distinction between the divine and the human elements in the inspiration of the Apostles by the Holy Spirit, making along with this correct distinction a wrong separation, and failing to trace the organic relation between the two. The Apostles — said they — did not speak always and all things so, as that Christ spake in them; for human weakness could not have endured the continuous indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Everything connected with the gratifying of earthly wants, as eating and drinking, was certainly excluded. The remark of St. Paul, Gal. 2 : 20, that it was not he that lived, but Christ lived in him, did not admit of being applied to everything. So, too, the prophets, after having uttered their predictions, returned again to the ordinary state of consciousness and were like other men. Christ excepted, the Holy Spirit abode with no one at all times.[2] Jerome, in opposition to such, refers to the inseparable connection of the divine and human elements in Christianity; and with still greater clearness, Chrysostom unfolds the same argument: "If one lives — says he — in a spiritual manner, the mode of his appearance, his demeanor and walk, his mode of speech, and, in a word, everything about him, will profit those who contemplate it."[3]

The Antiochian school was also led, by its peculiar exegetical bent, to another mode of apprehending the relation of the Old to the New Testament. While by the allegorizing method of interpretation it was easy to introduce the whole doctrine of the New Testament into the Old, the Antiochians were impelled by their peculiar bent and their hermeneutical principles, to inquire, what the Old Testament writers, under those determinate historical conditions and from their own peculiar points of view, consciously meant to say. But at the same time they recognized also the higher spirit, which pervades the entire Old Testament, — the ideas which pointed beyond the Old Testament and into the New. Hence they distinguished the ideal from the real historically conditioned element in the Old Testament scriptures; the idea lying at the ground of the consciousness of the writers enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and filling their minds, which had found its realization in Christ, and which after its realization had first been unfolded to a clearer consciousness, from the peculiar form presented by the circumstances of the times, in which they had apprehended this idea. They separated and held apart, what the prophets meant to say at their own peculiar historical point of view, and what the Spirit of God, which actuated them, aimed at through them. Thus they distinguished a conscious and an unconscious prophecy; and by means of their distinctions, equal justice could be done to faith and to knowledge, and the antagonism reconciled betwixt the philologico-historical, and the religious points of view. The object already aimed at, as we endeavored to show in the first volume, by many among the Gnostics, was expressed and unfolded by the Antiochians with a clearer scientific consciousness. Thus, for example, says Theodore of Mopsuestia: "Many of the wonderful things that happened, whether to the people at large or to those who were chosen for some particular end, the Holy Scriptures express, so far as it concerns them, hyper-

[1] The words in Chrysostom, Argumentum in ep. ad Philemon. T. XI. f. 772: Περιττὸν εἶναι τὸ καὶ ταύτην προσκεῖσθαι τὴν ἐπιστολήν, εἴγε ὑπὲρ πράγματος μικροῦ ἠξίωσεν, ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς ἀνδρός.

[2] Non semper apostolum, nec omnia Christo in se loquenti dixisse, quia nec humana imbecillitas unum tenorem sancti spiritus ferre potuisset. Excepto Domino nostro Jesu Christo, in nullo sanctum spiritum permansisse. Hier. præf. ad Philemon. ed. Vallarsi, p. 741, 742.

[3] Ὅταν τις πνευματικῶς ζῇ, καὶ σχήματα καὶ βαδίσματα καὶ ῥήματα καὶ πραγματα τοῦ τοιούτου καὶ παντα ἁπλῶς τοὺς ἀκούοντας ὠφελεῖ. L. c. f. 773.

bolically; and, to a casual glance, the letter seems here to possess no truth. But such things are found to be true, when they are applied to the Lord Jesus Christ himself; who, as he in all respects made an end to the shadow of the law, and substituted in its place the truth which answers to it, so therefore exhibits to view the truth of such expressions." [1] The promise given to Abraham, that in him and his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, referred in its literal meaning to his bodily posterity; but in reality and truth to Christ, through whom the nations were blessed in the true sense. [2] In like manner he explains the promises given to David respecting the kingdom which was to proceed from his house, in a twofold manner. [3] Hence Theodore, in explaining the citations from the Old Testament into the New, could distinguish the sense of the passages in the original connection of the Old Testament, and the application made of them by the Apostles. [4] Looking separately at the different stages in the evolution of revealed religion, he affirmed that, in the Old Testament only, the unity of God, but not the trinity was as yet revealed. [5] He thought this would be sufficiently apparent, even from the fact that the Apostles, after having lived for so long a time in familiar intercourse with Christ, were still ignorant of the higher sense in which he was the Son of God, but had denominated him the Son of God only in the sense in which men had been previously wont to understand the phrase, as indicating that he had been privileged with enjoying a peculiar union with God. [6]

P. 355. *At length he was fully convinced that Manicheism was a delusion.*] Yet he was already sufficiently master of the system to adjust everything according to the principles of the Manichean dualism. He composed a work on taste considered from this point of view, his tract De apto et pulchro, dedicated to Hierius, a Roman rhetorician, in which he places the opposition between good and evil beside that of the beautiful and the deformed; and endeavored to trace everywhere, in the spiritual and moral, as in the natural world, the same dualism betwixt the monad and the dyad.

P. 358. *That divine things must be incorporated with the life and affections, before we can be capable of an intellectual knowledge of them.*] That the understanding and knowledge of divine things presupposed, and flowed from, self-surrendering love, — as he says — "We must first love with a perfect affection him whom we would know." "By the life — says he — we make ourselves worthy of knowing what we believe." It seemed clear to him, that religious knowledge must proceed from the heart, that it was only through the entire surrendering of the soul, that truth, satisfying to the mind, could be found. "The love — says he — instilled by the Holy

[1] Λέγει μὲν ὑπερβολικώτερον ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐκείνων ἡ γραφὴ, τῆς λέξεως κατὰ τὸ πρόχειρον τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἐχούσης, εὑρίσκεται δὲ ἀληθῆ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὅταν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κρίνηται τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐν ἅπασι παύσας μὲν τοῦ νόμου τὴν σκίαν, ἐπεισαγαγὼν δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν οἰκείαν, εἰκότως καὶ τῶν φωνῶν τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιδείκνυσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. See the commentary on the Minor prophets, ed. Wegnern, p. 612.

[2] We may compare also what Theodore says in his Comment. on Joel I. p. 156, etc.

[3] See the Comment. on Micah, L. c. p. 354.

[4] E. g. Rom. 3: 12 in the above mentioned Comment. p. 501, and in many other places.

[5] See the above mentioned Comment. on the Minor prophets.

[6] Καὶ τοῦτον γε ἀπόδειξις αὐτάρκης ἐκ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων γένοιτο ἂν, οἳ, ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ παρουσίας, ἐπὶ μακρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ συγγεγονότες αὐτῷ, Χριστον μὲν ὡμολόγουν, ἐγνωκότες διὰ πολλῆς διδάσκαλίας, υἱὸν δὲ καθ' ὃν ἔφην λόγον, θεοῦ οὐκ ἠπίσταντο, πλὴν ὅσον κατὰ οἰκείωσιν ἔλεγον θεοῦ υἱὸν τὸν Χριστὸν κατὰ τὸ τῶν πρόσθεν ἔθος ἁγίων τὲ καὶ δικαίων. In the above mentioned Comment. on the Minor prophets, p. 639.

Spirit, leads to the Son, that is, to the wisdom of God by which the Father himself becomes known; for wisdom and truth can in no wise be found, unless when sought after by all the powers of the soul. But when they are sought after in a manner worthy of them, they cannot withdraw and conceal themselves from those that love them. By love is the longing; by love, the seeking; by love, the knocking; by love, the revealing; and finally, by love, the persevering in that which is revealed."[1]

P. 380. *The arch-deacon Athanasius.*] Athanasius had been destined and educated from his boyhood for the church; for the bishop Alexander had long before had his eye turned upon him. The occasion was this. On a festival in commemoration of the bishop Peter of Alexandria, who was martyred in the year 311, Alexander observed a troop of boys at their sports, imitating the rites of the church, in which Athanasius played the part of bishop, and performed all the ceremonies customary at the baptism of catechumens.[2] This appeared to the bishop a foretoken of what the boy was destined one day to become. He was educated with reference to the spiritual order, and became early distinguished for his Christian zeal, his intellectual gifts, and progress in knowledge. When a young man, he wrote the apologetical discourse which has already been mentioned. The zeal and acuteness with which he defended the doctrine of the unity of essence at the council of Nice, was the occasion of his being chosen, after the death of Alexander, the latter's successor in the bishopric, although he had not yet arrived at the canonical age. But the opposition to his choice, occasioned by his youth, nourished the germ of a future schism,[3] which was the more disastrous on account of the opposition of views previously existing in this church.

P. 394, bottom. *Were to be made Sons of God.*] Like Sabellius, Marcellus distinguished the divine essence in itself, the unity in repose, from the different modes in which God revealed himself in creation and in the redemption; — the latter being designated by the names Logos and Holy Spirit. The procession of the Logos from God, by virtue of that *δραστικὴ ἐνέργεια*, appears to him the intermediate agency in producing the entire creation. Moreover, he spoke of an evolution of the monad to a triad, like Sabellius; and also made it the final end and issue of the redemption, that all things should return back to the unity from which they had proceeded.[4] We shall still further unfold his views of this which he contemplated as the final consummation, in connection with what we have to say respecting his doctrine of the person of Christ. Moreover, the phrase "three hypostases or persons" seemed to Marcellus to interfere with the correct apprehension of the divine unity, and to mark too strongly the notion of separation.[5]

[1] Si sapientia et veritas non totis animi viribus concupiscatur, inveniri nullo pacto potest. At si ita quæratur, ut dignum est, subtrahere sese atque abscondere a suis dilectoribus non potest. After quoting Matth. 7: 7; 10: 26; Amore petitur, amore quæritur, amore pulsatur, amore revelatur, amore denique in eo, quod revelatum fuerit, permanetur. L. c. § 31.

[2] We find no good reason for questioning the truth of the much disputed story coming from the members of Athanasius' family. Rufinus, from whom the account proceeds, says: Sicuti ab his, qui cum ipso vitam duxerant, accepimus. Hist. eccles. lib. I. c. 14.

[3] The words of Pachomius in his letter to the bishop Ammon are: *Ἅμα τῷ καταστῆναι Ἀθανάσιον ἐπίσκοπον, οὐκ ἀγαθοὶ ἀνδρες αἰτιῶνται τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ γενόμενον, προβαλλόμενοι τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτοῦ τὸ νέων καὶ σχίσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ σπουδάζοντες.* See acta Sanctorum mens. Mai. T. III. the Appendix to the 14 Mai. f. 65.

[4] *Ἡ μονὰς ἀδιαίρετος οὐσα εἰς τριάδα πλατύνεται.* Eccles. theol. l. III. c. 4, f. 168.

[5] No *δυὸ διαιρούμενα πρόσωπα.* Of Asterius, he says: *Οὐκ ὀρθῶς οὐδὲ προσηκόντως εἴρηκε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις.* L. c.

P. 400. *More decidedly pronounced in the character of Eunomius.*]— This strongly decided bent made him also an opponent of many elements entering into the religious spirit of those times, which Arius had received; — as for example, the veneration paid to martyrs and to relics.[1] While Arius, as we have remarked, had won veneration as an ascetic; Eunomius, on the contrary, was opposed to the prevailing ascetic tendency. What to others was a matter of special veneration in Basil of Cæsarea, the marks left by his austerities on his bodily appearance, was spoken of by him oftentimes with rude expressions of contempt. He describes him as the man who had grown haggard and pale by his much fasting, and traces to this cause the asperity of his polemical writings.[2] He seems to have described the ascetic discipline as a course directed to no worthy object, and to have praised anxiety for correctness of doctrine as a thing of vastly more importance.[3]

P. 403. *The old creed respecting the Logos.*] While Arius taught that God had granted to the Son the highest place in the creation, because by his foreknowledge he saw that the Son, after his incarnation, would, through the obedience to God which he showed in his conflicts, render himself worthy of this place; Eunomius controverted this view, deriving everything else from that nature of the Logos himself, which had been bestowed on him by the will of the Father. "It was not by virtue of his obedience — said he — that he became the Son of God; but because he was begotten, as the Son and only begotten of the Father, he was obedient to the Father in his words and works."[4]

Strictly connected with his whole mode of apprehending Christianity stands that doctrine of his, which led him to fix an infinite chasm never to be filled up, betwixt the supreme original Being and the remaining creation, and to affirm that God could not communicate his essence to any creature.[5]

As Eunomius, the precursor of Socinus, suppressing, in his mechanical supernaturalism of the understanding, the idea of a communication of the divine life, must needs give the more prominence to the idea of a communication of knowledge by means of an express revelation, the notion of a revelation through the senses, it is proper here to notice the theory broached by him of the supernatural origin of language; viz. that God taught the first man to speak by outward lessons, gave him the names of things.[6]

[1] Hieronymus adv. Vigilantium, § 9: Rides de reliquiis martyrum, et cum auctore hujus hæreseos Eunomio ecclesiis Christi calumniam struis.

[2] He calls him: *Φακοτρίβωνα στρατιώτην* (in allusion to his meagre diet) *καὶ ἄγιον ἐξάγιστον· ὑπὸ νηστείας δὲ ὠχρεῶντα καὶ ὑπὸ πικρίας φονῶντα.* Vid. Gregor. Nyssen. c. Eunom. lib. I. T. II. f. 291.

[3] Though no absolute reliance can be placed on the words of Gregory of Nyssa, yet there is doubtless some truth at bottom, when, comparing Eunomius with that promoter of ascetic austerities, Basil, he says of him: *Κελεύοντος μὴ παρέχειν πράγματα τῇ φύσει πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν διὰ τῶν τοῦ σώματος ὀρέξεων προϊούσῃ μηδὲ ἀντιβαίνειν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, μηδὲ ακριβολογεῖσθαι περὶ τὴν τοιαύτην τοῦ βίου σπουδήν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶναι τινα βλάβην ψυχῆς διὰ τῶν τοιούτων συνισταμένην, ἀλλὰ μόνην ἀρκεῖν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν αἱρητικὴν πίστιν πρὸς τελειότητα.* L. c. f. 306.

[4] *Μόνος ὁ υἱὸς τῇ τοῦ πατρος ἐνεργείᾳ συστὰς ἀκοινώνητον.*

[5] Concerning God: *Οὐ κοινωνὸν ἔχων τῆς θεότητος, οὐ μερίστην τῆς δόξης, οὐ σύγκληρον τῆς ἐξουσίας, οὐ σύνθρονον τῆς βασιλείας.* Gregor. Nyss. orat. II. f. 440, and Eunomius' confession of faith published by Basil in the remarks on Socrates, l. V. c. 10, f. 61, ed. Mogunt.

[6] In opposition to Basil, whom he accuses of *τῇ ἔξωθεν φιλοσοφίᾳ κατακολουθεῖν, καὶ περικόπτειν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κηδεμονίαν, μὴ ὁμολογοῦντα παρ' ἐκείνου τὰς ὀνομασίας τελεῖσθαι τοῖς πράγμασι.* Orat. XII. f. 768. *Ἐπειδήπερ οὐκ ἀπαναίνεται τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ θεράποντας ὁ θεὸς ὁμιλίαν, ἀκόλουθόν ἐστιν*

P. 414. *By Basil's freedom of spirit and moderation.*] A source of great mischief, especially to the Oriental church, were the internal divisions that had grown out of the attempts to promote union by force under the reign of the emperor Constantine, the influence of which still continued to be felt. It was easier to create confusion, than to restore things back again to their natural order. By misunderstandings, by personal disputes about individuals to whom one or the other party were attached, schisms were engendered which could not be so easily healed. It was a crisis, through which the Oriental church was destined to pass from its hitherto distracted state, from balancing between Arianism, Semi-Arianism, and the recognition of the trinitarian unity of essence, to union in the latter. Now here there was special need of forbearance and wisdom, so as not to repel those who were on the point of transition, and to meet the advances of all those who gradually inclined to adopt the Homoousion. Basil, under these circumstances, was distinguished no less for his constancy and firmness in the contest with what was outward and foreign, than for his zealous and prudent activity in striving to restore the peace of the church. He said many things on this occasion, worthy of being remembered at all times in similar crises. "This age — he writes — has much that tends to the ruin of the church. Nowhere do we find edification of the church, reformation of the fallen, sympathy with the weak, protection for the sound and healthy among the brethren. Nor, again, is there any remedy for the malady which before prevailed, or means of prevention against the threatening evils of the future. And, moreover, the state of the church, generally, resembles an old garment, which may be easily rent by the slightest cause, and can never again be the same firm whole as it was.[1] At such a time it requires zeal and great caution to be the author of any real good to the churches. But the good consists in this, to reunite what has thus far been rent asunder. But this union might be effected, if we were willing to accommodate ourselves to the weak in matters where we can do no harm to men's souls."[2] Basil did everything in his power to bring nearer together the Oriental and Western churches, which had been separated by their different action in the case of the schism between Meletius and Paulinus in Antioch — the Antiochian Old and New city — and to gain the help of the Western church in behalf of the Eastern. "By your help — he wrote to the Christians of the West — the true faith must be restored back to the East. It is now time for you to show the East the thanks you owe her for the blessings you have received, from her."[3] His good intentions would have been better realized, if he had been able to overcome the pride and obstinacy of such Roman bishops as Damasus.[4]

P. 424. *The Christian idea of creation was preserved against all con-*

οἴεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὰς προσφυεῖς τῷ πράγματι τεθεῖσθαι προσηγορίας. L. c. f. 817.

[1] *Ὅλως ἔοικε λοιπὸν ἡ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατάστασις ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ, ὑπὸ τῆς τυχούσης προφάσεως ῥᾳδίως καταῤῥηγνυμένῳ, ὃ πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἰσχὺν ἐπανελθεῖν πάλιν ἀδυνατεῖ.*

[2] *Ἕνωσις δ' ἂν γένοιτο, εἰ βουληθείημεν, ἐν οἷς μηδὲν βλάπτομεν τὰς ψυχάς, συμπερενεχθῆναι τοῖς ἀσθενεστέροις.*

[3] *Ὧν ἐλαβέτε παρ' αὐτῆς ἀγαθῶν, τούτων ἐν καιρῷ παρασχέσθαι αὐτῇ τὴν ἀντίδωσιν.* Ep. 91 ad Valerian.

[4] He himself says, in reference to the qualifications requisite for him who would undertake an embassy to Rome, where he is speaking of a simple man, whom he describes as poorly fitted for a business of this sort: *Εὐγνώμονι μὲν ἀνδρὶ αἰδέσιμον αὐτὸ καὶ πολλοῦ ἀξίαν τὴν συντυχίαν, ὑψηλῷ δὲ καὶ μετεώρῳ, ἄνω που καθημένῳ, καὶ ὀὰ τοῦτο ἀκούειν τῶν χαμόθεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀλήθειαν φθεγγομένων μὴ δυναμένῳ, τί ἂν γένοιτο ὄφελος τοῖς κοινοῖς παρὰ τῆς τοῦ τοιούτου ἀνδρὸς ὁμιλίας, ὃς ἀλλότριον ἔχει θωπείας ἀνελευθέραν τὸ ἦθος;* Ep. 215.

fusion with the emanation-theory.] The Arians wished to show their opponents, that the same argument which they employed to prove the eternal generation of the Son, might serve also to prove a creation without beginning. Athanasius said: "We may not conceive of the paternity of God as a thing contingent to Him; since, in that case, we must needs represent him as subject to change. As certainly as it behooved him to be Father, so certainly we can never conceive of him as being other than such." [1] To this the Arians replied that, "on the same grounds, neither could we ascribe a beginning to the creation of God." But Athanasius could not feel the force of this objection. He insisted here upon the distinction between what is produced outwardly by the will of God, and that which is grounded in His essence. The conception of the former implies a beginning, that of the latter excludes all beginning. [2] But the question why God, when the power to create was ever with him, yet did not always create, Athanasius repelled as a question of insane curiosity. And yet he supposed a reason might be alleged why it could not be otherwise. To the being of the creature, produced as it is from nothing, eternal existence is a contradiction.[3] But he did not consider, that the notion of a being without temporal beginning and that of an eternal being are by no means identical, — that the idea of a *becoming*, having its ground in the dependence on a highest cause, may be conceived to be without a beginning in time, difficult as it unquestionably is for the consciousness, cramped and confined by the limitations of time, to fix and hold fast such a conception.

The penetration of Augustin doubtless enabled him to discern the difference between a creaturely becoming without temporal beginning, and an eternal, unconditioned, divine being. To him it was clear, that it is possible to suppose a spiritual world having no temporal beginning, and which always existed, without at the same time putting it on the same level with the only eternal one, or impinging on the doctrine of God as the almighty creator; because *becoming, without a beginning*, is not the same with *eternal being*.[4] Augustin, in his unbiassed reflections, became conscious of the difficulties arising from the dependence of the intellect on the forms of temporal intuition, [5] and preferred rather to confess his ignorance, than to assert anything arbitrarily.[6] "I return back — says he — to that which our Creator has been pleased to let us know; and confess that that transcends my own faculties, which He has either permitted to be known in this life by wiser men, or which He has reserved to be known first by the perfect in the life to come." [7] By this modest suspense he would furnish an

[1] Διὰ τοῦτο ἀεὶ πατὴρ, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιγέγονε τῷ θεῷ τὸ πατὴρ, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τρεπτὸς εἶναι νομισθῇ· εἰ γὰρ κάλον τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα, οὐκ ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν πατὴρ, οὐκ ἀεὶ ἄρα τὸ καλὸν ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ. Orat. I. c. c. Arian, § 28.

[2] Τὸ ποίημα ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποιοῦντός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἴδιον τῆς οὐσίας γέννημά ἐστι· διὸ καὶ τὸ μὲν ποίημα οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἀεὶ εἶναι, ὅτε γάρ βούλεται ὁ δημιουργὸς, ἐργάζεται. Τὸ δὲ γέννημα οὐ βουλήσει ὑπόκειται, ἀλλὰ τῆς οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἰδιότης. L. c. c. 29.

[3] Ἵνα δὲ κἂν ἀμυδρόν τινα λογισμὸν εὑρόντες μὴ σωπήσωμεν, ἀκουέτωσαν, ὅτι εἰ καὶ τῷ θεῷ δυνατὸν ἀεὶ ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠδύνατο τὰ γεννητὰ ἀΐδια εἶναι, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γὰρ ἐστι καὶ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται. Τὰ δὲ οὐκ ὄντα πρὶν γένηται, πῶς ἠδύνατο συννπάρχειν τῷ ἀεὶ ὄντι θεῷ;

[4] Et si semper fuerunt, (angeli,) creati sunt, nec si semper fuerunt, ideo creatori coæterni sunt. Ille enim semper fuit æternitate immutabili, isti autem facti sunt; sed ideo semper fuisse dicuntur, qui omni tempore fuerunt, sine quibus tempora nullo modo esse potuerunt. Tempus autem, quoniam mutabilitate transcurrit, æternitati immutabili non potest esse coæternum. De civitate Dei, l. XII. c. 15, § 2.

[5] Augustin, like Kant at a later period, recognized the same *antinomies* in respect of space and time. As infinita spatia temporis, so infinita spatia locorum. L. c. l. XI. c. 5.

[6] Vereor ne facilius judicer affirmare quod nescio, quam docere quod scio. L. c. l. XII. c. 15, § 3.

[7] Redeo igitur ad id quod Creator noster

example to his readers, that they might not suppose *all* questions could be answered. This self-restraint appeared to him to be the necessary condition of all true progress. "For — says he — if the child is nourished in proportion to his powers, as he grows he will become capable of receiving more; but if he receives more than he can bear, he will perish before he can grow up." [1] But Augustin, while he exhorted to humility of knowledge in such things, was opposed to that narrow bent of faith which disdainfully repelled the speculative need. "Behold — says he in his confessions — to him who asks — What did God do before he created heaven and earth? I answer not as one would who might wish to evade the force of such a question by a sarcasm — he was preparing the hell of those who too curiously pry into high mysteries. Rather would I simply answer, I do not know, in respect to what I do not know, than sneer at those who inquire into high things, or approve of a false answer."

As Augustin guarded against the error of conceiving God's work of creation as a temporal act, so, too, he was led by this means and by his view of the world, proceeding out of a deep religious consciousness, to a more profound way of conceiving the relation between the divine creation and the preservation and government of the world, and between the natural and the supernatural. It was he who first after Origen, developed still farther the notion of a miracle; and in his writings we may find the germ of all the profound remarks on this subject by the scholastic writers of the thirteenth century. Every thing in the course of the world's history is, according to Augustin, the realization of that which from eternity was determined in the divine ideas as a connected whole. In time, that is realized only in a gradual manner, which in the divine ideas subsists at once. In this view, no new thing can take place, which had not been prefigured in this ideal plan of the world. Furthermore, in the powers and laws which God originally laid in the creation, is included everything which God causes to proceed from these powers and laws in the whole course of nature, either with or without the agency of men, who serve as his instruments. "In one way — says Augustin — all things subsist in the Word of God, where they subsist, not as things created, but as eternal; — in another, in the elements of the world, where whatever is destined to *become*, was created at once potentially; — and in another, in things which are created — after the causes, which were created at once — not at once, but each in its own time." [2] He combatted the opinion which some entertained, that the world having once been created by God, everything else is produced by the world itself, as God has ordained and commanded, though God himself does nothing more. Against this theory he adduces the words in John, 5: 17, and adds: "Let us believe then, or if we are capable of it, know, that God continues to work, down to the present moment; so that if his agency should be removed from created things, all would perish." [3] Now if we contemplate the ideal plan of the world just described, we shall find every-

scire nos voluit; illa vero, quæ vel sapientioribus in hac vita scire permisit, vel omnino perfectis in alia vita scienda servavit, ultra vires meas esse confiteor.

[1] Si enim pro viribus suis alatur infans, fiet, ut crescendo plus capiat; si autem vires suæ capacitatis excedat, deficiet, antiquam crescat. L. c.

[2] Hæc aliter in verbo Dei, ubi ista non facta, sed æterna sunt; aliter in elementis mundi, ubi omnia simul facta futura sunt: aliter in rebus, quæ, secundum causas simul creatas, non jam simul, sed suo quæque tempora, creantur. De Genesi ad literam, l. VI. § 17.

[3] Sic ergo credamus, vel si possumus etiam intelligamus, usque nunc operari Deum, ut si conditis ab eo rebus operatio ejus subtrahatur, intercident. Confess. l. V. § 40.

thing connected together. What is called miraculous, and what takes place according to the ordinary course of nature, are grounded alike in this plan. All is alike the work of God, without whose continued creative agency nothing can subsist. Yet everything which God does, does not stand related after the same manner to the powers implanted in nature at the creation. It is here necessary to distinguish that which God causes to spring out of these powers themselves, and that which presupposes superadded divine influences and powers. This constitutes the difference between the natural and supernatural. But still the supernatural is not anything that contradicts the course of nature: for by virtue of God's all-embracing wisdom, of the harmonious connection of all that God does, the nature of everything which was to come to pass, even under new, superadded influences, had been foreordained. We will present what has here been unfolded in the words of Augustin himself. The elements of this corporeal world have their determinate powers and properties; that is, what each can do and cannot do, what can be produced or cannot be produced by means of each. From these original causes of things proceeds forth, in its own time, all that is produced. But it is in the power of the Creator to make out of all this, in a way transcending the ordinary course of nature, something other than what has its ground in those original causes which contain within them the seminal principles of all things. Yet nothing other than what is still included within those causes as possible, that is, possible to be produced from them by the divine Being.[1] For his almighty power is not an arbitrary attribute, but the almighty power of Wisdom; and out of each thing he brings, in its time, what he designed already at the creation to be able to bring out of it." [2] "God, the creator of all nature — says Augustin — does nothing contrary to nature; for that must be conformable to the nature of each thing, which He does, from whom the whole measure, number, and order of nature proceeds. We say, in no unbefitting manner, that God does something contrary to nature, when it is contrary to the course of nature known to us. This ordinary course of nature, which is known to us, is what we are wont also to call nature; and when God does anything that is contrary to this, we call it a miracle. But against that highest law of nature, which is as far exalted above the knowledge of the godless as it is of the weak, God no more acts than he acts against himself." [3]

Thus Augustin discerns the immediate agency of God in all nature, and looks upon miracles only as events suited to arouse the attention of those who pay no heed to the agency of God which lies hidden

[1] Super hunc autem motum cursumque rerum naturalem, potestas Creatoris habet apud se posse de his omnibus facere aliud, quam eorum quasi seminales rationes habent; non tamen id quod non in iis posuit, ut de his fieri vel ab ipso possit. De Genesi ad literam, l. IX. § 32.

[2] Neque enim potentia temeraria, sed sapientiæ virtute, omnipotens est, et hoc de unaquaque re in tempore suo facit, quod ante in ea fecit, ut possit. L. c. Hence he says, that the causales rationes quas Deus mundo indidit, sint ad utrumque modum habiles creatæ; sive ad istum quo usitatissime temporalia transcurrunt sive ad illum quo rara et mirabilia fiunt, sicut Deo facere placuerit, quod tempore congruat. L. c. l. VI. § 25.

[3] Deus, creator et conditor omnium naturarum, nihil contra naturam facit: id enim erit cuique rei naturale, quod ille fecerit, a quo est omnis modus, numerus, ordo naturæ. Sed contra naturam non incongrue dicimus aliquid Deus facere, quod facit contra id quod novimus in natura. Hanc etiam enim appellamus naturam, cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturæ; contra quem Deus cum aliquid facit, mirabilia nominantur. Contra illam vero summam naturæ legem, a notitia remotam sive impiorum sive adhuc infirmorum, tam Deus nullo modo facit, quam contra se ipsum non facit. Contra Faustum, l. XXVI. c. 3.

under the ordinary course of nature. "Who — says he — can contemplate the work of God by which this whole world is governed, and not be struck and overwhelmed with the wonderful? If he contemplates the power of life in a single seed-kernel, it is a great thing, calculated to fill the contemplator with amazement. But because men direct their attention to other things and give no heed to God's works, in which they should daily find occasion for praising God, He has, as it were, kept certain things of a more unusual character in reserve, for the purpose of awakening men from their sleep to the worship of Himself by "miraculous signs."

P. 426. *But here, according to his own theory* — .] It may be that Marcellus, whose theological interest was wholly absorbed in the doctrine of the Logos, did not turn his reflections on this point. At all events, if he had proceeded still further to unfold his own thoughts into clear consciousness, he must have been led to some such theory as the Sabellian.

It is important to take particular notice of this contrariety in the system of Marcellus. On the one hand, by transferring all the passages of the New Testament relating to Christ, which seemed to him not to be decided enough on the absoluteness of the Logos, to the person of Christ formed by the *ἐνέργεια δραστική* of the Logos, he must have been led to ascribe to this latter the highest place in the creation. This, in fact, harmonized well also with the view he took of the end and aim of redemption; viz. that this appropriation of human nature by the Logos was designed for the purpose of giving man the victory over Satan, who had deceived and overcome him; to glorify human nature by exalting it to a divine life, and to bestow on it the highest dignity.[1] But, on the other hand, his interest for the Logos-doctrine, which suppressed every other, forced him to convert Christ, as man, into a mere instrument or means, which of itself must disappear as soon as the end should be attained which he was to subserve; and accordingly he must have sunk the humanity of Christ to the nature of a mere accident, of which the Logos would in the end be wholly disencumbered.

If later theologians fell into labored and tortuous explanations of the epistle to the Colossians, because they were unwilling to find there the doctrine of Christ's divinity, Marcellus was driven to similar tortuous interpretations by an interest of the opposite kind; namely, that he might not be required to suppose anything whereby the absoluteness of the Logos might seem to him capable of being impaired. Because he believed that by the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, it was impossible to understand the Logos in himself, therefore the man formed by the *δραστικὴ ἐνέργεια* of the Logos must be understood by these words. And hence by the creation here ascribed to him, could be meant only the new spiritual creation, brought forth by Christ; and this in its effects must be extended also to the higher spirits, this being implied in the fact that Christ after his resurrection was exalted above all the rest of creation. The first-born is Christ considered simply as the first new man, the centre of the whole creation, the end of all, by whom the unity of the creation was to be restored after the subjection of everything evil.[2] Accordingly,

[1] In expounding John 12: 28, Marcellus says: *Ἵνα δι' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἐν τῇ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τῆς σαρκὸς δευτέρᾳ δόξῃ τὸν πρότερον θνητὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀθάνατον ἀπεργάσηται, καὶ τοσαύτῃ αὐτὸν δοξάσῃ δόξῃ, ὥστε μὴ μόνον αὐτὸν τῆς πρωτέρας ἀπαλλαγῆναι δουλείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἀξωθῆναι δόξης* — and afterwards: *Ἵνα ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπατηθέντα πρότερον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, αὐτὸν αὖθις νικῆσαι τὸν διάβολον παρασκευάσῃ· διὰ τοῦτο ἀνείληφε τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἵνα ἀκολούθως τούτου ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ἐξουσίας παραλαβεῖν παρασκευάσῃ.* Euseb. c. Marcell. Ancyran. l. II. f. 48, 49.

[2] *Πρωτότοκον εἶναι τὸν πρῶτον καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, εἰς ὃν τὰ πάντα ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι ἐβουλήθη ὁ θεός. Ἀκούεις, ὅπως οὐ μόνον ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ προϋπάρχοντα ἔν τε οὐρα-*

he referred also to this new creation produced by Christ, the words in Proverbs 8 : 22, 23 ; and in connection with this he brings what Paul had said, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," — understanding this as referring to the predetermination of that which was to constitute the foundation of the kingdom of God.[1] But as in his mind the *personal* Christ stood far in the back-ground, compared with the idea of the Logos — as in his view the whole depended simply on the transient moment when the *δραστικὴ ἐνέργεια* of the Logos animated the body — the question presents itself to him : For what purpose is this to continue when the end, the perfect redemption, the complete victory over the kingdom of evil, shall have been attained, — when the redeemed shall, after the resurrection, have attained to the perfect enjoyment of blessedness? The Logos, in fact, took into union with himself the *σάρξ* which was alien from him, only in order that that end might be attained. Marcellus appeals to the declaration of Christ : "The flesh profiteth nothing — it is the spirit that quickeneth." How then, he argued, should the flesh, that profiteth nothing, remain through all eternity united with the Logos, — how should the servant-form, which he assumed, continue to abide with him evermore?[2] Thus by his one-sided Logos-doctrine he was driven to the conclusion, that the Logos would finally, when the end had been attained, once more emerge from that particular form of manifestation by means of the *σάρξ* — would cast aside the human envelope — that the particular kingdom of Christ would then come to an end, and only the universal kingdom, the universal being, and the universal agency of the Logos existing with the Father, continue to remain. In proof of this he adduced 1 Corinth. 15 : 28, and the word "until" in Ps. 110 : 1.[3]

It is made evident, how far the true point of moment in the doctrine of redemption was lowered by the tendency of Marcellus ; how the separating gulf betwixt God and the creature was once more obtruded to view and the significance of Christ's personality lost sight of, when we find him saying : "Should any one, however, maintain, that the human flesh was worthy of the Logos, inasmuch as the latter made it immortal by the resurrection, let him know, that not everything which is immortal is on that account worthy of God : for God is greater than immortality itself, — He, who by his will can make even that which has no existence immortal. But that everything immortal is not therefore worthy of being taken into union with God, is evident from this, that the angels, though immortal, do not therefore come any nearer to unity with God."[4] Still, however, he must have been sensible into what straits he was driven by the position which he assumed ; in what conflict he became involved with the scriptural doctrine, which he desired to hold fast. The question met him : What was to become then of the *σάρξ* thus exalted to immortality? "The answer to this question — says he — transcends our knowledge. We see only through a glass darkly ;

νοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν καινὴν κτίσιν ἐκτίσθαι συμβαίνει. C. Marcell. l. II. f. 44.

[1] *Θεμέλιον μὲν τοῦτον ὀνομάζων τὴν κατὰ σάρκα αὐτοῦ προϋπορισθεῖσαν οἰκονομίαν.* L. c. f. 45.

[2] *Πῶς ἐγχωρεῖ τὴν ἐκ γῆς τε οὖσαν καὶ μηδὲν ὠφελοῦσαν [σάρκα] ἐν τοῖς μέλλουσιν αἰῶσιν αὐτῷ λυσιτελοῦσαν συνεῖναι τῷ λογῳ; πῶς ἔδει τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφὴν ἣν ἀνείληφεν ὁ λόγος, μορφὴν οὖσαν δούλου, συνεῖναι τῷ λόγῳ;* C. Marcell. l. II. f. 44.

[3] *Οὐκοῦν ὅρον τινὰ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἡ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία τε καὶ βασιλεία.* L. c. f. 51.

[4] *Ὅτι οὐ πᾶν ὅπερ ἀθάνατον, τοῦτο ἄξιον θεοῦ· μείζων γὰρ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀθανασίας ὁ θεὸς, ὁ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ βουλήσει καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἀθάνατα ποιεῖν δυνάμενος. Ἔτι δὲ οὐ πᾶν τὸ ἀθάνατον ἑνῶσθαι θεῷ ἄξιον δῆλον, ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχὰς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ ἀγγέλους, ἀθανάτους ὄντας, μηδὲν διαφορεῖν τῇ ἑνότητι τοῦ θεοῦ.* L. c. f. 52.

our knowledge is but in part. We shall come to the knowledge of this only when we see face to face. Question me not, then, on matters about which I have obtained no distinct knowledge from holy writ. I cannot therefore say anything definite respecting this divine σάρξ united with the Logos. But then I believe the holy scriptures, that there is one God, and his Logos, who proceeded from the Father, that through him all things might exist; but who will, after the general restoration, subject himself to God and the Father, who has subjected all things to him, that so the Logos may be in God, as he was also before."[1]

P. 426. *But the more logical Photinus — .*] Photinus, bishop of Sirmium in Lower Pannonia, and the scholar of Marcellus, in still farther unfolding the doctrine he had received from his master, passed beyond the limits which the latter was disposed to fix. He could not rest satisfied with the indefinite, uncertain manner in which Marcellus expressed himself respecting the humanity of Christ. In striving to resolve the contradiction which his predecessor had left standing, he was pushed on further. While Marcellus had started with no other interest than that in behalf of the Logos-doctrine, and was led along to his own peculiar theory respecting the nature and person of Christ only by his wish to hold this fast, Photinus, on the other hand, directed his attention to the whole doctrine concerning the person of Christ, and sought to frame to himself an adequate conception of this. Thus he came to a scheme altogether akin to Sabellianism.

He considered the Logos to be the divine reason, either the thinking reason hidden in God, or the reason revealing itself outwardly, and operative, the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or προφορικός.[2] The name Son of God he would not apply to the Logos, but only to the Christ who appeared in time. It was not till the time when he was born of the Virgin Mary, that, according to Photinus, the existence of the Son of God began. Before, he existed only in the divine idea, in the divine predetermination. In this sense he explained those passages of the Old Testament, which were understood to speak of a preëxistence of the Messiah.[3] Like Sabellius, he supposed a certain radiation of the divine essence in the form of the Logos constituted the personality in Christ. He supposed the human personality proceeded from a certain hypostasis of the Logos. Hence he is represented to have taught that the self-expanding essence of God constitutes the Son of God, or that the expansion of the divine essence is to be styled the Son.[4] Photinus also, after the same manner with Marcellus, taught that the particular kingdom of Christ would come to an end, when the final object of it should have been attained.[5] He would doubtless differ from Marcellus, however, in this, that although he asserted a future termination

[1] C. Marcell. l. II. l. 53.

[2] The theses opposed by the first council of Sirmium (A. D. 357) to the doctrines of Photinus, are specially important as serving to fix the character of these doctrines. We find here the following formula: Εἴ τις ἐνδιάθετον ἢ προφορικὸν λόγον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[3] See Epiphan. hæres. 51: Ὁ λόγος ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἦν, ἀλλ' ἦν υἱός. On Daniel 7: 13 — Τοῦτο προκαταγγελτικῶς ἔλεγεν, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑπάρχοντος, ἀλλα δὴ ὁ ἐμελλεν υἱὸς καλεῖσθαι μετὰ τὴν Μαρίαν, προχρηστικῶς τὰ πάντα ἀναφέρεται εἰς αὐτὸν· ἀπαρχῆς δὲ οὕπω ἦν, λόγος δὲ ἦν, καθάπερ ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ λόγος. With this, too, agree the opposite positions of the council of Sirmium.

[4] The Sirmian anathema runs: Εἴ τις πλατυνομένην τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν υἱὸν λέγοι ποιεῖν, ἢ τὸν πλατυσμὸν τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ ονομάζει. To which belongs also the following: Εἴ τις τὸν ἀγέννητον ἢ μέρος αὐτοῦ ἐκ Μαρίας λέγειν γεγεννῆσθαι τολμᾷ.

[5] The antithetic position in the Sirmian confession of faith respecting Christ: Οὐ ἡ βασιλεία, ἀκατάπαυστος οὖσα, διαμένει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀπείρους. Ἔσται γὰρ καθεζόμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τουτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

of the kingdom of Christ, yet he did not extend this also to the personality of Christ formed by the radiation of the Logos, but attributed to the latter an eternal duration. Had not this been so, he assuredly would not have escaped from censure for so disparaging the dignity of Christ. Moreover, it may be inferred from the antagonistic positions of the Sirmian council, that he referred the names "Holy Spirit" and "Paraclete," simply to the activity of God or of Christ.

P. 428, bottom. *In the next place, it was his opinion* —.] Apollinaris was no friend to a stiff and disconnected supranaturalism; but he was for having the supernatural so apprehended as to leave room for the recognition of nature in all its rights. The supernatural element must be conceived as existing in perfect harmony with the natural. This principle is expressed in the words: "Nature is not disturbed by its Creator;" by which is meant, that God never brings about supernatural events in such a way as to subvert the laws of nature; as to destroy the particular form of an essence which has its ground in the laws of its nature. From this the conclusion would follow, which Apollinaris himself deduces from his principle in the same connection with the passage above cited, — that God uses all beings as his instruments in a way corresponding to their several natures; thus, for example, he employs rational beings, gifted with formal freedom, in no such way as to destroy their peculiar nature as free beings — in no such way as to supersede what distinguishes *them* from beings governed by the necessary laws of nature. The important consequences which follow from the principle here expressed, are sufficiently evident.

P. 431. *The lower and the higher principles in man's nature.*] Thus Apollinaris supposed, — as it seemed to him necessary to do, in order to recognize Christ as God-man, and the true unity in him, — that there is but one nature in Christ, the divine nature become human; and but one motion of the will corresponding thereto; and but one activity, as actuating the entire life; for every thing in him, it is supposed, proceeded from the immutable spirit as its moving principle; just as in man, the entire life is determined and guided by the presiding soul. In a letter to the emperor Jovian, Apollinaris says: "When the fulness of time was come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, that he might be the Son of God, — God according to the Spirit: the Son of man according to the flesh; the one Son — not two natures, one adorable nature, and another to which no adoration is due; but one incarnate nature of the God Logos, to which, in its union with the flesh, one adoration is due."[1] The two natures, the divine and the human, — he meant — are in him blended in one. He is to be acknowledged as Lord in this one nature composed of the deity and the humanity.[2] In his work written against the bishop Diodore of Tarsus, he says: "The instrument and that by which it is moved produces, by its very nature, but one and the same action; and where the action is one, there is also at the ground of it but one essence."[3] "Those persons would make impossibilities possible, (bore a rock with the finger,) who suppose that in Christ there were two spirits, a divine and a human;[4] for if every

[1] Οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν, μίαν προσκυνητὴν καὶ μίαν ἀπροσκύνητην, ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην καὶ προσκυνουμένην μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει. Maji scriptorum nova collectio, T. VII. 1833, p. 16.

[2] Μιᾷ συγκράτῳ τῇ φύσει ἀνθρωπον τὸν κυρίον λέγομεν. L. c. p. 16.

[3] Ὀργανὸν καὶ τὸ κοινοῦν μίαν πέφυκεν ἀπυτελεῖν τὴν ἐνέργειαν. Ὧι δὲ μία ἡ ἐνέργεια, μία καὶ ἡ οὐσία, μία ἄρα γέγονεν οὐσία τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς σαρκός. L. c. p. 20.

[4] Δακτύλῳ γλίφουσι πέτραν, οἱ δύο νόας ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ δογματίζοντες.

spirit determines itself freely in accordance with its own peculiar nature, it is impossible, that in one and the same subject there should be two natures, combined together, willing opposite things." [1] "As Paul nobly declares: in God we live, move and have our being; so too the will of God, through the Logos dwelling in the flesh, sufficed to move and animate that flesh, the divine activity taking the place of the soul." [2] "He maintained that when two individual essences unite together, a neutral being is the result; as in the case of the mule, the properties of the ass and of the horse are united, and as out of the mixture of two different colors results a third. But nothing formed out of such a combination has the properties of two opposite kinds complete, but partially mixed. Such is the union of God and man in Christ. He is therefore neither wholly man nor wholly God, but a mixture of God and man." [3]

P. 431, second sentence on the page — *a name which could not otherwise be ascribed to him.*] As Apollinaris supposed that the spirit properly constitutes the man; and as instead of the human spirit, he supposed the divine, immutable spirit, the Logos in Christ; — so in this view of the matter he might say, that the Logos was man before his appearance in humanity, understanding in this sense those passages where Christ speaks of his being with the Father before the creation. "The man Christ — says he, in following this connection of ideas [4] — preëxisted; — not as though the spirit, that is God, was a different being from Christ himself, but so that the Lord was the divine spirit in the nature of the God-man. [5] In this way only is it possible to understand how he existed before his birth on earth; how he was before all things; was of the same race with God." [6] Hence he says, Christ did not become man, but he became *as* man; — namely, he was not of the same essence with man in the most exalted part of his nature. [7]

P. 432. *According to this connection of ideas* — .] The Logos remains still the immutable, infinite, omnipresent being; and yet his activity is one which is limited by the σάρξ. [8] Also by virtue of the σάρξ animated by him, he takes part in the passion. [9] This capacity of suffering in the σάρξ passes over to the Logos, as the σάρξ receives the divine animating power

[1] Εἰ γάρ πᾶς νοῦς αὐτοκράτωρ ἐστι ἰδικῷ θελήματι κατὰ φύσιν κινούμενος, ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν ἑνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποκειμένῳ δύο τοὺς τἀναντία θέλοντας ἀλλήλοις συνυπάρχειν. Maji T. VII. p. 70.

[2] Ἐπεὶ γάρ ἄριστα Παῦλος βοᾷ, ἐν τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν, ἤρκει καὶ μόνον τὸ αὐτοῦ θέλημα, διὰ ἐν τῇ σάρκι σκηνώσαντος λόγου, πρὸς τὸ ταύτην ζωοποιεῖν καὶ κινεῖν, ἀναπληρούσης τῆς θείας ἐνεργείας τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς τόπον καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου νοός. L. c. p. 203.

[3] Μεσότητες γίνονται ἰδιοτήτων διαφόρων εἰς ἓν συνελθουσῶν, ὡς ἐν ἡμιόνῳ ἰδιότης ὄνου καὶ ἵππου, καὶ ἐν γλαυκῷ χρώματι ἰδιότης λευκοῦ καὶ μέλανος· οὐδεμία δὲ μεσότης ἑκατέρας ἔχει τὰς ἀκρότητας ἐξ ὁλοκλήρου, ἀλλὰ μερικῶς ἐπιμεμιγμένας· μεσότης δὲ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐν Χριστῷ οὐκ ἄρα οὔτε ἄνθρωπος ὅλος οὔτε θέος, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου μίξις. L. c. p. 310.

[4] After having thus expounded the sense which such expressions have in the connection of ideas in Apollinaris, it is needless to enter at large into the refutation of those arbitrary interpretations of his meaning, which men have indulged in on speculative grounds to which Apollinaris was utterly a stranger.

[5] Καὶ προϋπάρχει ὁ ἄνθρωπος Χριστος, οὐχ ὡς ἑτέρου ὄντος παρ' αὐτὸν τοῦ πνεύματος, τοῦτ' ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσει θείου πνεύματος ὄντος. Gregor. Nyss. Antirrhetic. p. 149.

[6] Προϋπάρχειν τῆς ἐν γῇ γεννήσεως, πρὸ πάντων εἶναι, σύμφυλον εἶναι. L. c. p. 191.

[7] Οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπος, διότι οὐχ ὁμοούσιος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὸ κυριώτατον. Antirrhetic. p. 177. Hence the title of the book refuted by Gregory of Nyssa: Ἀπόδειξις περὶ τῆς θείας σαρκώσεως τῆς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἀνθρώπου. L. c. p. 126.

[8] Respecting Christ's relation to the Father, he says: Διαιρῶν μὲν τὴν ἐνέργειαν κατὰ σάρκα, ἐξισῶν δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα, (the divine essence, the animating spirit.) The ἰσότης ἡ ἐν δυνάμει and the κατὰ σάρκα τῆς ἐνεργείας διαίρεσις. L. c. p. 194.

[9] The σὰρξ συνετέθη πρὸς τὸ οὐράνιον ἡγεμονικὸν, ἐξοικειωθεῖσα αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸ παθη-

of the Logos into itself. But how is it possible to conceive of any such thing, except on the supposition that a personality distinct from the infinite Logos proceeds from the influence which the Logos exercises on the σάρξ? And the idea of an intermediate being, which is neither wholly God nor wholly man, would lead, in fact, to a theory of that very kind which Apollinaris was solicitous to avoid. It is difficult to form, from the fragments which have come down to us, any clear idea of the manner in which Apollinaris would explain to himself the prayer of Christ, that if possible, the cup of agony might pass from him. On the one hand, he considered this as conclusive evidence, that He who was entering upon his sufferings distinguished his own will from that of the Almighty Father.[1] On the other, he maintained, against his adversaries, that this was not as they supposed, the will of the man from the earth; but the will of the God who descended from heaven.[2] We can explain this only by supposing, that since Apollinaris ascribed to the Logos the capacity of suffering which was in the σάρξ, accounting in this way for those words of the prayer, he considered himself therefore warranted to find here a proof of suffering, and yet to attribute it to the Logos himself, by whom the σάρξ was animated.

P. 442, third sentence. *He has adopted them as his children.*] "An essential union — Theodore supposed — could truly subsist only between beings the same in essence; not between those unlike in essence; for in the latter case, there must be a union of elements differing in kind." [3]

P. 443. *Share in all the honor, glory, and dominion belonging to himself.*] It is owing to the union of the natures by the divine good pleasure — says Theodore — that the same name is, by *homonymy*, given to both; that they partake of the same dominion, dignity, power; and that they are never separated; — by virtue of all which the two constitute one person, indeed they are called one." [4]

P. 443. Middle. *The human nature has been taken up into fellowship with the divine.*] "This kind of union — said he — keeps the two natures unmixed and undivided; both become thereby one person; — there is one will and one activity, and accordingly, one dominion." [5]

P. 447. *Nestorius — belonged among the disciples of the Antiochian doctrine.*] He was accustomed to oppose to the ἕνωσις κατ' οὐσίαν, κατὰ φύσιν to the ἕνωσις κατ' εὐδοκίαν, κατὰ θέλησιν. The former appeared to him to be contradictory to common sense, and irreconcilable with the immutability of the divine essence.[6]

τικὸν ἑαυτῆς καὶ λαβοῦσα τὸ θεῖον οἰκειωθεν. Maji T. VII. p. 301.

[1] Εἰ ἰσοσθενὴς καὶ κοινωνὸς τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐρχόμενος ἦν, πῶς ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ γινόμενος προσηύχετο κτλ. L. c. p. 203.

[2] Ὅτι τὸ θέλημα τοῦτο ἴδιον εἴρηται οὐκ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἐκ γῆς, καθὼς αὐτοὶ νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ τοῦ καταβάντος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Antirrhetic. p. 201.

[3] Ὁ τῆς κατ' οὐσίαν ἑνώσεως ἐπι μόνων τῶν ὁμοουσίων ἠληθευται λόγος· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἑτεροουσίων διέψευσται, συγχύσεως εἶναι καθαρὸς οὐ δυνάμενος. Collectio Maji, T. VII. p. 69.

[4] Ἡ κατ' εὐδοκίαν τῶν φύσεων ἕνωσις μίαν ἀμφοτέρων τῷ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας λόγῳ ἐργαζεται τὴν προσηγορίαν, τὴν αὐθεντίαν, τὴν δυνασ-τείαν, τὴν δεσποτείαν, τὴν ἀξίαν, τὴν ἐξουσίαν, μηδενὶ τρόπῳ διαιρουμένην, ἑνὸς ἀμφοτέρων κατ' αὐτὴν προσώπου καὶ γενομένου καὶ λεγομένου. Maji, l. c. p. 69.

[5] Ὁ τῆς κατ' εὐδοκίαν ἑνώσεως τρόπος, ἀσυγχύτους φυλάσσων φύσεις καὶ ἀδιαιρέτους, ἓν ἀμφοτέρων τὸ πρόσωπον δείκνυσιν, καὶ μίαν τὴν ἐνέργειαν μετὰ τῆς ἑπομένης τούτοις μιᾶς αὐθεντίας καὶ δεσποτείας. Maji, l. c. p. 69.

[6] As he expresses himself in the following fragment: Τῷ κατ' οὐσίαν λόγῳ, φύσει φύσις ουχ ἑνοῦται χωρὶς ἀφανισμοῦ· οὐκέτι γὰρ αὐταῖς σώζεται ὁ τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λόγος· ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὴν θέλησιν ἕνωσις καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, ἀτρέπτους αὐτὰς τηρεῖ καὶ ἀδιαιρέτους, μίαν αὐτῶν δεικνῦσα πεποιημένην τὴν θέλησιν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν. And in the second fragment, the καθ' ὑπόστασιν καὶ φύσιν ἕνωσις is rejected as untenable, and the κατ' εὐδοκίαν ἕνωσις, μίαν τῶν ἠγωμένων ἀποσώζουσι θέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν maintained. Maji, T. VII 1833, p. 69.

GENERAL INDEX.

A.

Abasgians, conversion of the, 116.
Abdas of Susa, 110.
Abyssinian Church, 109—121.
Acta Pilati, 4.
Ædesius, 119.
Aërius, 342—343.
Aëtius 399, 409.
Agapæ, 325.
Agapetus of Rome, 150, 534.
Agapius, 710.
Agnoëtism. 438, 466, 554, 597.
Acacius, of Amida, 113.
Acacius of Berœa, 463.
Acacius of Cæsarea, 408.
Acacius of Constantinople, 527, 528, 533.
Ἀκέφαλοι, 529, 530.
Alaric, 129.
Alexander of Alexandria, 220. His participation in the Arian controversy, 366—370.
Alexander of Antioch, 417.
Alexander of Constantinople, 385, 386.
Alexander of Hierapolis, 485, 487, 490.
Alexandria, synod at, (A.D. 362,) 409, 432.
Alexandrian school: Interpretation of scripture and inspiration, 351, ff. Points in which it differed generally from the Antiochian school, 352. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 444, 445.
Ambrose. Election to the episcopate, 423, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78, 141, 144. Incident with Theodosius, 180, 181. Priscillian, 711, 714. Active in behalf of Monachism, 259. Against Jovinian, 276. Concerning fasts on the Sabbath, 299. Composer of church hymns, 318. Anthropology, 562. Intermediate state for unbaptized children, 669. Lord's supper, 670.
Amphilochius of Iconium. Against images, 291. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 420.
Anachorets. See Monachism.
Anastasius, emperor, 530—532.
Anastasius, presbyter of Nestorius, 448, 458.
Anastasius of Rome, 689.
Anatolius of Constantinople, 516, 517, 518, 520.
Ancyra, council of, (A.D. 314,) 147, 160, 179. Synod of (A.D. 358,) 405.
Andreas of Samosata, 486.
Annianus, 597, 598.
Anthimus, 533—534.
Anthropology, 557, 661.
Anthropomorphites, 690, ff.
Anthusa, 226, 693.
Ἀντιμεθίστασις ὀνομάτων in Apollinaris, 431; controverted by Theodore, 443; in the Alexandrian school, 444.
Antiochian school, 149. Interpretation of scripture, 350. Points in which it differed generally from the Alexandrian school, 352, 353. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 435, 444.
Antioch, council of, (A.D. 341,) 154, 388, 389, 390. Council of, (A. D. 345,) 390.
Anthony, 228, 236.
Aphthartodocetism, 549, 550.
Apocatastasis, 676, ff.
Apollinaris of Antioch, 58.
Apollinaris of Laodicea, 58. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 428—434. Controverted by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 440, ff.
Arabia, the gospel in, 117, 120, 121.
Arcadius, 79, 81, 700.
Ardashad, synod at, 114.
Arian controversy, 360, 408.
Ariminum, council of, 405, ff.
Arius, 365. Doctrine, 361, 369. Participation in the Arian controversy, 369, 388. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 418. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 425.
Arles, council of, (314,) 141, 189, 190. On the time of the paschal feast, 301. Council of, (355,) 396. Council of, (475,) 646.
Armenia, Christianity in, 113, 114. Monophysites in, 553, 554.
Arnobius, the younger, 645.
Ascholius of Thessalonica, 737, 740.
Aspebethos, 118, 119.
Asterius of Amasea, 49. On images, 288, 290.
Athanaric, 127, 736.
Athanasius. Life and labors, 380, 414. Julian and Athanasius, 53, 54, 120.
Athanasius on Origen, 679. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 419, 420. Doctrine of creation, 424, ff. Against Apollinarism, 433. Lord's supper, 672, 673.
Atticus of Constantinople, 112, 701.
Audius and the Audians, 705, 706.
Augustin — Development of his Christian

life and doctrines, 354—359. His mother, 337. Platonism, 102, 103. Importance compared with Tertullian and Origen, 353, 67, 79, 82, 91—93. (De civ. Dei,) 95, 97, 98, 100. De fide et operibus, 100, 101, 129, 136, 137, 139, 143, 144, 146, 151. Concerning Rome, 167, 168. On councils, 176. Church discipline, 180. Efforts with the Donatists, 197—203. Theological polemics with the Donatists, 203—217. In behalf of the Anchorites, 248. Monachism, de opere Monachorum, 259—261. Against Jovinian, 277. De bono conjugali, 277. Reading of the bible, 281, 282. Sign of the cross, 287. Fasting on the Sabbath, 298. Fasts, 304. Festival of the New Year, 315. As a preacher, 317. Frequent celebration of the Lord's supper, 328. Idea of sacrifice in the supper, 332. Adoration of saints, 335, 336. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 421, 422. Anthropology, 564—572. De gestis Pelagii, 585. On the civil power applied against Julian, 594. Appeal to the Christian consciousness, 594. Antagonist of the Pelagian doctrines, 598—626. De gratia et libero arbitrio, and de correptione et gratia, 626. De prædestinatione sanctorum, and de dono perseverantiæ, against the Semi-Pelagians, 631. Retractationes, opus imp. and death, 634. Idea of the sacraments, 662—665. Opposed to the limbus infantium, 669. On faith in the case of infant baptism, 670. Doctrine of the Lord's supper, 673, 674. Purgatory, 675. De mendacio ad consentium, 718.

Auxentius, bishop of the Goths. See Appendix.

Auxentius of Milan, 428.

B.

Babæus, 552, 553.

Bachiarius, 714.

Baptism, 51. Euchites, 242. Administration of, 320—326. Doctrine of, 665, ff.

Barbatianus, 276.

Bar Sudaili, 555—557.

Barsumas, abbot, 501, 510.

Barsumas of Nisibis, 552.

Basiliscus, 135, 526, 527.

Basil of Ancyra, 405, 406. Basil of Cæsarea, 413, 414. Friend of Gregory Nazianzen, 416. At Athens, 150. Election to the episcopate, 153. Julian, 58. Basilias, 137. Intercession, 142, 145. In favor of the Cenobite life, 246. Rules for monks, 251, 252. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 420. Chrestomathy, from Origen, 679.

Benedict of Nursia, 261—265.

Bible, reading of the, 280—283. Reading of the bible before the church assemblies, 282. Study of the bible among the Goths, 129. Among the Antiochians, 150.

Bishop. See church constitution.

Boniface II. of Rome, 650.

Bonosus opposed to the worship of Mary, 340.

Bordeaux, synod at, (A.D. 384,) 712.

Braga, council of, (A.D. 563,) 718.

C.

Cæcilian, 183, ff.

Cæsarius, of Arles, 261, 304, 648, 650.

Calliana, (Calcutta,) 117.

Candidian, 468, 473, 474.

Carthage, Council of, (A.D. 401,) 300. (A.D. 403,) 198. (A.D. 404,) 199.

Cassian, John, 261, 627—630.

Cassiodorus, 150, 579.

Catechumens, 321, 322.

Celibacy, 147—149.

Chalcedon, ecumenical council of, 518, 524.

Character indelebilis, 663.

Chor-bishops, 159, 160.

Christ, doctrine concerning the person of, 424—553. Christmas, festival of, 308, 314.

Chrysaphius, 507, 516.

Chrysostom, 692—700. Anthusa, 226, 227. Labors in behalf of the Goths, 128, 129. Eutropius, 145—73, 80, 95, 146, 149. Presbyters, 155, 179. Stagirius, 238. Anachorets, 248, 250, 251. Monachism, 267—269. On the right worship of God, 278, 279. Prayer, 279. Reading of the bible, 281, 282. Sign of the cross, 286, 287. Images, 291. Celebration of festivals, 296. Fasts, 297. Christmas, 309. As a preacher, 317. Infant baptism, 320. Lord's supper, 328, 329. Sacrifice in the Lord's supper, 332. Pilgrimages, 341. Inspiration and interpretation of scriptrue, 352, 353. Anthropology, 657—659. Baptism, 665, 666. Doctrine of the Lord's supper, 670.

Church, invisible and visible — Failure of distinguishing between — in the Donatist controversy, 203. Conception of the — by Tichonius, 209, 210. Augustin, approximating to the true conception of, 212. Conception of the invisible church by Jovinian, 275.

Church and state, 130, 146, 195.

Church buildings, 283, 286.

Church psalmody, 317, 318.

Church divisions, 182, 222.

Church constitution, 130—182.

Church discipline, 178—182.

Circumcellions, 192, 193, 195, 196.

Cœlestin of Rome, 123. In the Nestorian controversy, 461—463, 493. In the Pelagian controversy, 634.

Cœlestius, 579, ff. Doctrine of baptism, 667, 668.

Councils, 133, 175—178.

Confirmation, 155, 323.

Consilia evangelica, disputed by Jovinian, 269. How considered by Pelagius, 579 584. By Julian, 617.

Constans, 31. Donatists, 193—196. Arian controversy, and Athanasius, 392, 393

Constantia, sister of Constantine, 16, 289, 378, 379.
Constantine the Great, 5—31, 104, 132, 133, 135, 138, 139. Donatists, 188—193. Letter to Antony, 233, 297, 300. Arian controversy, 370—388. Manichæans, 708.
Constantine the younger, 31, 280, 388.
Constantinople, second ecumenical council of, (A.D. 331,) 416—418, 420. Condemnation of Apollinaris, 436. Council of, (A.D. 360,) 408. Synod at, (A.D. 448,) 504. Synod under Mennas, at, (A.D. 536,) 534. Council of, (A.D. 551,) 546. Fifth ecumenical council at, (A.D. 553,) 547—549, 703, 704.
Constantius, 31—36, 120, 221. Arian controversies, 387—410.
Cresconius, 198
Cross, sign of the, 286, 287.
Cultus, Christian, 278, 343.
Cyrill of Alexandria. Representative of the Alexandrian school, 444. In the Nestorian controversy, 453—498.
Cyrill of Jerusalem, 98, 411. Baptism, 665. Lord's supper, 670.

D.

Dalmatius, 476, 477.
Damasus of Rome, 71, 148, 154, 173, 221, 222, 683, 711.
Deacons. Deaconesses, 155, 158.
Demetrius Chytas, 32.
Demophilus of Constantinople, 416.
Didymus, 149, 349, 679, 704.
Dictinnius, libra, 717, 718.
Diodore of Tarsus, 496, 551, 677.
Dionysius the Areopagite, writings ascribed to, 350, 556.
Dionysius Exiguus. Collection of decretals, 178. On the time of the Easter festival, 302.
Dioscurus, 500—522.
Diospolis, synod at, (A.D. 415,) 583—585.
Docetism. Hilary. See Appendix. Priscillian, 717.
Domitian of Ancyra, 536—540.
Domnus, of Antioch, 503, 513.
Donatists, 182—217. Church discipline, 205.
Donatus, of Casæ Nigræ, 187, 189—191.
Donatus Magnus, 191.
Dsunovas, 120.

E.

Easter, time of, 301, 302.
Edessa, school at, 551, 552.
Elesbaan, 120, 121.
Elvira, council of, 141, 147.
Ephesus. Third ecumenical council at, 467—479. Robber synod at, 509—514.
Epiphany. Feast of, 306—308. As a season for baptism, 324.
Epiphanius, 680—697, 151. Against images, 292, 293.
Episcopal power. Growth of, 155.
Eschatology, 675—678.
Euchites, 240—247.
Eudocia, 460, 507, 516, 524.
Eudoxia, 82, 694—700.
Eudoxius of Antioch, later of Constantinople, 403, 408, 409, 411.
Eugenius, 78.
Eulogius of Cæsarea, 583.
Eunapius, 93.
Eunomius, 399—409. An Aristotelian, 349. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 419. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 425.
Euoptius of Ptolemais, 471.
Euphemites, 707.
Euphemius of Constantinople, 530.
Eusebius, of Cæsarea. Participation in the Arian controversy, 367, ff. 373, ff. 383, ff. Against images, 289, 290. Doctrine of the Lord's supper, 674, 675. Panegyric on Constantine, 6, 23, 30.
Eusebius of Doryleum, 504, 505, 512, 513.
Eusebius of Nicomedia. Participation in the Arian controversy, 367, 377, 379. Baptizes Constantine, 28.
Eusebius, of Vercelli, 151, 259, 396.
Eustathius of Antioch, and the Eustathians, 378, 411, 417.
Eustathius of Sebaste, and the Eustathians, 241, 342.
Euthymius, monk, 119.
Eutropius, 145, 693, 694.
Eutyches, 501, 504, ff.
Eutychius, of Constantinople, 548, 550.
Evagrius, the Origenist, 691, 704.

F.

Facundus of Hermiane. In the controversy of the three chapters, 544, 545. Respecting councils, 177.
Fasts, 293. Jovinian on, 270, ff. Aërius, opposed to laws regulating, 343.
Fasting, seasons of, 297—299.
Faustus of Mileve, 313, 710.
Faustus of Rhegium, 261, 645—647. Controversy about his work de gratia, 649, 650.
Felix of Apturgis, 187.
Festivals, Christian, 296—316.
Flavian of Antioch, 142, 244.
Flavian of Constantinople, 505—513, 517.
Fortunius, 197.
Fraus pia. Euchites, 244. Origenists, 538. Priscillianists, 717, 718.
Frumentius, 119, ff.
Fulgentius Ferrandus, 542, 543.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, 650.

G.

Gallus, Julian's brother, 37, 41.
Gangra, council of, 244.
Gaudentius of Brescia, 70.
Gaudentius of Thamugade, 202, 213.
Gelasius, 598. Lord's supper, 671, 672.
Gennadius, presbyter at Marseilles, on Augustin, 647.
Gennadius of Lower Hermupolis, 528, 529.
Georgius of Alexandria, 35, 60, 399.

Georgius of Laodicea, 405, 406.
Gnosimachi, 706.
Goths, Christianity among the, 125—129. Arians, 423, also in the Appendix.
Grace. See Pelagian controversies.
Gratian 70—72, 222.
Gregory of Alexandria, 389, 392.
Gregory of Nazianzus, 414, 418. Mother, 226—58, 137, 150—67, 149, 165. On councils, 176. Infant baptism, 319. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 420. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 427. Against Apollinarism, 433, 434. Doctrine of baptism, 665. Intermediate state for unbaptized children, 669. Lord's supper, 674. Chrestomathy from Origen, 680.
Gregory of Nazianzus, the father, 59, 707.
Gregory of Nyssa. Influence on the council of Constantinople, 413. His relations with Origen, 680. Pilgrimages, 342. On the rage for discussing doctrines at Constantinople, 388. On the inward experience, in opposition to Eunomius, 401, 402. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 421. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 427. Lord's supper, 672. On the final restoration, 674.
Gregory Photistes, 113.

H.

Helena, mother of Constantine, 5, 341.
Helladius of Tarsus, 490
Helvidius, against the worship of Mary, 340.
Heron, monk, 239.
Heros of Arles, 583.
Hilarion, monk, 118, 235, 236, 342.
Hilary of Arles, 173.
Hilary, the friend of Prosper, 631, ff.
Hilary of Poictiers. Against the confounding of Church and State, 33, 134. Author of church hymns, 318. In defence of Athanasius, 396, 397. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 419. Soul and body of Christ, 427. Anthropology, 559—562. Lord's supper, 670, 671.
Hilarus, deacon at Rome, 514.
Hipporegius, council of, 164.
Homerites, Christianity among the, 117—121.
Honorius, 79, ff. 200.
Hormisdas of Rome, 533, 649—650.
Hosius of Cordova, 154, 371, 398, 404.
Hyginus of Cordova, 711.
Hypsistarians, 707.

I.

Ibas of Edessa, 551, 552. Letter of — condemned, 538, 548.
Iberians, conversion of the, 114, 115.
Idacius of Emerita, 711, 712.
Images, 287—296.
India, the gospel in, 116, 117.
Infant baptism, 319, 320.
Innocent of Rome. On the Roman primacy, 170. On fasting on the Sabbath, 299. In the Pelagian controversies, 585, 587.
Inspiration, doctrine of, 351, 352.
Instantius, 711, 712.
Intercessions of bishops, 141—144.
Irenæus, Comes, 468, 475, 478, 494.
Ireland, Christianity in, 122—125.
Isidore of Pelusium, 134, 283, 284, 454. Anthropology, 661. Baptism, 666.
Isidore, presbyter of Theophilus of Alexandria, 687, 691.
Ithacius of Sossuba, 711, 712.

J.

Jacob of Edessa and the Jacobites, 553.
Jerome, 681—685, 129, 155. Active in support of monasticism, 259. Against Jovinian, 276, 277. On fasting on the Sabbath, 298. Against the theatrical mode of church psalmody, 318, 319. Against Vigilantius, and in favor of the worship of the saints, 338, 339. Against Helvidius, 340. Pilgrimages, 341, 342, Interpretation of scripture and inspiration, 352. Pelagian controversies, 581, 585.
Jews. Favored by Julian, 49. Persecution of the Christians on the part of the, 118.
John of Antioch. In the Nestorian controversy, 463, 498.
John, Comes sacrarum, 478.
John of Jerusalem, 582, 583, 685, 686, 687.
John, Philoponus, 554, 555.
John, Syncel of Cyrill, 478.
John Talaya, 528, 529.
Johannites, 701.
Joseph, Patriarch of Armenia, 114.
Jovian, 412.
Jovinian, 269—277.
Judaism, Julian's views of. See Appendix. Its relation to Christianity and to Paganism. See Appendix.
Julian, emperor, 30, 32, 37—66, 69, 84—89, 196.
Julian of Eclanum. Participation in the Pelagian controversies, 592—597. Advocate of the Pelagian doctrines, 600—625. Doctrine of baptism, 666.
Julius of Rome, 171, 172, 389, 390.
Justina, 423.
Justinian, 83, 533—550, 135, 649, 703, 704, 709.
Justin, 532, 533.
Juvenalis of Jerusalem, 470, 510, 524.

L.

Laity, participation of the — in ecclesiastical elections, 152, ff.
Lampon, 458.
Laodicea, council of, 157, 160, 173, 298. On the festival of Sunday, 298. On church psalmody, 318.
Lazarus of Aix, 583.
Lazians, conversion of the, 115, 116.
Leo the Great, 104, 169, 170, 508, 509. On the Robber's Synod, and the Chalcedonian Council, 514, ff. 525. Was he the author

of the book de vocatione gentium ? 639. Manichæans, 708, 709.
Leo, emperor, 526.
Leontius of Neapolis, in defense of images, 294, 295.
Leporius, 596, 597.
Lerins, cloister of, 261, 635, 645, 648.
Libanius, 33, 39, 47, 51, 74, 75.
Liberius of Rome, 221, 308, 398, 404, 405.
Licinius, 12—19.
Life, Christian, 223—277.
Lord's supper, celebration of the, 325—330. Doctrine of the, 670—675.
Lucian, 89.
Lucidus, 645, 646.
Lucifer of Cagliari, 396—398, 412.
Luciferites, 412.
Lucilla, 186, f.

M.

Macarius of Egypt, 691.
Macarius Politicus, 691.
Macedonius of Constantinople, (A.D. 360,) 408.
Macedonius of Constantinople, (after A.D. 510,) 530, 531.
Macedonius, monk, 249.
Majorinus, 188—191.
Male, (Malabar.) 117.
Manichæans, 707—710. Exclude wine in the sacrament of the supper, 330.
Marcellus of Ancyra, 394, 395. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 425, 426. Opponent of Origen, 679.
Marcellus of Apamea, 77.
Marcian, emperor, 516.
Marcian, monk, 255.
Marriage. Despised by the Eustathians, 245. Jovian's views concerning, 270, 271. Considered a sacrament by Augustin, 664.
Maris of Chalcedon, 59.
Mark of Arethusa, 51, 61.
Mark of Memphis, 710.
Mark, monk. Sole trust in the Redeemer, 255.
Martin of Tours. Active in defence of monasticism, 259. Priscillianists, 712—714.
Maruthas of Tagrit, 110, 700.
Mary, worship of, 339—341. Mary the θεοτόκος. See Nestorian controversy.
Maternus, 34.
Maxentius, 7.
Maximin, 1—5, 14—16.
Maximus, emperor, 711, ff.
Melchiades of Rome, 189.
Meletius of Lycopolis, and the Meletian schism in Egypt, 217, 221, 382, 388.
Meletian schism at Antioch, 410—412.
Meletius of Mopsuestia, 490, 492.
Meletius of Sebaste, 410—412.
Memnon of Ephesus, 468, ff.
Mennas, 534—540.
Mensurius, 183, 186.
Meropius, 119.
Metropolitan constitution, 162, ff.
Miesrob, 113.
Milan, synod at, 396.
Mihr Nerseh, proclamation of, 105, 107.
Miracles. Views of Augustin concerning. See Appendix.
Monachism, 103, 118, 150, 227—278.
Monica, 227.
Monophysites, beyond the Roman empire, 552—555.
Monophysite controversies, 524—550.
Moses of Chorene, 114.

N.

Nectarius of Constantinople, 181.
Neo-Cæsarea, council of, (A.D. 314,) 147, 156, 318.
Nestorians in Persia, 551, 552.
Nestorian schools, 150.
Nestorian controversy, 446—524.
Nestorius, 446—495. Anthropology and participation in the Pelagian controversy, 659, 660.
Neo-Platonism, 36, 38, 81, 102, 103.
New Year, festival of the, 314, 315.
Nicæ in Thrace, 408.
Nice, council of, (first ecumenical,) 372—378, 147, 151, 153, 157, 165, 174. Decision with respect to the Meletian schism, 220. On the time of the celebration of the passover, 302. Intended council of, (A.D. 451,) 517, 518.
Nilus, 238. Against indolence and too long prayer, 241. On the blessings of the monastic life, 250, 251, 253. On images, 292. Lord's supper, 670, 671.
Niobites, 554.
Nisibis, 150, 552.
Nonna, 226.
North-African church. Its free spirit, 164—167, 174, 586, on Rome.
Nuns, cloisters for, 237.

O.

Oak, synod of the, 697, 698.
Offering, notion of, connected with the sacrament of the supper, 332—334.
Optatus of Mileve, 166, 167.
Orange, council of, (A.D. 529,) 650.
Oriental church. As distinguished from the Western church, 135, 171, 346—350, 557, 558. Anthropology of the, 651—661.
Origen, 349, 350. Compared with Augustin, 353, 354.
Origenists and the Origenistic controversy, 536—538, 678—704.
Original sin, (inherited sin.) See Pelagian controversy.
Orosius, 93. In the Pelagian controversy, 582

P

Pachomius, labors of, 236, 237, 238. Opponent of Origen, 680.
Paganism, 70.
Palladius, 123.

Papacy, 165, ff.
Parsism, 105, ff.
Passover, feast of the — time, 301—303. Among the Audians.
Patriarchal constitution, 163—165.
Patrick St., 122—125.
Paulinus of Antioch, 412.
Paulinus, deacon from Milan, 580.
Paulus catena, 32.
Paul, the hermit, 228, 229.
Paul of Emesa, 483.
Pelagian controversy, 564—625.
Pelagius, life of. Doctrine of human nature of Christ, 572—580. In the Pelagian controversy, 580, ff. Opposed to the doctrine of purgatory, 675.
Pelagius, Roman arch-deacon, 537.
Persian church, 104—113, 551—552.
Peter, the clothier, 530, 531.
Peter of Alexandria, 218—220.
Peter of Jerusalem, 537, 538.
Peter Mongus, 528, 529.
Petilian, 201, 202.
Philippopolis, council of, 391.
Philoxenos, 530. Against images, 295.
Photinus of Sirmium, 395. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, 425.
Pilgrimages, 341, 342.
Platonism, as a form of church doctrine, 349, 350.
Pneumatomachi.
Pontianus, 541.
Porphyry of Gaza, 81.
Possessor, 649.
Prayer, doctrine concerning. Euchites, 241. Chrysostom, on this point, 279. Antiochian church-prayer for catechumens, 321, 322.
Predestinatians, 641—643.
Predestination, doctrine of, 623—625.
Presbyters, 155.
Priesthood, false idea of the, 146.
Priscillian and the Priscillianists, 710—718.
Proæresius, 57.
Proclus of Constantinople, 450, 451, 488. 496—498.
Proclus, the Neo-Platonist, 83.
Prosper of Aquitania, 630—638.
Proterius of Alexandria, 525.
Provincial synods, 162.
Prudentius, 81.
Ptolemæus, monk.
Pulcheria, 460, 482, 483, 507, 516.
Purgatory and purgatorial fire, 675, 676.

R.

Rabulas of Edessa, 551, 552, 496.
Redemption, doctrine of. Different views of the Eastern and Western churches, 665—670. As held by Augustin, 618, 619. By Pelagius, 578, 579. By Theodore of Mopsuestia, 656, ff. By Priscillian, 716, 717.
Relics, worship of, 334.
Reparatus of Carthage, 546.
Rheginus of Constantia, 472.
Rhetorius, 706, 707.
Rome, 123, 124, 162, 163, 168—175, 299, 389.
Rufinus, 685—689.

S.

Sabas, 737.
Sabbath, celebration of the, 297—299.
Sacraments, administration of the, 322—332. Doctrine concerning the, 661—675.
Sapor II. 104.
Sarabaites, 247, 248.
Saragossa, synod at, (A.D. 380,) 711.
Sardica, council of, 154, 160, 172, 391, 392. Canons of this council confounded with those of the council of Nice, 172.
Sarmatio, 276.
Scripture, interpretation of, 350—353.
Sects, history of the, 704—718.
Secundus of Ptolemais, 377, 378.
Secundus of Tigisis, 184.
Seleucia, in Isaurea, council of, 407—409.
Semi-Arianism, 373, ff.
Semi-Pelagianism, 625, ff.
Seneca, a bishop of Italy, 598.
Serapion, monk, 690, 691.
Sermon, the, 316, 317.
Sermon on the mount, 576.
Severus, poem of, 12.
Severus, monophysite, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 554.
Silverius of Rome, 535—536.
Simeon, of Seleucia, 108, ff.
Simeon, the Stylite, 257, 258.
Simplicius, 84, 724.
Sirmium, council of, (A.D. 351,) 395. Synod at, (A.D. 357,) 404, 405.
Siricius of Rome, 275, 324, 684, 689, 714.
Socrates on the observance of feasts, 296.
State and church, 130, ff. Donatus, 195. Intermingling of the state, 345, 346.
Stephanus Gobarus, 555.
Strategius, 14, 708.
Study of the ancients, 55, ff. 150, 682, 693.
Sunday, observance of, 299—301.
Symmachus, 72, 73, 96, 97.
Synesius, 103, 148, 181, on Monasticism, 254. Platonism, 350, 702.

T.

Taprobane, (Ceylon,) 117.
Thalassius of Cæsarea, 510.
Themistius, 33, 68, 69, 70, 96.
Theodora, 533, ff.
Theodorus Ascidas, 536—539.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 106. Doctrine of inspiration, 352. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 422. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ. Cyrill intends his condemnation, 496, ff. Condemned, 536—547. Participation in the Pelagian controversy, 651—653. Anthropology, 653—657. Doctrine concerning baptism, 666, 667. Apocatastasis, 677, 678.
Theodoret, 465—523. Mother, 95, 112, 137, 143. Rome 166. Monasticism, 249. Worship of saints, 336. Interpretation of Scripture, 353. Doctrine of the Holy

Spirit, 422. His writings condemned, 536—548. Sacrament of the supper, 671, 672.
Theodosius the Great, 73—78, 142, 180, ff. 249, 414, 416.
Theodosius II. 134, 145, 146, 460, 467, ff. 514, 701.
Theodosius, the Monophysite, 524, 525.
Theognis of Nice, 378, 379.
Theognist, 713.
Theology, in the more restricted sense, 360—430.
Theological education, 149—151.
Theonas of Marmarica, 378.
Theophilus of Alexandria. In the Origenistic controversy, 689—700.
Theophilus the Indian, 116—118.
Thiven, synod at, (A.D. 536,) 553. Tichonius, 209, ff.
Timotheus Ailurus, 525, 526, 527.
Timotheus Salophaciolus, 526, 527, 528.
Titus of Bostra, 59.
Toledo, council of, (A.D. 400,) 717, 718. Council of, (A.D. 589.)
Trinity, doctrine of the, 360—430.
Tyre, synod at, (A.D. 335,) 383.

U.

Ulphilas, 125, ff. See Appendix. His Eunomianism—Appendix.
Ursacius of Singidinum, 404—409.
Ursinus, 221, 222.

V.

Valence, council of, 650.
Valens, emperor, 90, 142, 267, 412, 413.
Valens, monk, 239.
Valens of Mursa, 404, ff.
Valentinian I. 69, 136, 414, 423.
Valentinian II. 72, 73, 132.
Valentinian III. 173, 709.
Vandals, Arians, 424.
Varanes, 113, 734.
Vigilantius, 149, 277. Opposed to the worship of images, 337—339.
Vigilius of Rome, 535—549.
Victorinus, 57, 58.
Vincentius, from Lerina, commonitorium, 635, 636.
Vocatione, gentium liber de, 638—641, 184. In favor of the Roman primacy, 169.

W.

Western church, 166, 348—359. Anthropology of the, 558, 651.

Z.

Zeno, emperor, 135, 526, 527, 552.
Zeno of Verona, 284.
Zosimus, the pagan historian, 93.
Zosimus of Rome, 175. In the Pelagian controversy, 587—592.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 010 234 199 5

Kodak Gray Scale

A 1 2 3 4 5 6 **M** 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 **B** 17 18 19

© Kodak, 2007 TM: Kodak

Blue Cyan Green Yellow Red Magenta White 3/Color Black