

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

THE HISTORY
OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

by the same author

THE BIBLICAL HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE

LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES

TO AD 461

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON

42854

LONDON
GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD

Ruskin House Museum Street

First published in 1891

Second Edition 1898

Third Edition 1902

Fourth Edition 1905

Fifth Edition 1909

Sixth Edition 1914

*Reprinted 1924, 1942, 1947, 1951, 1954, 1957, 1962
and 1965*

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act 1956, no portion may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiry should be made to the publisher.

Printed in Great Britain

by Frank Juckes Ltd

Stratford Street North, Camp Hill, Birmingham 11

PREFACE.

I HAVE endeavoured to give completeness to my work by adding a further chapter on *Church Life in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*. The earlier chapters I have left unchanged save for the correction of a few press errors.

JESUS COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE,
July, 1914.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THIS work aims at presenting in a condensed form the principal facts in the growth and development of the Christian Church during the first three centuries. It has been thought advisable to sketch briefly the history of the Jews from the days of Ezra to the coming of the Christ, with the object of shewing how the events of that important but little known period contributed to the rapid diffusion of the Gospel. A few passing allusions to the life and work of our Saviour and His Apostles have been thought sufficient. A detailed account of our Lord's ministry and of the history related in the Acts of the Apostles would have involved the discussion of many important questions, exceeding in itself the limits of the present volume. I have nevertheless attempted to trace back all the more striking movements of the period under treatment to the Apostolic age; careful study of the New Testament being, I venture to suggest, an indispensable preliminary to the right understanding of the phenomena of the subsequent History of the Church. It has been my object as far as possible to acquaint the reader with the results of modern investigation in the field of Ecclesiastical History and Literature, and in the foot-notes his attention has been directed to several works easily accessible to all students.

I am indebted to the Rev. A. C. JENNINGS, Rector of King's Stanley, for revising the last six chapters with the utmost care, and for giving me the full benefit of his literary experience. My thanks are also due to the Rev. A. NAIRNE, Fellow of Jesus College, for many thoughtful suggestions.

JESUS COLLEGE,

CAMBRIDGE,

March, 1891.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

I HAVE now been able to do as promised when the Second Edition appeared in 1898, by substituting for the summary of events from A.D. 381 to A.D. 461 three chapters dealing more fully with this period. The whole work has been revised; and, instead of merely giving the contents of the chapters, I have endeavoured to introduce the reader to each of them by a brief outline of the subject of which it treats.

November, 1905.

PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION.

To this edition I have added a chapter on Christianity beyond the limits of the Roman Empire; and I have also made three Maps: one to illustrate the Arian controversy; one to indicate the places of ecclesiastical importance in Asia Minor; and a third, for the use of which I hereby express my gratitude to DOM CUTHBERT BUTLER, O.S.B., Abbot of Downside, and to the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, to illustrate monasticism in Egypt.

I must express my thanks to H. L. PASS, Esq., of St. John's College, for his notes on Aphraates and the Syrian Church; to the Rev. B. T. DEAN SMITH for making a new Index and verifying references; and to Mr. R. WALLIS for his care in reading the proofs.

JESUS COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE,

July, 1909.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PREPARATION OF THE WORLD FOR CHRISTIANITY.

B.C. 535—63.

The ruin of the ancient Judæan community resulted in a church-nation, a people reorganized on a purely religious basis. The Dispersion of Israel foreshadowed the Christian dispensation; the synagogues prepared the way for the churches. Under Hellenic influence the Jews began to draw more closely to Western ideas. They endeavoured to shew that their Scriptures had inspired the philosophers of Greece. The attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy their religion caused the Jews to revert to the Messianic hopes of the Prophets. This persecution introduced the idea of martyrdom: the sufferings of the martyrs increased the belief in a resurrection. Many fundamentally Christian ideas prevailed in the centuries immediately before Christ. The multiplication of sects and parties—Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes, etc.—testifies to the vitality of Judaism during this period. Proselytism, a new feature in Judaism, was both active and successful; though the Gentiles, whilst acknowledging the high moral teaching of the Jews, could not overcome their repugnance to Jewish life. The success of Jewish principles and the failure of Jewish ordinances to attract the heathen world testified to the need of a religion like Christianity. Greece and Rome both contributed to prepare the way for the Gospel, the one by philosophy, the other by the establishment of law and order.

pp. 1—14.

CHAPTER II.

THE TIMES OF THE CHRIST.

B.C. 66—A.D. 29.

The rise of the family of Herod on the ruins of the Asmonean dynasty, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the tragedies in the household of Herod the Great, were accompanied by a great revival of Messianic hopes. At his death Herod's dominions were partitioned among his sons, Judæa falling to Archelaus, who in A.D. 6 was deposed for misgovernment, and his territory incorporated into the Roman Empire and placed under a procurator. This caused the rebellion of Judas of Galilee and the rise of the Zelots, who refused to acknowledge any king but Jehovah. The hostility between Jew and Gentile had become more keen than ever when the Baptist delivered his message. Jesus Christ began His preaching in almost the same words as the Baptist, and His work was one of gradual self-revelation. He revealed the nature of His kingdom, then of His mission as the Christ, and lastly He declared His Divinity.

pp. 15—28.

CHAPTER III. THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES.

A.D. 29—96.

The Church, according to the Acts of the Apostles, began in Jerusalem as a purely Jewish institution, first under St. Peter, afterwards under James the Lord's brother. The Hellenistic Jews soon joined the infant Church, and developed a missionary spirit. The Gospel was preached throughout Syria, and the Gentiles began to seek admittance to the Church. The influence of the Church of Jerusalem seems to have waned somewhat after the persecution of Herod Agrippa I. Owing to the zeal of the Christians at Antioch, Barnabas and Paul were sent forth on their mission to Asia Minor. This is the real starting point of Gentile Christianity. St. Paul crossed into Europe, and the Acts of the Apostles ends with his arrival at Rome. By the close of the Apostolic age churches had been founded in most parts of the Empire, and legends assign to each of the Twelve Apostles spheres of work, some of which were in the remotest countries of the known world.

pp. 29—42.

CHAPTER IV. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT.

A.D. 14—156.

The Roman State, though naturally tolerant of ideas, could not endure an unauthorised religious society like the Church. As belonging to an illegal sect the Christians were liable to constant attacks owing to popular frenzy, often stimulated by the Jews. The government for a variety of reasons made no determined effort to stamp out Christianity during the earlier ages of the Church. The different emperors varied in their attitude towards the Christians. Nero persecuted to avert suspicion from himself; Domitian for domestic reasons. Trajan in his correspondence with Pliny regulated the procedure in regard to the Christians: Ignatius' memorable journey from Antioch to martyrdom at Rome took place under Trajan. Under Hadrian the Apologists for Christianity began to make their appearance; and in the reign of Antoninus, Polycarp, the last hearer of an Apostle, suffered at Smyrna.

pp. 43—62.

CHAPTER V. THE CONQUEST OF HEATHENISM BY CHRISTIANITY.

A.D. 161—313.

The virtues of Marcus Aurelius, his Stoicism and love of law, made him a persecutor; and he approved of the terrible martyrdoms of Lyons and Vienne. His profligate son Commodus left the Church in peace; but when order was restored after his death, Septimius Severus continued the persecution of the Church. During

the first half of the third century the Christians were left in comparative peace, and even encouraged; but Decius in A.D. 250 made a resolute attempt to suppress the Church. This was renewed under Valerian; but his successor Gallienus made Christianity a *religio licita*. A long period of peace preceded the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution, which continued, at least locally, down to the victory of Constantine over Maxentius near Rome. The first act of the conqueror was to issue the famous edict of Milan, giving the Christians complete liberty of conscience.

pp. 63—92.

CHAPTER VI.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

A.D. 70—154.

Theories resembling those of the old Tübingen School, which assigned a very late date to most of the New Testament, have now been generally abandoned. The idea of a sharp division between Jewish and Gentile Christians has also ceased to be regarded as even plausible. The New Testament, as a whole, is looked upon as a product of the first century; and the Apostolic Fathers are a sort of inferior sequel to it. The *Epistle of Barnabas* imitates somewhat unsuccessfully the allegorical methods found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* is a sort of Jewish Christian catechism, throwing much light on early church life. Clement is the author of a genuine Epistle from the Roman to the Corinthian church, and the same Father is credited with other writings. The letters of Ignatius, written on his journey from Antioch to Rome, where he was to suffer, shew the intensity of the spirit of martyrdom, and the growth of episcopacy. A great controversy has raged about their genuineness. Papias of Hierapolis and Polycarp of Smyrna represent the churches of Asia. The latter, as the pupil of St. John and the teacher of St. Irenaeus, is the link which binds the Church of the first age to that of the close of the second century. pp. 93—121.

CHAPTER VII.

ORIGIN AND PRINCIPLES OF GNOSTICISM.

A.D. 60—200.

Gnosticism was the attempt to mingle the religions and ideas of the East with Christianity. Its great underlying principle was the view that all that is material is evil. We see traces of Gnosticism in the New Testament. In some cases the Gnostic sects set all ideas of Christian morality at defiance. The Ophites were the first Gnostics—the followers of Basilides, Valentinus and Marcion were representatives of different tendencies of current thought. The Judaizing sects of Gnostics and Marcion's conflict with them are next dealt with. Gnosticism affected the Church by forcing its

teachers to formulate their views and determine their canon of Scripture. Justin, Tertullian, Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria all combated Gnosticism. The rise of the Manichaean heresy marked the close of the old Gnosticism and the beginning of a long conflict with the Catholic Church. pp. 122—152.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES.

A.D. 100—300.

In the early stages of religion God is thought of as personal, but as the ideas of the infinite and eternal gain ground He begins to be regarded as an abstraction. Then the notion of God being known by His Word or Wisdom develops. Jewish theology reached this point in Philo, and the Christians regarded the Incarnation as the supreme manifestation of the Word. From this starting point Christian Theology is traced through the *Letter to Diognetus*, Justin Martyr, Theophilus (the first to speak of a Trinity), Clement, and Origen. The opposite tendencies to those of the Church Fathers take different forms of Monarchianism. In the East, Sabellius and Paul of Samosata are typical Monarchians. In the West, the chief Monarchians were the two Theodoti, Praxeas and Noetus; their opponents were Tertullian and Novatian. The doctrines of human nature, the Holy Spirit, Redemption, Millenarianism and the Resurrection are next dealt with; but it is necessary to remember that the theology of this age was somewhat undeveloped and that it still awaited the time when it should be regularly formulated. pp. 153—179.

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS AND PHILOSOPHIES.

A.D. 100—300.

Christianity in many respects expressed the general tendencies of thought in the second and third centuries. There was a strong tendency towards Monotheism. This is seen in the worship of Serapis, and in the increasing attraction of Mithraism, the sacraments of which strangely resembled those of the Church. The Mysteries also expressed the desire of the age. Philosophy tended towards moral discipline; between Stoicism and Christianity there were seeming affinities, though at bottom there was a real difference. Neo-Platonism arose, and though it seemed to have many ideas in common with Christianity, the philosophers of this school became the bitterest foes of the Church. Nevertheless Neo-Platonism influenced the development of Christian theology. The Apologists are next alluded to as presenting the Christian attitude towards heathen thought. pp. 180—208.

CHAPTER X.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

A.D. 29—313.

The Church existed from the first, but its development was gradual. The earliest churches were small and widely scattered; the dangers of persecution and heresy tended to unite and organize them. The first churches were, perhaps, modelled on the synagogues; soon however Christian peculiarities became manifest. But, from a survey of the subject in the New Testament, the Apostolic Churches of Jerusalem, Corinth, Philippi, Ephesus, and Rome seem to have had different forms of government. In St. Clement's letter addressed to Corinth we notice a marked distinction between clergy and laity. In the days of Ignatius episcopacy existed at least in Asia; but by the close of the second century it was unquestionably universal. In the third century St. Cyprian formulated his views on the character of episcopacy. There were, however, attempts to restrain the growing power of the clerical order, and to these are due the rise of Montanism and Novatianism, as well as the dispute about Origen's right to teach. The Sacraments are treated of, and brief accounts of the Eucharist in St. Paul, the *Didache*, Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, are given. Then follows a sketch of the social side of Christian life.

pp. 209—242.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHURCHES OF ROME, CARTHAGE, AND ALEXANDRIA.

A.D. 54—313.

The remarkable position of the Roman church is due partly to the importance of the city, but also to the Apostolic origin of the see and to the virtues of the early Roman church. St. Paul's work in the church founded before his arrival at Rome, is described. Despite the silence of the New Testament, St. Peter's sojourn at Rome is unquestionable. The first bishops of Rome are obscure, but we have a letter from Clement "fourth from the Apostles". Christianity soon made its way into the imperial family, and some of Domitian's relatives suffered for professing it. The letter of Ignatius to the Romans, and the visit of Polycarp to Rome during the Paschal controversy, attest the importance of the church. The story of Hippolytus and Callistus reveals to us the social condition of Christians at Rome. The Decian persecution shews the nobler side, several successive popes being martyrs. The last part of the third century, so far as the Roman church is concerned, is somewhat obscure, except for the action of Pope Dionysius, A.D. 259—269.

The African Church had no apostolic founder and its origin is unknown; but no church produced grander examples of Christian constancy. Tertullian, a type of the sternest form of African Christianity, joined the Montanists because he was dissatisfied with the lenity of the Catholic Church. Cyprian, who albeit a Catholic was an admirer of Tertullian, guided the church of Carthage through the perils of the Decian persecution and exalted the claims of episcopacy. He had a controversy with Pope Stephen on the question of rebaptism.

The Alexandrian church was the meeting place of the culture of the East and West, the home of Christian philosophy. Its early constitution of a bishop and twelve presbyters, who elected and consecrated their leader, is peculiar. Its chief centre of interest was the Catechetical School with its great teachers, Pantænus, Clement, and Origen. The career of Origen, his youth, his teaching, his travels, his persecutions, and his critical labours, is traced. He was the founder of the School of Antioch, the rival of Alexandria.

pp. 243—278.

CHAPTER XII.

CONSTANTINE IN THE WEST. THE EMPIRE AND THE CHURCH.

A.D. 313—323.

The victory of Constantine over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge was regarded as a Christian triumph and connected with a Divine vision. It was followed by the edict of Milan. Constantine's policy towards the Church was marked by caution. He introduced Christian ideas under the cover of much official paganism, and his words and actions were studiously ambiguous. His legislation, however, bears unmistakable traces of Christian influence. His chief Christian adviser at this time was Hosius, bishop of Cordova in Spain. His first difficulty in connection with Christianity was the Donatist schism in Africa, arising out of the consecration of Caecilian as bishop of Carthage, by Felix, an alleged *traitor* in the Diocletian persecution. The case was tried at Rome and at Arles, and Caecilian's consecration pronounced valid. But his opponents would not listen to reason, and under Donatus they formed a formidable schism. In 323 Constantine overthrew his last rival Licinius and became master of the whole Empire.

pp. 279—296.

CHAPTER XIII.

ARIANISM AND THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA.

A.D. 318—337.

In the East a dispute between Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and the priest Arius, led to serious consequences. Arius

accused Alexander of Sabellianism, and propounded a theory that Christ, though God, was not God in the same sense as God the Father. Arius appealed to his fellow students of the School of Lucian; and finally Alexander excommunicated him. Constantine called the council of Nicaea to settle the question. Arius and his heresy were at once condemned; but the party of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, wanted a more indefinite creed than that proposed by Alexander and his friends. In the end the Alexandrians induced the Council to accept their creed. Athanasius, the deacon, became bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 328. The friends of Eusebius tried to discredit him, and managed to have him banished and Arius recalled. Arius however died on the day appointed for his restoration to the Church. At Rome, just after the council, Constantine had great trouble owing to dissensions in his own family, and his son Crispus was executed. To this period belongs the story of the Donation to pope Silvester, on which the papal claims to temporal dominion were based. After the visit to Rome, St. Helena, mother of Constantine, discovered the Holy Places at Jerusalem. Constantine was not baptized till just before his death in A.D. 337. pp. 297—327.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

A.D. 337—361.

Constantius believed that he could unite the Church if the Creed of Nicaea and the *homöousion* formulary were set aside. This was at first the view of the so-called 'Conservatives' headed by Eusebius of Caesarea. The Eusebians, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, were resolved to introduce Arianism, whilst the 'Conservatives' were at heart orthodox, but disliked Athanasius. So the two parties combined at Antioch to get rid of the *homöousion* and Athanasius. Julian, bishop of Rome, when appealed to, supported Athanasius, and so did the emperor Constans, brother to Constantius. Athanasius, who had returned on the death of Constantine, had been again banished from his see, but was restored by the Council of Sardica A.D. 343 and returned in A.D. 346. Then followed a period of tranquillity, during which the Arians gathered strength by attacking the allies of Athanasius. When Constantius, on the death of Magnentius, became master of the West he forced the bishops to renounce Athanasius and finally drove him from Alexandria in A.D. 356. The Arians then put forward a succession of creeds at Sirmium; and finally forced the Western bishops at Ariminum, and the Eastern at Seleucia, to subscribe to an Arian creed drawn up at Nicé in Thrace. The death of Constantius caused the controversy to cease for a time.

pp. 328—350.

CHAPTER XV.

JULIAN AND THE PAGAN REACTION.

A.D. 361—363.

Julian and his elder brother Gallus were the sole survivors of the family of Constantine, whom the soldiers slew in A.D. 337, when Constantine II., Constans, and Constantius were made emperors. They were educated by Constantius and trained in the Christian discipline. Julian was even ordained a 'Reader'. Gallus in A.D. 351 was associated in the Empire and made Caesar. His misgovernment ended in his being summoned to Constantius, and being executed in a treacherous manner. Julian in the meantime had long been secretly attached to the ancient religion. He was summoned to Milan by Constantius after his brother's death, and shortly afterwards allowed to study at Athens. In A.D. 354 he was declared Caesar and sent to Gaul. He won great fame as a soldier; and when his troops were ordered to the East they rebelled and proclaimed him Augustus. Julian then openly professed heathenism and marched against Constantius; but the death of that emperor prevented a civil war. Julian's short reign was an attempt to revive Paganism and to debase Christianity without persecuting its professors. It was a brilliant but complete failure. In A.D. 363 Julian was killed in battle. pp. 351—374.

CHAPTER XVI.

CONCLUSION OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY IN THE EMPIRE.

A.D. 363—381.

On the death of Constantius the Western Church reverted to the Nicene Creed, mainly owing to Athanasius' wise action on his return to Alexandria. Antioch also, despite a serious schism, favoured orthodoxy. Jovian, Julian's Christian successor, was followed by the impartial Valentinian in the West, and Valens, who favoured the *Homoean* Arian, in the East. Great influence was exercised by the Cappadocian Fathers—Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus—on the side of orthodoxy, and, despite the imperial displeasure, the Creed of Nicaea was daily gaining ground. New heresies were arising as to the divinity of the Holy Spirit and the Godhead and Manhood in our Lord. After the defeat and death of Valens at Adrianople there was no further question as to the triumph of Nicene doctrine; and at the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381 the Nicene Creed became the creed of the Empire.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE REIGN OF THEODOSIUS AND THE FALL OF PAGANISM.

A.D. 381—395.

With the close of the Second General Council the Creed of Nicaea became the sole legal religion in the Roman empire.

Arianism, proscribed by law, made its home among the Teutonic nations. The old religions began to totter to their fall, as the destruction of the Serapeum at Alexandria and of the heathen shrines in Gaul testified. The rigid enforcement of the new laws against heresy in the case of Priscillian in Spain shocked the Christian conscience, but foreshadowed the days of persecution. Rome was at the height of its prestige as the holy city of antiquity; but even there the old faith received a shock. St. Ambrose at Milan influenced Gratian to decline the office of Pontifex Maximus, and made Valentinian II. refuse to restore 'Victory' to the Senate House. Rome, under the fostering care of Pope Damasus, became a centre of Christian reverence. Ambrose in the meantime resisted the Empress Justina's attempt to obtain recognition for Arianism at Milan, and exercised great influence over Theodosius when that emperor came to Italy. By the close of the fourth century the foundations of mediæval Christianity were laid. pp. 398—433.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE EASTERN CHURCH AND THE THIRD AND FOURTH GENERAL COUNCILS.

A.D. 395—452.

The Empire in theory remained united, but was practically divided by the descendants of Theodosius into East and West. Arcadius in Constantinople was the tool of ambitious favourites. The career of Synesius is an example alike of the state of transition in thought, and of the miseries of the provinces. The story of Chrysostom's patriarchate at Constantinople shews the dissoluteness of the capital, the jealousy of Alexandria, and the power of the Emperor. This saint is a true sufferer for righteousness. The controversy about the two Natures of our Lord is traced from Apollinarius, who maintained practically one Nature in Christ, the Divine. The School of Antioch laid undue stress on the Human side of our Lord, but they were not challenged till Nestorius allowed the title *Theotokos* to be refused to the Blessed Virgin. This was the signal for controversy. Cyril of Alexandria obtained the condemnation of Nestorius at Ephesus, and then came to terms with the Antiochene theologians. His successor, Dioscorus, managed to secure the support of Theodosius II., and finally, when Eutyches was accused of Monophysitism, obtained his acquittal at the 'Latrocinium' of Ephesus. On the death of Theodosius, Marcian and Pulcheria supported Leo, whose 'Tome' was accepted at Chalcedon, and the Egyptian church was gradually alienated from that of the Empire. pp. 434—476.

Supplementary Note on "The Christological Controversy and Modern Thought." pp. 476—478.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE WESTERN CHURCH.

A.D. 400—461.

The Latin aptitude for organization and government saved the Church whilst the Western Empire crumbled to pieces. In the fifth century the Western Church took the form which continued to exist for more than a thousand years. The three great factors in moulding it were (1) Jerome, the scholar, who produced the Vulgate; (2) Augustine, the theologian, who gave (a) an impulse to piety by his *Confessions*, (b) a theory of the Church in his conflict with Donatism, (c) a theory of Grace in his refutations of Pelagianism, (d) an ideal of government in his *City of God*; (3) the Church of Rome with her great Popes, Innocent and Leo the Great. Leo established his supremacy over Gaul, in the case of Hilary of Arles and Celidonius, as well as over Illyricum, Italy, Sicily and Spain. He is said to have saved Italy by his boldness in confronting Attila, and to have mitigated the horrors of the sack of Rome by Gaiseric. He was less fortunate in his interference with the affairs of the East; though at Chalcedon he gave the creed to Christendom. The greatness of his work lay in consolidating Roman Christianity during the fall of Roman domination in the Western Empire.

pp. 479—541.

CHAPTER XX.

ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCHES OUTSIDE
THE EMPIRE.

Syrian Christianity implies the Church extending from the neighbourhood of Antioch to the Persian Gulf. Its chief home was Edessa: its origin the conversion of Abgar the Black, A.D. 50. The Syriac Versions are numerous and interesting. For a long time the *Diatessaron* of Tatian was used in place of the four Gospels. Most of the country of Syrian Christianity was within the empire of Persia. In *Persia* the Faith was encountered by the Zoroastrian religion, and many Christians endured martyrdom. The *Armenian* is the first national church. Founded by St. Gregory the Illuminator, it bravely withstood the Persian fire worshippers, and is still in existence. The Christianity of the neighbouring country of *Iberia or Georgia* was introduced by the captive maiden St. Nina, a kinswoman of St. George. The *Ethiopian* church was founded in the days of St. Athanasius by Frumentius and Edesius. It continues as the native church of Abyssinia (Habesh), which has preserved the Book of Enoch. The *Teutonic* peoples were as a rule Arians. Their great missionary was Ulfilas, the translator of

the Bible into Gothic. *Ireland* was converted by Papal missionaries. Its first bishop was Palladius, and he was succeeded by Patrick, a Briton who had been taken captive to Ireland and was educated at Lerinum and Auxerre. Patrick landed near Wicklow A.D. 433, and about 441—3 was made Archbishop of Armagh. St. Ninian was the apostle of the northern *Picts*. pp. 542—566

CHAPTER XXI.

CHURCH LIFE IN THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES.

After the Edict of Milan the Christian Church ceased to be a persecuted society and entered upon a new career under the ægis of the Empire. The rapidity of its increase during the next few centuries is phenomenal, and would have been, humanly speaking, impossible but for its complete and elaborate organization. This followed geographically the same lines as the imperial system. The great capitals became the leading metropolitan churches, and their patriarchs corresponded to the chief officials of the Empire. Rome for a long time produced no great bishop; but, nevertheless, the See constantly advanced in influence and in the estimation of other churches. Alexandria ruled all Egypt, and the power of its bishop extended to Æthiopia. Antioch was regarded as the chief spiritual authority, not only in Syria but throughout the East. Constantinople, as New Rome, gradually won the second place and ranked next to the Apostolic See. The dioceses in many places were very extensive, the bishops being assisted by *Chorepiscopi* or county bishops. The functions of the priests varied in different places: at Rome and elsewhere only the bishop preached. The deacons occupied an important place. The minor orders were early in existence, and the ministry of women, though differing in places, was fully recognised. The legality of the marriage of the clergy was recognised, but not universally. Councils were the legislative and disciplinary courts of the Church.

The church buildings are described, especially those of the basilican type. Their decorations were lavish. The Sacrament of Baptism was administered with much striking symbolism—for example at Jerusalem, according to the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril, who also describes the Eucharistic Service. Preaching was very popular in the fourth century and reached a very high standard of excellence. The penitential discipline of the Church, the holy days, Christian charities, etc., are next treated. The passion for relics, the desire to visit holy places, and the survival of heathen customs under Christian forms, attest the waning spirituality of the Faith. Nevertheless, the Fathers drew a wise distinction between essentials and non-essentials. The Monastic

movement supplied an outlet for Christian zeal when the days of persecution were ended. Cenobitic life tended to curb its early extravagances, and made it the tremendous force which it ultimately became. pp. 567—588.

APPENDIX A.

ON THE OPHITES, BASILIDES AND VALENTINUS.

pp. 589—595.

APPENDIX B.

ROMAN CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

(By the Rev. A. C. JENNINGS, M.A., Rector of King's Stanley.)

The Catacombs and Early Monuments.

pp. 596—616.

INDEX.

pp. 617—648.



DATES OF IMPORTANT EVENTS, ETC.

- B.C. 535—336 JEWS under Persian domination.
 „ 333—175 Jews under Greek domination.
 „ 175—135 The age of the Maccabees.
 „ 161—144 Jonathan, high priest.
 „ 144—135 Simon, high priest.
 „ 135—106 John Hyrcanus, high priest and ethnarch.
 Book of Enoch.
 „ 106—77 Alexander Jannaeus, high priest and king of Judaea.
 „ 77—65 Hyrcanus II.
 „ 63 Pompey takes Jerusalem.
 „ 47 Herod appointed Governor of Galilee.
 „ 40 Herod King of Judaea.
 „ 34 Herod makes Aristobulus high priest.
 „ 31 Battle of Actium.
 „ 29 Death of Mariamne.
 „ 14 Herod rebuilds the Temple.
 „ 8 Herod's sons by Mariamne executed.
 „ 5 (*circa*) BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST.
 „ 4 Death of Herod.
 A.D. 6 Deposition of Archelaus, ethnarch of Judaea.
 „ 7 Rebellion of Judas of Galilee.
 „ 26 Pontius Pilate Procurator of Judaea.
 „ 29 (*circa*) THE CRUCIFIXION AND RESURRECTION.
 „ 41 Herod Agrippa I. king of Judaea.
 „ 44 Death of Herod Agrippa.
 „ 54 St. Paul at Corinth. Jews expelled from Rome.
 „ 57 Pomponia Graecina accused of practising foreign superstition.
 „ 58 St. Paul writes to the Romans.
 „ 63 St. Paul at Rome. Epistle to the Philippians.
 „ 64 Fire at Rome. Persecution by Nero.
 „ 68 St. Peter and St. Paul martyred in Rome.
 „ 70 Destruction of Jerusalem.
 „ 83 Death of Pomponia Graecina.
 „ 96 Clement of Rome writes to the Corinthians. Flavius Clemens
 (Consul A.D. 95) executed, and Flavia Domitilla banished.
 „ 100 Cerinthus (Judaizing Gnostic).
 „ 110 Pliny's Letter to Trajan. Martyrdom of Ignatius.
 „ 115 Jews of Cyrene cause disturbances.
 „ 117 Letter to Diognetus.
 „ 120 Papias bishop of Hierapolis.
 „ 130 (*circa*) Montanus in Phrygia. Basilides.
 „ 130 (*circa*) Shepherd of Hermas. Pius I. bishop of Rome.
 „ 133 Hadrian at Athens. *Apologies* of Quadratus and Aristides.
 „ 135 Suppression of the revolt of Barcochab. Jerusalem called *Aelia*
 Capitolina.
 „ 138 Justin Martyr's *First Apology*.
 „ 139 (*circa*) Marcion at Rome. Valentinus at Rome.

- A. D. 154 Polycarp at Rome.
- " 156 Polycarp martyred at Smyrna.
- " 165 Justin martyred at Rome.
- " 166 The *Annus Calamitosus*. Plague at Rome.
- " 171 Theophilus bishop of Antioch.
- " 174 The war against the Quadi. "The Thundering Legion."
- " 177 Persecution at Lyons and Vienne.
- " 180 Persecution at Madaura in Africa.
- " 182 Irenaeus bishop of Lyons.
- " 193 Empire sold by auction to Didius Julianus.
- " 196 (*circa*) Praxeas at Rome. Montanists excommunicated by Victor.
- " 200 (*circa*) Clement of Alexandria.
- " 202 Law of Septimius Severus forbidding persons "*Judaeos fieri*".
Monarchian disputes at Rome. Tertullian becomes a
Montanist. Martyrdom of Perpetua and her companions.
- " 219 Heliogabalus brings the idol of Emesa to Rome. Callistus
bishop of Rome.
- " 220 (*circa*) Hippolytus writes the *Philosophumena*.
- " 231 Origen ordained a presbyter in Syria.
- " 236 Hippolytus banished to Sardinia.
- " 244 Beryllus of Bostra retracts his erroneous views of the Trinity.
- " 247 Dionysius bishop of Alexandria.
- " 248 Cyprian bishop of Carthage.
- " 250 Persecution by Decius.
- " 251 Novatian made bishop of Rome in opposition to Cornelius.
- " 257 Edict of Valerian against the Christians.
- " 258 Martyrdom of Cyprian.
- " 260 Gallienus makes Christianity a *religio licita*.
- " 269 Synod to condemn Paul of Samosata.
- " 276 Manes the heresiarch flayed alive by order of Persian king.
- " 284 Accession of Diocletian.
- " 303 Persecution under Diocletian. First three edicts.
- " 304 Fourth edict. Illness of Diocletian.
- " 308 Severe persecution under Galerius.
- " 310 Edict of Toleration by Galerius.
- " 311 Maximin persecutes in Syria.
- " 312 Battle of the Milvian Bridge.
- " 313 Defeat of Maximin by Licinius. Edict of Milan.
- " 314 Synod of Arles.
- " 316 Constantine pronounces sentence against the Donatists.
- " 318 Outbreak of the Arian dispute at Alexandria.
- " 321 Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, excommunicates Arius.
- " 321 Constantine grants the Donatists freedom of conscience.
- " " The *Dies Venerabilis Solis* to be observed as a holiday.
- " 323 Final defeat of Licinius. Constantine sole emperor.
- " 325 Council of Nicaea.
- " 326 Death of Crispus.
- " 327 Helena's visit to the Holy Land.
- " 330 Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, deprived.
- " 334 Constantinople completed.
- " 335 Synod of Tyre.
- " 336 Athanasius banished to Trèves. Death of Arius.
- " 337 Death of Constantine.
- " 339 Athanasius goes to Rome.

- A. D. 341 Council of the Dedication, at Antioch.
 „ 343 Councils of Sardica and Philippopolis.
 „ 344 Deposition of Stephen, bishop of Antioch.
 „ 346 Return of Athanasius to Alexandria.
 „ 350 Revolt of Magnentius. Death of Constans.
 „ 351 Photinus condemned at Sirmium.
 „ „ Defeat of Magnentius at Mursa.
 „ 355 Councils at Milan. Constantius visits Rome.
 „ 356 Expulsion of Athanasius from Alexandria.
 „ 359 Arian triumphs at Ariminum and Seleucia.
 „ 360 *Homœan* Synod at Constantinople.
 „ 361 Death of Constantius.
 „ 362 Julian at Antioch.
 „ 363 Death of Julian.
 „ 365 Revolt of Procopius.
 „ 366 Semi-Arians approach Liberius.
 „ 370 Election of Basil to See of Caesarea in Cappadocia.
 „ 373 Death of Athanasius.
 „ 374 Ambrose bishop of Milan.
 „ 378 Defeat and death of Valens at Adrianople.
 „ 379 Theodosius *Augustus* in the East.
 „ 381 Second General Council at Constantinople.
 „ 383 Death of Gratian.
 „ 385 Troubles between Ambrose and Justina at Milan.
 „ 387 The imperial statues thrown down at Antioch.
 „ „ Conversion of St. Augustine.
 „ 388 Destruction of the Serapeum.
 „ 390 Massacre of Thessalonica.
 „ 392 Death of Valentinian II. Usurpation of Eugenius.
 „ 395 Death of Theodosius.
 „ 398 John Chrysostom bishop of Constantinople.
 „ 404 Exile of Chrysostom.
 „ 410 Rome taken by Alaric.
 „ 415 Synod of Diospolis.
 „ 417 Pelagianism condemned.
 „ 428 Nestorius bishop of Constantinople.
 „ „ Vandals invade Africa.
 „ 430 Death of Augustine.
 „ 431 Third General Council, at Ephesus.
 „ 439 Carthage taken by Gaiseric.
 „ 440 Leo elected Pope.
 „ 444 Death of Cyril of Alexandria.
 „ 449 The *Latrocinium* at Ephesus.
 „ 450 Death of Theodosius II. Pulcheria marries Marcian.
 „ 451 Battle of the Catalaunian Fields (Châlons).
 „ „ Fourth General Council, at Chalcedon.
 „ 455 Rome sacked by Gaiseric.
 „ 461 Death of Leo the Great.

CONTEMPORARY EMPERORS AND BISHOPS OF ROME.

A.D.	EMPERORS.	BISHOPS.
14	Tiberius	
37	Caius (Caligula)	
41	Claudius	
54	Nero	St. Peter and St. Paul in
68	Galba	Rome.
69	Otho	Linus
„	Vitellius	} <i>precise dates uncertain.</i>
„	Vespasian	
79	Titus	
81	Domitian	
96	Nerva	Clement
98	Trajan	Euarestus
		Alexander
		Sixtus I.
117	Hadrian	Telesphorus
		Hyginus
138	Antoninus Pius	Pius I.
		Anicetus
161	Marcus Aurelius	Soter
		Eleutherus
180	Commodus	A.D.
193	Pertinax	190 Victor
„	Didius Julianus	
„	Septimius Severus	198 Zephyrinus
211	Geta and Caracalla	
217	Macrinus	
218	Heliogabalus	219 Callistus I.
222	Alexander Severus	223 Urban I.
		230 Pontianus
235	Maximin the Thracian	235 Anteros
237	Two Gordians	236 Fabian
238	Gordianus III.	
244	Philip the Arabian	
249	Decius	
251	Gallus	251 Cornelius
252	Volusianus	252 Lucius
253	Aemilianus	253 Stephen
„	Valerian and Gallienus	257 Sixtus II.
260	Gallienus	259 Dionysius
268	Claudius II.	269 Felix I.
270	Aurelian	
275	Tacitus	275 Eutychianus
276	Probus	

XXIV CONTEMPORARY EMPERORS AND BISHOPS OF ROME.

A. D. EMPERORS.		A. D. BISHOPS.	
282	Carus		
283	Carinus and Numerian.....	283	Caius
284	Diocletian alone		
286	Diocletian and Maximian		
292	{ Diocletian and Maximian, <i>Augusti</i> Constantius and Galerius, <i>Caesars</i> }	296	Marcellinus I.
305	{ Constantius and Galerius, <i>Augusti</i> Severus and Maximin Daza, <i>Caesars</i> }	304—308	<i>See vacant.</i>
	Constantine, <i>Caesar</i> 306		
	Galerius, Maximin Daza, }	{ 308	Marcellus I.
307	{ Constantine, Licinius (Maximin, Maxentius) }	{ 310	Eusebius
		{ 311	Miltiades
313	Constantine and Licinius	314	Silvester
323	Constantine alone		
337	{ Constantine II. (337—340) Constans (337—350) Constantius }	{ 336	Marcus
		{ 337	Julius
350	{ Constantius alone (350—361) with Gallus, <i>Caesar</i> (351—354) with Julian, <i>Caesar</i> (354—361) }	{ 352	Liberius (Felix, <i>anti-pope</i>)
361	Julian		
363	Jovian.....		
[Empire divided]			
A. D.	WEST.	A. D.	EAST.
364	Valentinian I.	364	Valens.....
		366	Damasus " (Ursicinus, <i>anti-pope</i>)
375	{ Gratian (375—383) Valentinian II. (375—392) }		
 379	Theodosius I....	
	[Theodosius sole Emperor 392—395.]		
395	Honorius	395	Arcadius
		408	Theodosius II..
		417	Zosimus
		418	Boniface I. (Eulalius, <i>anti-pope</i>)
		"	
424	Valentinian III.	422	Celestine I.
		432	Sixtus III.
		440	Leo I.
		450	Pulcheria and Marcian
455	Maximus.....		
457	Majorian	457	Leo I., the Thracian
461	Libius Severus	461	Hilarus
	[Ricimer, without the title]		
467	Anthemius	468	Simplicius
472	Olybrius.....		
473	Glycerius		
474	Julius Nepos.....	474	Leo III., the Younger
475	Romulus	475	Zeno the Isaurian
	Augustulus		

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY.

BEFORE entering upon the history of the Christian Church it is necessary to enquire how it came to pass that such an institution became possible. For, while recognising the special work of God's providence in the planting of Christianity upon earth, we are equally bound to admit that He employs natural means for the furtherance of His purpose. The Apostle is writing with historical accuracy when he tells the Galatians that "when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son";¹ and, humanly speaking, it is difficult for us to imagine that Christianity could have made rapid progress at any earlier period of the history of mankind. The constitution of primitive society would have been an insuperable bar to the preaching of the gospel; nor could a universal religion have had any attractions so long as the ancient ideas of national cults and tribal gods retained their hold on the imaginations of men. Before the civilized world could be prepared to receive Christianity, it was necessary that the narrow and exclusive spirit which is so greatly fostered in small nationalities should be on the wane, and that a general desire should arise among men to acknowledge the

existence of One Supreme God. If Christ therefore came in the fulness of the times, we may naturally expect to find that in the countries where His religion made most progress the belief in one God had become wide-spread, and that the barriers which existed between men had begun to be weakened.

The work of proclaiming the unity of God fell almost entirely to the share of Israel, though, as we shall see in the course of our studies, the trend of pagan thought was already in the direction of Monotheism. God's chosen people have however been justly regarded as the great religious teachers of humanity, and their history is almost entirely occupied by the record of the development of their religious consciousness under His fostering care. At a comparatively early period the Israelite teachers had grasped the doctrine of the absolute unity of God. In the Old Testament the conception of the nature of Jehovah is found to be ever increasing in sublimity. At first, His worshippers seem to have regarded Him as a powerful protector of the nation; then as the only God Whom an Israelite might lawfully worship; and finally as the only true God of all the world, Whom all people would eventually be brought to acknowledge.¹ In this way the sublime notion of a Messianic king was developed with increasing strength in the minds of Israel's teachers, till it culminated in the Divine predictions of the Evangelical Prophet,

1. See my *Biblical History of the Hebrews*, chaps. v., ix. and x. The exact time at which the religion of Israel became monotheistic is doubtful, but there can be no question that by the time of Amos (B.C. 750) the prophets acknowledged Jehovah as the God of all nations, cf. Amos ix. 6, 7; but, as has been shewn, the earliest of the literary prophets "were confident that they were continuators of the teaching of men like themselves." Robertson, *The Early Religion of Israel*, p. 72. Even Wellhausen admits that in the days of the monarchy "The relation of Jehovah to people and kingdom remained firm as a rock: even to the worst idolators he was the God of Israel." The passages which seem to indicate that in early times a low conception of Jehovah prevailed in Israel, are the outlaw Jephthah's words to the king of Ammon in which Jehovah and Chemosh are mentioned together (Judges xi. 24), and the words which David complains that his enemies used when they drove him from the heritage of Jehovah saying "Go, serve other gods". (I Samuel xxvi. 19.) See Robertson-Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 74, where he denies the natural tendency of the Semitic religion towards monotheism, and declares that the prophets of Israel maintained an ethical standard in regard to Jehovah foreign alike to Semitic and to Aryan tradition

whose utterances form the conclusion of the Book of Isaiah.¹ The hopes of ancient Israel were greatly checked by the calamities which befell it, and after the return from captivity the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah forced the energies of the nation into a new channel by reorganizing the community on a purely religious basis.

The Jews under Persian rule. B.C. 535—336. For two centuries, if we except the personal memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews had no history. But this period of silence was also a period of activity.² The ancient religion of Israel was replaced by Judaism. When the voice of prophecy ceased, the people turned for guidance to the written Word. The Law of Moses took the place of the Ark of the Covenant, the scribe that of the priest with Urim and Thummim.³ Though the sacerdotal order continued to exercise its functions, it was from the rabbi that the people sought for guidance. Many of the characteristic traits of the modern Jew—his patience, his zeal for the Law, and his tenacity of purpose—began to appear under the new régime. The Holy Land was no longer the sole dwelling-place of the chosen race. Only a few had been persuaded to return; a rich and influential part of the community remained in Babylon, and the descendants of those fugitive Jews who had taken refuge in Egypt as early as the days of Jeremiah⁴ no doubt still existed in that country. This was the beginning of the Diaspora or dispersion of the Jews, which played such an important part in the early progress of the Gospel. Of even greater significance as an epoch in religious history was the erection of the first synagogue.⁵ The essentials of the

1. Isaiah xl.—lxvi.

2. Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, ch. i.

3. Jer. iii. 16. Ezra ii. 63. Neh. vii. 65. The veneration with which the High Priest was regarded after the Captivity is however illustrated in the description of Simon the Just, Eccclus. l.

4. Jer. xli. 17. See, however, Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, vol. i. The *Assuan Papyri* published by Mr. Mond reveal the presence of a Jewish colony in Egypt as early as B.C. 471. The documents are precisely dated.

5. The date of the institution of the synagogue worship is unknown. Ps. lxxiv. speaks of 'meeting-places of God' (R.V. and A.V. 'synagogues') מִקְוֵי אֱלֹהִים (v. 8); but the date of this psalm is uncertain. Synagogues are not

ancient worship of Israel—the holy spot, the altar and the sacrifice—had no place in the new assembly, where men might meet to worship the God of their fathers outside the limits of the Holy Land without a sanctuary or priesthood. In this way it became possible for the religion of Israel to exist throughout the world, and men became familiarised with the idea of a faith forming a bond of brotherhood. When Israel ceased to be a nation it became a church, the limits of which were not defined by the boundaries of a small territory, but by the words of a revealed law and by a common faith. Thus in the

Israel during
the Grecian
supremacy.
B.C. 333—175.

silence of the Persian period, Israel was being prepared for a more active sphere of work under the Macedonian conquerors of Western Asia; the dispersion, which had hitherto been directed eastward, now taking a westward course. In addition to Jerusalem and Babylon, Alexandria, founded by Alexander in B.C. 332, became the third great centre of Judaism. The foundation of this city, which still continues to be the chief link binding together East and West, marks the commencement of a new phase of human life. Three peoples most different in character were assembled in one city which the genius of the Macedonian conqueror had chosen for the trading capital of his empire. The Egyptian, the Jew, and the Greek became fellow citizens of Alexandria, and the influence of each nation was felt by the other two. It was here that the Jews first studied the philosophy of Greece and translated their Scriptures from the ancient Hebrew. More liberal ideas than had hitherto been possible began to prevail, and the leading Jewish teachers hastened to recognise that the wisdom of the heathen was illumined by many divine truths. The national pride of the Jewish doctors, as well as their consciousness that all truth must be a revelation of the One True God, led them to endeavour to prove that the great philosophers of Hellas had borrowed from the

in any way prominent in the history of the struggle under the Maccabees. We can only infer that meetings of Jews for the purpose of study of the Law and worship existed from the time of the Captivity and even earlier. (Ezek. viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1, xxxiii. 31.) In N. T. times the synagogue was well known as an ancient institution, Acts xv. 21.

teachings of the Hebrew prophets, and that the real master of such teachers as Pythagoras and Plato was the great lawgiver Moses.¹ Nor did Jewish theologians disdain to use the language of Greek philosophy to express their views concerning the nature and being of God. It seemed at first as though there would be harmony between two nations so utterly different in temperament as the Hellenic and the Jewish. The Greeks were not at first repelled by their contact with Judaism. Alexander treated the Jews with great favour, and the Ptolemies and Seleucidae agreed in their policy of granting privileges to the nation.² The widely accepted legend that the Sacred Books of the Hebrews were translated at the instigation of Ptolemy Philadelphus is an example of the interest the Greeks felt in the religion of their fellow settlers in Alexandria.

The story of the translation of the Septuagint, as the Greek version of the Scriptures was termed, related in a supposed letter from a Greek named Aristeas to his friend Philocrates,³ is an example of the eagerness with which the Alexandrian Jews sought to prove the honour in which their sacred books were held by the first Greek kings of Egypt; and a literature of forgeries rapidly grew up with the object of shewing that the most revered teachers of antiquity were imbued with the spirit of the Hebrew sages. The venerable names of Orpheus and of the mysterious Sibyls were attached to hymns and oracles designed to glorify Judaism in the eyes of the Greeks; and literary frauds of this description were for a considerable time practised at

1. Hermippus (B.C. 200) traced some of the doctrines of Pythagoras to Jewish sources, Josephus *c. Apionem* i. 22. Aristobulus, who is quoted by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* and by Clement of Alexandria in a commentary on the Pentateuch addressed to Ptolemy Philometor, maintains that Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato all followed Moses in his teaching about the word of God. See esp. *Praep. Ev.* XIII. 12.

2. For Alexander's visit to Jerusalem see Josephus, *Ant.* xi. viii. 4, 5. He allowed the Jews to enlist in the army and yet obey their own laws. For Seleucus Nicator and Antiochus the Great, see *Jos. Antiq.* XII. iii., and for Ptolemy Philadelphus, *Jos. Antiq.* XII. ii. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, and art. 'Israel and Greece', *Interpreter*, July, 1907.

3. The letter is printed separately in Havercamp's edition of Josephus. See also Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 519.

Alexandria by Jews and Christians alike.¹ Not without significance also was the attempt to make a Holy Land in Egypt itself. Onias, the son of the High Priest of that name, fled to Egypt after the murder of his father, B.C. 171, when the High Priesthood was usurped by the unscrupulous Menelaus. Onias rendered important services to Ptolemy Philometer in his war with his brother Physcon, and was created Ethnarch of the Jews of Alexandria. Ptolemy at his request granted to Onias the temple at Leontopolis in the Heliopolitan nome. As Onias was undoubtedly the legal High Priest, we have the remarkable example of a temple built in defiance of the Law served by High Priests of the purest descent; and this anomaly continued down to the time of the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem.²

The peaceful relations between the Jews and Greeks of Alexandria are in marked contrast with the bitter feuds which distracted the Holy Land. The glorious High Priesthood of Simon the Just, B.C. 270, closed a period of tranquillity. Of this great man history is comparatively silent, but as Grätz truly remarks, "It is always a favourable testimony to an historical personage when tradition gives her voice in his favour." The author of *Ecclesiasticus* describes in poetical language with all the richness of Oriental imagery the appearance of Simon when he officiated in the Temple. His practical wisdom is evidenced by the improvements he carried out at Jerusalem; and his recorded sayings give us a high idea of the largeness of his mind and the generosity of his sentiments.³ With him ends the

1. See Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, bk. I. ch. 3. The most important are the *Sibylline Oracles* (part of bk. III. dates from B.C. 160); the *Book of Enoch*, the oldest parts of which date from about B.C. 170; and the *Book of Jubilees*, probably written about the time of Christ.

2. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. iii. Onias supported his right to build a temple by quoting Isaiah xix. 18, 19, that "there should be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt". The very name of the city was said to have been given by the prophet. "One shall be called the city of Heres," that is Heliopolis, the City of the Sun. See Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, II. 25.

3. For Simon the Just see *Ecclus.* I.: *vv.* 1—4, his care for the safety of Jerusalem; 5—21, the magnificence with which he conducted the services of the Temple. His pupil Antigonus of Socho has preserved

age of the 'men of the Great Synagogue', as the teachers from Ezra to Simon are styled, and the struggle between Judaism and Hellenism commences. Into the details of this great contest it is unnecessary to enter. It is sufficient to remark that it culminated in the heroic struggle sustained by Mattathias the priest of Modin and his sons headed by Judas the Maccabee against the mad attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to Hellenize Judaea.¹ The results were of the utmost importance to Christianity. In the first place, the martyr spirit obtained recognition; in the second, the Messianic hopes were again aroused. The martyrs of the Maccabean age taught the world the lesson, that opinions for which men are prepared to die possess an unquenchable vitality. The obscure and unknown victims who suffered nameless tortures rather than abandon the Law of their God were the precursors of the Christian martyrs whose blood became the seed of the Church. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he sees the approach of persecution, recalls the memory of the Jewish martyrs of this period.² An age in which men are laying down their lives for what they are convinced is the truth is sure to be one in which they are led to dwell on the belief in a future life, and on the prospects of a glorious deliverance.³ There must be a growing conviction that the God in whose name they are suffering

two characteristic sayings of Simon. See Grätz, *History of the Jews*, ch. xxi. His date is uncertain, as from the Talmudic accounts it is not clear whether he was Simon I. (300—292) or Simon II.

1. Five books of Maccabees are extant. The first book, which formerly existed in Hebrew, relates the events from B.C. 170 to 135. The second book begins with the attempt of Heliodorus to rob the Temple and closes with the defeat of Nicanor by Judas: B.C. 180 (?) to 161. The third book is probably of Alexandrian origin and relates events before the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Its date has been placed as late as A.D. 67. The fourth book is also entitled 'About the Sovereignty of Reason', and is ascribed to Josephus by Eusebius and St. Jerome. The fifth book contains a History of the Jews from the time of Heliodorus to that of our Lord. A translation of the three books not in our Apocrypha has been published by Dr. Cotton.

2. Heb. xi. 35. "Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance." With this compare II Maccabees vi. 30, where Eleazar says "To the Lord . . . it is manifest that whereas I might have been delivered from death I endure sore pains."

3. II Maccabees abounds with allusions to a future life: vii. 14, 36, xii. 43, xiv. 46.

has joys untold in store for His saints whom He is preparing shortly to avenge. The Jews in their struggle with Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors were undoubtedly animated by these hopes, to which their familiarity with the Old Testament gave a strong Messianic colouring. Without entering into a discussion as to the exact date of the Book of Daniel, we may remark that its narratives of the heroism of the Jews in Babylon were well calculated to inspire the courage of the persecuted people with fresh determination, whilst the predictions of the rise and fall of earthly empires which were to precede the establishment of the eternal kingdom of God were found to be particularly consoling. It has been truly said that the Book of Daniel is the first philosophy of history. The nation is widened into the world, the restored kingdom of Judah into a universal kingdom of God.¹ With these hopes of a Messianic kingdom, that which Ewald rightly calls the innermost impulse of all true religion rose with growing strength, and the hopes of immortality and resurrection received a firmer and clearer development than before.²

In the Apocalyptic Book of Enoch, parts of which have been assigned to the time when, during the reign of John Hyrcanus, Demetrius II. was pursuing his career of conquest along the coast of Palestine, the Messianic hopes were very clearly expressed.³ The Messiah was made to

Book of Enoch.
B.C. 135-106.

1. Bp. Westcott, *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, vol. 1. art. 'Daniel'.
2. Ewald, *History of Israel*, vol. v., p. 305, English Translation.
3. The Book of Enoch is possibly alluded to by St. Jude (*ev. 14, 15*), but it is an open question whether he derived his quotation from tradition or from writing. It is quoted in *Barnabas* (Ep. iv. 3, xvi. 5). Tertullian (*De Cultu Feminarum* i. 3) mentions it as Scripture, "though not received by some, nor admitted into the Jewish canon." It was known to St. Augustine (*Civ. Dei* xv. 23) "Unde illa, quae sub ejus nomine proferuntur et continent istas de gigantibus fabulas, quod non habuerint homines patres, recte a prudentibus judicantur non ipsius esse credenda." See also *Apost. Const.* vi. 16, where the forgeries under the names of Moses, Enoch, and Adam are condemned. The book was rediscovered in Æthiopic by Bruce the Abyssinian traveller in 1773. It has been frequently translated. A few Greek fragments are preserved by George Syncellus, and another copy was discovered in 1886 at Akhmin. The latest edition is by R. H. Charles, Oxford, 1893. See also Ewald, *Hist. Israel*, vol. v. p. 348. *Enoch* is now pronounced to be a composite work, the ground-work of which is assigned by most to the second century B.C., but some of the remainder belongs to

appear as both human and divine, predestined by God from all eternity. Great trials were to precede his coming. A resurrection of the dead was foretold, and the Son of Man was to appear on the throne of his majesty.¹ Without entering farther into the history or the literature of the second century before Christ it will be perceived that the Jews had been taught some truths essential to the establishment of a universal religion. They had learned that religious communities could be formed outside the Holy Land, they had formed the idea of a world-wide kingdom of God, they had grasped the doctrine of a resurrection, and in addition to this they had proved the power of martyrdom as a means of preserving and extending their faith. The course of history had yet to teach that which they afterwards learned with so much difficulty, namely that the kingdom of the Truth must be spiritual in its character.

After the death of Judas the Maccabee, the Asmonean dynasty of Priest-Kings: Jonathan 161—144, Simon 144—135, John Hyrcanus 135—106, Aristobulus 106—105, Alexander Jannaeus 105—77, Hyrcanus II. 77—65 B.C. B.C. 161, his brother Jonathan continued the struggle with Syria. The claims of Alexander Balas to the crown of the Seleucidæ gave to Jonathan an importance of which he was not slow to avail himself. Alexander Balas, supported by the Romans, became king of Syria, and his ally Jonathan was made high-priest.²

It is probable that the ancient line of high-priests had already become extinct. From this time the royal and priestly powers in Israel were united in one person, and it must have seemed as if the ideal of the ancient Theocracy was about to be revived. But the priestly rule of the Asmoneans, far from being the precursor of the establishment of a religious empire, ended in the domination of the Herods and the extinction of the

post-Christian times. *Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. 'Apocalyptic Literature', §§ 25, 26. Chaps. i.—xxxvi. are declared to be the oldest piece of Jewish literature that teaches the general resurrection of Israel, describes Sheol according to the conception that prevails in the N. T. as opposed to that of the O. T., or represents Gehenna as a place of final punishment. *ib.* § 27.

1. Bishop Westcott, *Introd. to Study of Gospels*, ch. ii.

2. I Macc. x. 21. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, Sect. III.

national independence. From the first the dynasty had within itself the seed of national ruin. Judas the Maccabee had been the first to make overtures to Rome,¹ the alliance had been renewed by Jonathan² and afterwards by Simon.³ Thus the royal power of the high-priests was fostered by the future destroyers of the Jewish people.

But a more fatal danger arose from the factions of the Jews themselves. When the civil and religious government is identical, religious disputes are certain to distract a country. Questions of faith notoriously produce the bitterest animosity, and a priest-king cannot fail to take part in controversy. The closing years of John Hyrcanus were distracted by the feuds between the Pharisees and Sadducees, and in the reign of Hyrcanus II. a dispute between that monarch and his brother Aristobulus led the Romans to interfere. The crafty Antipater and his still craftier son Herod saw their opportunity; the Asmoneans were displaced, and Herod reigned as the vassal of Rome.

The fall of the priest-kings ought to have shewn the Jews that to establish an earthly empire was for them a hopeless task, and without doubt during the government of Herod and the Romans many despaired of the coming of a conquering Messiah.⁴ The Law and tradition became once more the great consolation of Israel, and the factions in the state developed into great religious schools of thought.

The origin of the term Sadducee is not known. The Mishna derives the name from *Tseduqim* (righteous ones). They are said to be the followers of Zadok the disciple of Antigonus of Socho, and to have misinterpreted their master's precept, "Be not like servants who serve their Master for the sake of receiving a reward," so far as to deny the life after death. This statement however rests on the authority of a certain R. Nathan, who wrote a commentary on a treatise of the Mishna called *Aboth*, and probably

Parties in Judaism: Sadducees.

1. I Macc. viii.
2. I Macc. xii. 1-4.
3. I Macc. xiv. 16-19.
4. See Prof. Stanton's *Jewish and Christian Messiah*.

flourished about A.D. 1000.¹ Their leading tenets were a belief in free will and a rejection of the traditional interpretation of the Mosaic Law, together with a denial of the belief in a resurrection, and future rewards and punishments. The party was eminently aristocratic in its composition and in the policy it adopted. Josephus says that when the Sadducees became magistrates they addicted themselves to the notions of the Pharisees for fear of the people.² The Sadducees represented the conservative element in Judaism. The statesmen of the nation and the priestly aristocracy were fully alive to the danger of innovation. The result was that they were often intolerant and severe. It was a Sadducean high-priest that condemned Christ, and the Sadducees were the first to persecute the infant Church.³

Though the character of Sadducean Judaism is at first sight uninviting, it expresses one of the progressive tendencies of the age. The restrictions of Mosaism made men desire freedom, and although the Sadducees looked to Greece corrupted by luxury and scepticism, rather than to the prophetic pictures of a spiritual Israel,⁴ their attitude indicates the growth of a feeling which found its noblest expression in the phrase of St. James, "The perfect law of liberty."⁵

Pharisees.

The very name of Pharisee has so odious a sound in the ears of a Christian that we are apt to misjudge the character of a great movement in Judaism which was not without effect on the diffusion of Christianity. Despite our Saviour's well deserved denunciations of their hypocrisy, the Pharisaic party was the representative of a noble effort to reform

1. Hausrath, *New Test. Times*, vol. 1., p. 136, Eng. Transl.; Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. i. 4; XIII. x. 6; *Bell. Jud.* II. viii. 14. The popular notion that the Sadducees rejected all the Scriptures except the Pentateuch is due to a confusion between their tenets and those of the Samaritans. Epiphanius says they are an off-shoot of the Christian sect of the Dositheans! *Smith's Dict. Bible*, art. 'Sadducees'. The most important allusions to this sect in the New Test. are their denial of the resurrection (*Matt.* xxii. 23; *Acts* xxiii. 8), of angels (*Acts* xxiii. 8), their connexion with the priestly aristocracy at Jerusalem (*Acts* v. 17). They are not mentioned by St. John.

2. *Jos. Antiq.* XVIII. i. 4.

3. *Acts* iv. 1.

4. Bp. Westcott, *Introduction to Study of the Gospels*, ch. II.

5. *St. James* i. 25.

Judaism. In some respects they resemble the English Puritans of the seventeenth century. Both paid the utmost regard to Scripture, both numbered in their ranks men of the most earnest piety, and in both an unduly scrupulous attention to matters of minor importance produced a large amount of hypocrisy. The hard legalising spirit, which in the Jewish sect led to the most binding form of ritualism the world has ever known, in the Christian Puritan took an opposite direction; but both in their strength and weakness the Puritan and Pharisee are nearly related.¹

The chief tenets of the sect resulted from their treatment of Scripture. The Pharisees held that the Law of Moses was supplemented by a vast oral tradition. This had a good and a bad side. To make it impossible to break the ordinances of Moses the most complicated rules were invented, and the tendency to place legal purity above morality was greatly fostered. On the other hand, the reverence for tradition marked a crisis in religious feeling. It was a declaration that the Law had left something to be desired before it could be a living power in Israel. Pharisaism also struck a blow at the priesthood by placing the man learned in the Law of Moses above the descendant of Aaron, thus preparing Judaism for the abolition of the priestly system. Moreover, although the Law of Moses says nothing about the duty of prayer or the doctrine of the resurrection, the Pharisees made each an important part of their system. Thus while the legalism of the Pharisee and the freedom of Christ's teaching are utterly incompatible, we find many important points of contact between them; and the Pharisees in the Acts of the Apostles are represented as generally less disposed to persecute the Church than the Sadducees.²

Essenes. The object of the Sadducee was to conform himself to the world, that of the Pharisee to live in yet separated from it; but the Essene introduced a new principle destined to have a very powerful influence on the subsequent development of

1. But see Grätz, vol. II., ch. i. for a description of the best side of Pharisaism. As judges the Pharisees inclined to the side of mercy.

2. Acts v. 34 foll. Acts xxiii. 9.

Christianity. His ideal was to form a kingdom of God isolated from the world. He withdrew himself from all that was profane in order to be nearer to God. The Essene communities were distinguished, partly by an excess of Pharisaism, a morbid craving after moral purity, and partly by an admixture of foreign customs borrowed from the religions of the East. The Essenes avoided marriage, the slaughter of animals, and animal food; they lived in communities, and their lives were regulated by ascetic discipline. Strict Jews in all that regarded ceremonial purity, they nevertheless refused to take part in the Temple worship because beasts were slain there in the sacrifices.¹

The multiplication of religious parties sufficiently shews the activity of Judaism at this period. There was a constant unrest, an expectation of a great change. St. Luke tells us how saintly minds were constantly looking for the consolation of Israel and the coming of the kingdom of God.² The Gentiles seem to have also recognised something of the divine mission of Israel.

Contrary to both their ancient and modern custom, the Jews had become energetic missionaries, especially among women. Our Lord says that the Pharisees "compassed sea and land to make one proselyte",³ and the constant mention of the persons who worshipped God (*σεβόμενοι*) in the Acts of the Apostles shews how numerous they must have been in the great cities.⁴ The heathen were alternately attracted by the

1. The Essenes are mentioned by Josephus *Antiq.* XVIII. i. 5, where he describes their doctrines and says they numbered about 4000; and in *Bell. Jud.* II. viii. 3—13 there is a full account of the sect. Philo alludes to them (see F. C. Conybeare's edition of the Treatise *De Vita Contemplativa*, Oxford, 1895). Pliny (*N. H.* v. 15—17) describes their communities. The chief early Christian writers who allude to the Essenes are Hegesippus in Eusebius *H. E.* iv. 22, as one of the seven Jewish sects, and Hippolytus, *Haer.* IX. 13—22; see Bishop Lightfoot's Excursus on the Essenes in his Commentary on the Ep. to the Colossians.

2. St. Luke ii. 25, 38.

3. St. Matth. xxiii. 15.

4. Acts xiii. 43, 50; xvii. 4. Mr. Conybeare in his Excursus on the authorship of Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*, p. 260, says "Of Philo's writings a large number have a missionary aim," and he quotes p. 259 a passage from the treatise on Repentance in which Philo speaks of converts as a Christian might have done a century later.

loftiness of the Jewish creed and repelled by the nation itself, and it is evident that Judaism *per se* could not have become the religion of the world: for a Gentile to accept the faith of Israel was one thing; but it was a different thing for him to become a Jew. The history of Christianity shews how all that was best in Judaism together with far nobler truths than Israel had known were presented to the world.

The heathen world had been prepared for the reception of a universal religion by two important forces supplied by Greece and Rome. One of the greatest debts posterity owes to the Greeks is that they first taught mankind how to think. The bold questions of the Greek philosophy made men enquire into the truth of that which custom had taught them. Thus at the time of our Lord, when the Roman empire had been Hellenised, a spirit of enquiry was abroad ready to give new doctrines a hearing. The scornful words of the philosophers at Athens about St. Paul shew at any rate that men were at least prepared to listen.¹

The work of Rome was to unite and organize the world, to destroy nationalities, and to improve communication. Under her rule men began to move freely from place to place, and the Christian preacher went from town to town in the track of the merchant.

1. Acts xvii. 18—20.



CHAPTER II.

THE TIMES *Of* THE CHRIST.

WHATEVER opinions men may hold of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, it must be universally admitted that His life is the most important epoch in history. This must however in a work like the present be touched upon with the greatest possible brevity, and in this chapter only a very few points can be so much as hinted at.

Our main object must be to speak of the times of the Messiah as illustrating the establishment of the Christian Church. The one aspect of the Saviour's work which we must keep before us is that of the Founder of a society, and it will first be necessary to state clearly the popular idea upon which Christ based His Church. It was that of a Kingdom of the Heavens,¹ an ideal Hebrew State in which the hope of Israel was to be realised. This hope animated the nation more strongly as its earthly prospect became darker. Men turned from the world with its painful realities to contemplate a state of things which could only exist in a dim and distant future; and the condition of the Jewish community in Palestine amply justified its dissatisfaction with the existing position of affairs.


To form any idea of Jewish thought in the days of our Lord's ministry it is necessary to bear in mind the historical events of the preceding epoch, the most

1. Matth. iv. 17, x. 7, xiii. 24—53. See also Mark i. 14, 15, *ix.* 1; Luke iv. 43, ix. 2, 27, xiii. 29, xvi. 16, xvii. 20, xix. 11, xxi. 31; Acts i. 3.

prominent of which are the fall of the Asmonean dynasty and the rise of Herod.¹

Antipater and Herod. When John Hyrcanus conquered the Edomites,² he forced them to adopt the Jewish religion. This compulsory conversion brought in due time a fearful nemesis upon the house and nation of the zealous monarch. Antipater, an Idumæan of a noble family, became a satrap of Idumæa under Hyrcanus II.³ The power of the Asmoneans was already on the wane. The priest-kings, failing to satisfy the requirements of the strict party of the Pharisees, allied themselves with the rival sect of the Sadducees, and in B.C. 95 the former felt the sanguinary vengeance of their opponents.⁴ For some years however the kingdom continued to exist, though torn by rival factions; and it needed only a disputed succession to complete the ruin of the dynasty. This calamity occurred when Hyrcanus II., an amiable but weak prince, became king; and his brother Aristobulus, a man of greater energy but perhaps no greater wisdom, set

1. To understand this period it is necessary to bear in mind the relationship of the descendants of Alexander Jannæus:



2. About 125 B.C. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. ix. 1; *Bell. Jud.* I. ii. 6. Idumæa or Edom in our Lord's time was practically the south of the Philistine Plain and the Negeb. The Edomites by the Law were admitted to the full privileges after three generations. They became fanatically Jewish during the times of the war with Rome; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* IV. iv. See G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 239.

3. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. i. 3.

4. *Ibid.* XIII. xiii. 5.

himself up as a candidate for the throne. It is not necessary to enter into the details of this quarrel: both claimants sought foreign aid and became mere counters in the great game which Rome and Parthia were playing for the supremacy of the East. It is enough to say that both nations captured Jerusalem, and that the Roman success was remarkable for the profanation of the Holy of Holies by Pompey, who entered the sanctuary out of curiosity, but did not allow the Temple to be plundered.¹ When the Parthians took the city the royal high priest Hyrcanus was made a captive and mutilated to disqualify him from continuing to perform his sacred duties.²

During these troublous times the house of Antipater was steadily increasing its influence and importance. His son Herod from early youth gave evidence of abilities of a high order. When he was still a young man he governed Galilee and had suppressed a rebellion in favour of Antigonus the son of Aristobulus. For putting to death Hezekiah the leader of the insurgents Herod was summoned to appear before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, but he appeared at the head of his armed retainers and was acquitted.³ Herod was as dextrous in dealing with the Romans as he was bold in his acts in Syria. He enjoyed the friendship of Antony, and when in B.C. 40 he went to Rome for the nominal purpose of securing the kingdom for the grandson of Hyrcanus, the youthful Aristobulus, he was himself nominated to the crown of Judaea. Herod's star now seemed completely in the ascendant. He captured Jerusalem with the assistance of the Roman general Sosius,⁴ and gave his position a shadow of legitimacy by becoming the husband of Mariamne, the last of the Asmoneans except the youthful Aristobulus, who in B.C. 34, at the age of seventeen, was consoled for the loss of the kingdom by his elevation to the High Priesthood. The boy did not long enjoy his perilous honours. His beauty and his

1. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. ch. iv. § 4. Cicero *pro Flacco* 28.

2. *Ibid.* XIV. ch. xiii. § 10.

3. *Ibid.* XIV. ch. ix. §§ 2 and 4.

4. *Ibid.* XIV. ch. xvi.

undoubted right to the throne won him so much popularity, that Herod had him removed to Jericho, where his death while bathing was generally attributed to the connivance of the king. The politic Idumean however never lost the support of his Roman patrons: in vain did Alexandra, the mother of Aristobulus, invoke the powerful aid of Cleopatra; even she could not shake the trust reposed in Herod by Antony. Nor did the fall of the triumvir after Actium ruin his client. Herod immediately set out to visit the victorious Octavian. So doubtful was he of returning alive, that he left secret orders that Mariamne should be put to death in case he perished; but he found that Augustus was as easily won as Antony. Seeing that Herod was the one man who really understood the East, the Emperor made him his friend and confirmed him in the possession of his kingdom.

Few monarchs have ever had a harder part to play than Herod. On the one hand he was obliged to conciliate the Romans, and on the other to consider the interests of his subjects. The former task he performed to admiration. No man could have shown greater dexterity than Herod in the management of his affairs during the stormy death-throes of the Republic. But Herod had his greatest difficulties in his own country, and in his household. He, a Jew by religion, had to govern a mixed population of Jews, Greeks, and Arabians. If he attempted to conciliate the Jews it must be at the risk of mortally offending the others, and he was supported by the Romans on condition that he kept the peace of Syria. He shewed his sympathy with his Hellenic subjects by the erection of cities like Caesarea, which he named after his Roman master; nor did he shrink from the more difficult task of winning popularity among the Jews.

**Rebuilding of
the Temple by
Herod.
Begun B.C. 20.**

In the eighteenth year of his reign Herod proposed to rebuild the Temple. Everything was done to satisfy the scruples of the people. Priests were trained to build the inner courts, and the materials were all prepared before a stone of the old Temple of Zerubbabel was

displaced.¹ The dedication of the Temple was celebrated with a pomp unequalled even by that of Solomon, and the Rabbis themselves declared that he who had not seen the Temple of Herod had seen nothing beautiful.²

But although the restoration of the Temple was acknowledged by the Jews to be one of the signs of the Messianic age, and though a party of them affected to consider Herod the Messiah, the majority of the nation was not deceived. The people detested him, and the temporary popularity which the building of the Temple had given him vanished when—perhaps in honour of the expected visit of Agrippa—he erected a golden eagle over its gateway.

Herod's failure to win popularity with the Jews is not surprising. He was distrusted as an alien of the abhorred race of Edom, against which the prophets had so often spoken, and besides he had usurped the crown of the now popular family of the Asmoneans. His beautiful wife Mariamne was the last surviving representative of the fallen house, and his sons by her shared the blood of the deliverers of Israel. His own relations detested his connexion with the deposed dynasty, and the palace of Herod was full of intrigue. It is superfluous to repeat at length the story of the troubles of his household and family.

Mariamne was the first and noblest victim. Though Herod loved her greatly he had on two occasions ordered her to be put to death if he should not return, and this secret had twice been betrayed. Mariamne well knew her husband to have been the cause of the death of all her family. Distrust and fear on the one hand, and an insane jealousy fanned by palace intrigues on the other, caused her death.³ Herod was long inconsolable, but the rumour of a revolt roused him once more to action. Alexandra, the mother of Mariamne, had proclaimed her daughter's sons by Herod to be true representatives of the Maccabees. The subject of debate among the doctors of

Death of
Mariamne.
B.C. 29.

1. Josephus, *Antiq.* xv., chap. xi.
2. Hausrath quotes *Succa* 5, 6; *Baba Bathra* 4a.
3. Josephus, *Antiq.* xv., chap. vii.

the schools alluded not obscurely to the political question of the day. It was: Is it an advantage for a clean person (the sons of Mariamne) to be descended from an unclean person (Herod)? The people were also in favour of the young princes. But Herod crushed the revolt, and put Alexandra, and Costobar the husband of Salome, his sister, to death. From this time all seemed to prosper with the king. Mariamne's sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, were sent to be educated at Rome, his dominions were increased by the favour of Augustus, his kingdom now equalled in extent the empire of Solomon, and he was constantly erecting new cities and fortifications. He became more and more a Gentile in sympathies, and his position with Caesar and Agrippa was constantly improving.

Execution of the sons of Mariamne. When the sons of Mariamne returned from Rome, Antipater the eldest son of Herod fomented the dissensions between his father and brothers. Alexander and Aristobulus were taken to Rome, where Herod accused them before Augustus. The Emperor succeeded in allaying the suspicions of their father, and they were acquitted. But Herod's fears returned when he was again at Jerusalem. His sons were tried before Saturninus the proconsul of Syria, their father again acting as accuser. This time he was able to obtain their condemnation, and in B.C. 8 the two heirs to the claims of the Maccabees were put to death. Antipater did not reap the reward of his treachery, but was executed just before his father expired. This gave rise to the jest of Augustus that it was better to be Herod's pig (*ὄν*) than his son (*υἶόν*).¹

Messianic hopes at the close of Herod's reign. The close of the reign of Herod had been marked by a Messianic movement instigated by the Pharisees. It was asserted that the kingdom of Herod would certainly pass to his brother Pheroras. Bagoas, an eunuch, was persuaded that the prophecy of Isaiah

1. The jest is given by Macrobius (A.D. 410) in Latin; Augustus must however have spoken in Greek to give it point.

would be fulfilled in himself, and that he would have a son who should establish the kingdom of Messiah.¹ Herod slew all the members of his household who had consented to what the Pharisees had said, as well as those concerned in the plot. Thus at the very time of Christ's birth Messianic hopes revived and were the cause of bloodshed. The story of the massacre of the Innocents at Bethlehem is confirmed by the conduct of Herod at this time, and the fact of the silence of Josephus as to this point may be explained by the supposition that the murder of a few children was forgotten in the torrents of blood shed whilst the tyrant

Death of Herod.
B.C. 4.

drew near his end.² Herod died in great agony at Jericho. He was reported to have commanded the elders of Judaea to be assembled in the hippodrome and to be put to death when he himself should breathe his last. This sanguinary order was never executed.

It is important to remember the facts of the reign of Herod in connexion with the rise of Christianity, because the kingdom of Herod bore some external resemblances to the kingdom of the Messiah anticipated by the Jews. It was co-extensive with the empire of David and Solomon; it saw a new and fairer temple arise, and an age of prosperity such as had never been known before in Israel. But how clearly did the nature of Herod's kingdom demonstrate the vanity of earthly dominion! Founded by craft and servility, secured by treachery, and cemented by blood, it fell to pieces when he, whose master mind created it, died of a loathsome disease at Jericho.

**Partition of
Herod's
dominions.**

Herod by will divided his kingdom among his sons. The territory beyond the Jordan was bequeathed to Philip, son of Cleopatra of Jerusalem: Galilee and

1. Isaiah lvi. 3—5.

2. Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii. vi. 5. See Hausrath, vol. II., pp. 42 foll. Perhaps the character of Herod has been misunderstood. His task of governing his dominions justly as a vassal of the Romans was practically an impossible one. See Morrison, *History of the Jews under the Romans*, and Vickers, *History of Herod*.

Peraea, as a tetrarchy, to Antipas; Judaea, with the title of king, to Archelaus. The whole family betook themselves to Rome to wrangle over the inheritance. The Jews, by permission of Varus, governor of Syria, sent a deputation to beg that the theocracy might be restored and Archelaus deprived.¹ Revolts broke out in every part of Herod's dominions, and several adventurers laid claim to the title of king of Israel. Varus, assisted by the Arabs of Aretas and other enemies of the Jews, restored order with great severity.

Herod Philip. The will of Herod was confirmed by Augustus, but Archelaus was not allowed to assume the title of king. Philip, the only virtuous man of the family of Herod, ruled his tetrarchy well,² and died A.D. 34. It was to his country our Lord retired, when He took refuge from His enemies before the Transfiguration.

Herod Antipas. Antipas was much detested by his Jewish subjects for being the son of a Samaritan mother. He inherited from his father both his taste for building and his contempt for Jewish scruples. In erecting the city of Tiberias on the site of an ancient cemetery he committed a crime unpardonable in the eyes of the Rabbis. His worst offence was his adulterous marriage with his niece and sister-in-law, Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, and wife of his brother, called Philip by St. Mark—not the tetrarch, but the son of another Mariamne, daughter of Simon. The Roman governors detested him for his intimacy with Tiberius, and his character is given in a word by our Lord, Who calls him “that fox.”³

Archelaus. Archelaus administered the affairs of Judaea for ten years, after which Augustus deprived him of all his dominions and exiled him to Gaul. He seems to have governed with great cruelty

1. Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. xi. 2. The parable of the Minae (St. Luke xix. 11—27) alludes to the embassy of the Jews against Archelaus.

2. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. iv. 6.

3. St. Luke xiii. 32, τῆ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ.

Judaea made a dependency of Syria. After the deposition of Archelaus Judaea was incorporated into the province of Syria, and placed under a Roman Procurator. Quirinus, then governor of Syria, appointed a Roman knight by name Coponius to this office, and ordered a census to be taken of the population. This was the signal for a revolt which began in Galilee under the famous Judas.¹ The extreme party separated themselves from the Pharisees and took the name of Zealots.² Their watchword was "No king but the Lord." The revolution was crushed, but the Zealots remained, and their fanaticism ultimately led to the ruin of the Jewish nation.

Roman Procurators. M. Ambivius and Annius Rufus, whose administrations were unimportant, succeeded Coponius as Procurators of Judaea. Tiberius's well-known plan of allowing provincial governors a long tenure of office was exemplified in the case of Valerius Gratus, who remained eleven years, A.D. 15—26, and deposed no less than four high-priests—Annas, Ishmael, Eleazar son of Annas, and Simon son of Kamith—leaving Caiaphas in office when he departed. But Annas, according to the New Testament,³ in the opinion of the people remained the high-priest *de jure*. The administration of Pilate,

Pontius Pilate. A.D. 26—37, who succeeded Gratus, was characterised by cruelty, aggravated by the indecision of his character. Pilate became one of the most odious of the Roman procurators.⁴ His first act rendered him unpopular. It had been customary to leave the *signa* of the troops outside Jerusalem, in deference to the religious scruples of the Jews; Pilate ordered them to be taken into the Holy City. The people were very indignant and besieged him

1. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. i. 1. Acts v. 37.

2. From the dying exhortation of Mattathias, 1 Macc. ii. 50: "Now therefore, my sons, be zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers."

3. St. Luke iii. 2; St. John xviii. 13; Acts iv. 6.

4. Hansrath refers to Philo *Leg. ad Caium*; Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. lii. §§ 1, 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. ix. §§ 2—4.

with petitions. Pilate commanded them to present themselves in the circus, and surrounded them with troops. The Jews expressed their readiness for martyrdom, and the Procurator withdrew the *signa*. This exhibition of weakness was fatal to Pilate's authority. He experienced a similar rebuff when he tried to place golden shields inscribed with the names of the Emperor and himself in his palace on Mount Zion. The four sons of Herod, who were in Jerusalem, remonstrated on behalf of the people. Pilate again gave way. His conduct on both occasions was in keeping with his behaviour when Jesus was brought before him. His extortionate and oppressive government made him liable to be accused of serious offences, and he was consequently often compelled to yield to the voice of popular clamour.

Such then was the state of the Holy Land in the days of Christ. The people were thoroughly discontented, hating the yoke of Herod in Galilee, and that of the procurator in Judaea. Taxation was very heavy; our Lord's discourses contain many allusions to debt and imprisonment, to men being delivered over to the tormentors, to the debtor being sold with his wife and children and all that he had. The Gentiles were excluded from all intercourse with Jews. To enter a Gentile building was considered by the Rabbis a cause of defilement. No food prepared by a Gentile might be eaten by a Jew; to sit at his table was unlawful. The testimonies of the New Testament and of the Talmud on this point are identical; the latter says, that if a Gentile is bidden by a Jew to his house and is alone even for a minute, all food on the table becomes unclean.¹ This extreme bitterness of feeling, unknown in earlier times, was a forecast of the coming struggle between Jews and Gentiles which the next generation was destined to witness. It is a strong proof of the divine nature of the message of our Lord, that it should ignore the popular ideas and feelings of the age and pronounce to a people embittered by oppression and religious animosity the words, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

1. See Hausrath, vol. II., p. 85.

**Preaching
of the Baptist.**

The life and work of Jesus Christ belongs more properly to a detailed account of the New Testament times than to ecclesiastical history. His coming was prepared by the preaching of His kinsman, John the son of the priest Zacharias. John resumed the work of the ancient prophets. He boldly announced that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. But he declared that this Kingdom was to be purely spiritual; to enter it a thorough change of heart was necessary, fruits worthy of repentance must prepare men for its reception. The wideness of the kingdom was proclaimed in John's words to the Pharisees and Sadducees: "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham."¹ John refused to do more than proclaim the Kingdom; he denied that he was the Christ, or Elias, or the prophet foretold by Moses; he was only "the voice of one crying in the wilderness."² The advice he gave was wise and practical. People were exhorted to be charitable and ready to share the good things of life with one another. The publicans were told not to exact more than was appointed by the government, the soldiers were exhorted to abstain from violence and to be content with their rations.³ The ascetic preacher of righteousness shewed none of the exclusive zeal of a fanatical zealot, but prepared the way for a universal Church. One rite alone was adopted by John—that of baptism. The nature of this ceremony has been much disputed. In later times the baptism of John was considered as quite distinct from Christian baptism,⁴ and it seems to have been rather a prophetic sign than a sacrament. The purgation of Israel from all impurity had been recognised as a sign of the coming of the Messiah, Zechariah having foretold that "a fountain would be opened to the house of David for sin and for uncleanness";⁵ this, as well as the Jewish ceremony of baptizing proselytes, and the

1. St. Luke iii. 8.

2. St. John i. 23, quoting Isaiah xl. 3.

3. St. Luke iii. 10—14.

4. Acts xix. 3—5.

5. Zech. xiii. 1. (Hausrath.)

ablutions of the Essenes, may have been the origin of John's baptizing those who came to him. According to Josephus, John taught the people "that washing would be acceptable to God if they made use of it, not for the remission of some sins only, but for the purification of the body supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness."¹ The Baptist founded a school, apparently of ascetics like himself, but he evidently felt that he had initiated a movement which One greater than he must perfect, and his own exclamation when he saw Jesus after His baptism, "Behold the Lamb of God!" led two of his disciples to leave him and go to the greater Teacher.² One of these, Andrew, brought his brother Simon to Jesus, who immediately surnamed him Cephas, or Peter.

Three stages in Christ's work. Jesus Christ began His preaching by using exactly the same words as His predecessor; but instead of going into the wilderness to attract multitudes by stern denunciations and ascetic life, He went among the villages of Galilee saying "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."³ Without attempting to give the facts of His divine life on earth, it is sufficient to observe that our Lord appears first to have taught the people the nature of the Kingdom of Heaven, secondly to have shewn Himself to be the Christ, and lastly to have revealed His divinity.

Jesus (a) declared the nature of His Kingdom. The Kingdom of the Heavens or the Kingdom of God occupies a very important place in the Gospels. It has been well said that descriptions of its characteristics and forecasts of its future make up the whole central portion of the Synoptic Gospels. According to the teaching of our Lord this Kingdom is sometimes an influence spreading in the world, sometimes the realization of the hopes of the saints at the end of all things, sometimes a truth to be apprehended;

1. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. v. 2. Quoted by Hausrath.

2. St. John i. 35—37.

3. St. Matth. iii. 1, iv. 17, Μετανοείτε· ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

but the main idea of His teaching on this subject is that it is a new society by which men on earth were to be brought into fellowship with God in Heaven by means of the Messiah, who is the true head of Israel.¹ This Kingdom by His coming was already in the world, and men were saying "Lo here!" and "Lo there!" when all the time the Kingdom of God was in their midst (*ἐντός ὑμῶν*).

(b) showed Himself to be the Christ. It was not till He had taken refuge near the sources of the Jordan, in the dominions of the mild and virtuous Philip, that our Lord asked His disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter's reply, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," was the occasion for our Lord's declaration that this was the rock upon which He would build His Church.² But Jesus warned His disciples to tell no man as yet that He was the Christ. He knew too well that to proclaim Himself Messiah would defeat all the divine plan for establishing a spiritual kingdom among men; to assume the title of Christ at such a time being to declare war with the Roman empire and to bring about a revolt like that of Judas of Galilee.

(c) revealed His Divinity. The third stage in founding the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth was entered upon when our Lord went up to Jerusalem. No human Messiah, no divinely inspired prophet could set up an everlasting kingdom which could never be destroyed, which could prevail over sin and death. This was the part not of man but of God. Our Lord had therefore to proclaim Himself perfect God as well as perfect man. This He did in the plainest terms, not only to His disciples but also to the Jews when He said, "Verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM."³

It only remained that the proofs should be given to the world that our Lord was that which He had

1. Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, part II., ch. i.

2. St. Matth. xvi. 18.

3. St. John viii. 58. "Christ was the centre of Abraham's hope. Abraham came into being as man : Christ is essentially as God." Westcott *in loco*.

proclaimed Himself to be. His Resurrection, by declaring Him to be the Son of God,¹ assured His followers that His Kingdom was a reality; His Ascension marked the time when He ceased to work visibly among men and began to reign invisibly in their hearts.

I. Rom. i. 4.



CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES.

The Christian Church after the Ascension. OUR Lord left His disciples with the assurance that "all authority had been committed to Him in heaven and in earth," and with the injunction that they were to "make all the nations their disciples."¹ He had given them orders to admit new proselytes to their society by the right of baptism, and He had instituted the sacrament of His Body and Blood with the command, "This do in remembrance of me,"² as a bond of union among themselves. He had given the assurance, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,"³ and He had bestowed special powers on the eleven Apostles, when He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained."⁴ But He had warned His disciples not to make any effort to preach their message till they had been endued with power from on High. They were to make Jerusalem the scene of their earliest labours, and to await there the promised gift of the Holy Spirit.⁵ The infant Church faithfully obeyed the Lord's command. A very small body indeed out of the numbers who had heard Jesus, formed the new society. It consisted of the eleven, the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, the Blessed Virgin, the brethren of our Lord, and a few others, and amounted in all to 120.⁶ But this small society possessed the power of continuing

Election of Matthias.

1. St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19 (R. V.).

3. St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

5. Acts i. 4.

2. St. Luke xxii. 19.

4. St. John xx. 22, 23.

6. Acts i. 13, 14, 15.

itself, as its first action testified. It was necessary that the Apostles should be twelve in number, to represent the twelve tribes of ancient Israel. According to St. Peter's statement, the successor to Judas must be a man who had been with the Lord since the time of the Baptism of John and who had seen Him after the Resurrection, as it was a *sine qua non* for a candidate for the apostolate to have seen the risen Lord.¹ Two disciples were selected; the ultimate choice was referred to God. They cast lots, and the lot fell on Matthias.

**The Day of
Pentecost.**

The real beginning of the active work of the Christian Church dates from the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Feast of Pentecost, or Feast of Weeks. The speech of St. Peter, shewing that the gift of the Holy Ghost had been predicted by Joel as one of the signs of the kingdom of Messiah, had an extraordinary effect on his hearers, among whom were Jews and proselytes assembled at the feast from every nation under heaven. It is noticeable that the peoples of Asia mentioned in the Apostle's first epistle were largely represented on the occasion of his first speech.² St. Peter's statement that Christ had risen from the dead, made without fear of contradiction seven weeks after the Crucifixion in the city where Jesus had suffered, had a most convincing effect on his hearers, three thousand of whom were forthwith baptized.

**The Church at
Jerusalem.**

We are told that the first community of believers at Jerusalem put all their possessions into one common stock.³ "No one said that anything was his own, but they had all things common." But it appears that it was not considered obligatory for a man to contribute his entire

1. *μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως* Acts i. 22. Besides the Twelve, the following are called apostles in the New Testament: Barnabas, Paul, Andronicus, Junias, and James the Lord's brother. St. Paul says of himself, "Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (1 Cor. ix. 1). Westcott and Hort read *οὐκ εἰμι ἐλεύθερος; οὐκ εἰμι ἀπόστολος;*

2. Acts ii. 9. 1 Pet. i. 1. Cappadocia and Pontus and Asia are mentioned in both.

3. Such is Renan's opinion in his work *Les Apôtres*. Neander (*Planting of Christianity* vol. i. pp. 24—26) is against this view.

property to the common fund. Ananias was expressly told by St. Peter that the money for which he had sold his property was his own;¹ and his offence consisted in his having pretended to contribute the whole instead of only a part of his property.² The Jewish believers were very poor, and were in later times supported by the churches outside Jerusalem. St. Paul was perpetually engaged in collecting funds from his Gentile converts for their benefit.³ There were, however, some wealthy members, like Barnabas, and Mary the mother of Mark, whose house was a place of meeting for the disciples.⁴ A great number of priests⁵ also became believers, and the growing sect included several of the Pharisees.⁶ The wealthy Sadducees were from the first implacable enemies to the faith.⁷ The brethren were Jews of the most orthodox type, attending to all the ceremonial Law with scrupulous fidelity; they frequented the Temple daily, and met for private prayer and the breaking of bread in their own houses.⁸

Although Peter was at first the **James the Lord's brother.** acknowledged head of the Church at Jerusalem, the leadership soon passed out of his hands. No doubt his apostolic zeal soon led him to seek a wider sphere of action, and we are told that he was entrusted with the gospel of the circumcision.⁹ After the persecution by Herod Agrippa, or perhaps at an even earlier date, the government of the Church at Jerusalem was committed to James the Lord's brother. This remarkable man seems to have resembled the Baptist rather than his divine Kinsman. His epistle is an echo of the prophetic age, abounding with denunciations of wealth and luxury, of greed for gain and forgetfulness of God. At the same time it gives

1. Acts v. 4, *οὐχὶ μένον σοὶ ἔμενον καὶ πρᾶθὲν ἐν τῇ σῆ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπῆρχεν.*
 "Their life towards each other was exhibited in the qualified and guarded community of goods which they practised." Hort, *Judaistic Christianity* Lect. III.

2. Acts v. 2.

3. Rom. xv. 26. I Cor. xvi. 23. II Cor. ix. 1.

4. Acts xii. 12.

5. Acts vi. 7, *πολύς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ἀπήκουον τῇ πίστει.*

6. Acts xv. 5.

7. Acts iv. 1; v. 17. St. James ii. 6.

8. Acts ii. 46, 47.

9. Gal. ii. 7.

us many indications of the character of the Church of Jerusalem. Most of its members were very poor and greatly harassed by the wealthy Sadducees, who dragged them before the judges and blasphemed the good name by which they were called. Their assemblies were styled synagogues.¹ In cases of illness they sent for the elders, who made use of oil to heal the sick.² Though the epistle probably belongs to a later date than the beginning of the history of the Faith, it no doubt represents the condition of the early Church when it was a Jewish community.³ Hegesippus, the ancient Church historian, gives an account of James, which, though manifestly apocryphal, enables us to conjecture the cause of his being so honoured by his countrymen. His words are as follows: "James the brother of the Lord succeeded to the government of the Church in conjunction with the apostles. He has been called the Just by all from the time of our Saviour to the present day. . . . He was holy from his mother's womb, and he drank no wine nor strong drink, nor did he eat flesh. No razor came upon his head. He did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not use a bath. He alone was permitted to enter into the holy place; . . . and he was in the habit of entering alone into the Temple and was frequently found upon his knees begging forgiveness for the people, so that his knees became hard like those of a camel in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God and asking forgiveness for the people."⁴ In the Acts and Epistles, St. James appears as the leader of the Jewish party, but nothing is said of his asceticism.

1. St. James ii. 2 (R.V.).

2. St. James v. 14.

3. On the date of the Epistle of St. James see J. B. Mayor's commentary, p. cxxiv. Mr. Mayor places it between A.D. 40 and 50, and considers it one of the earliest canonical books; but Dr. Hort, though he admits it to be the work of St. James, who according to Josephus (*Ant.* xx. ix. 1) was put to death about A.D. 62, considers that it belongs to a later period than A.D. 50. *Judaistic Christianity*, Lect. VIII. See also Mr. St. John Parry's work on the Epistle of St. James.

4. Euseb., *H.E.* ii. 23. See also *ib.* v. 24, where St. John is said to have worn the *πέταλον* of the priests. For St. James' epistle and his relationship to our Saviour, see Mayor's Commentary. For the early growth of Christian asceticism see Burkitt's *Early Eastern Christianity*, Lect. 4, p. 118 ff.

Hellenistic Converts. But the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem could never have made the world accept the faith of the Apostles. The Church of the Hebrew-speaking Jews must have remained an isolated community with no attractions for the outside world. It was the Hellenistic¹ element which gave Christianity its character of a missionary religion. The Greek Jews of the Diaspora carried the Gospel to all parts of the world, and being already in partial sympathy with the heathen among whom they dwelt, were disposed to admit them to the benefits of the faith in Christ. This was particularly offensive to the less broad-minded Jews of Jerusalem, who, if they were ready to tolerate the believers as an eccentric sect, were not disposed to allow the idea that the Gentiles were capable of equal privileges with the chosen people. It was in this way that the first real persecution of the Church arose.

The Seven. Those of the Hellenistic Jews who believed complained that their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. The Apostles being unwilling to leave off preaching to attend to the lower duties of serving tables, appointed seven men, whose names shew them to have been Greek-speaking Jews, to attend to this business; of these the most important were Stephen, Philip, and Nicolaus, the latter being not even a Jew by birth but a proselyte of Antioch. The teaching of Stephen gave great offence to the Jews, and he was accused before the Sanhedrin of speaking blasphemous words against Moses and against God.² His accusers, wilfully misinterpreting his use of our Lord's words, charged him with saying that "Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place (*i.e.* the Temple of Jerusalem) and change the customs which Moses commanded us."³ The most prominent opponent seems to have been Saul of Tarsus, then a young man,

1. It is well for the student of the New Testament to distinguish between *Ἰουδαῖος* the Jew by nation, *Ἑβραῖος* the Hebrew by language, *Ἑλληνιστῆς* the Greek-speaking Jew, *Ἰσραηλῆϊτης* the Jew by religion.

2. Acts vi. 11.

3. Acts vi. 14; St. John ii. 19.

whose clear logical mind had already to all appearance recognised that Christ's religion and Judaism were incompatible. The history of the choice of the deacons and the condemnation of Stephen was of two-fold importance. The former, as M. Renan has rightly pointed out, committed the Church to that which has been one of her greatest sources of strength, the care of the poor;¹ the latter marked the severance between the adherents of ancient Mosaism and the followers of Jesus.

The death of Stephen was the signal for a dispersion of the early Christians, the Apostles alone feeling bound to remain at their post in Jerusalem.² Philip the deacon made a convert of a proselyte who held the office of chamberlain to Candace, Queen of Ethiopia. He also preached with great success in Samaria. Some of the brethren took refuge in Damascus,³ where there was apparently a Christian church. There were believers at Lydda,⁴ and at Joppa.⁵ A still more important centre was formed at Antioch, the capital of Syria, consisting almost entirely of Hellenistic Jews.⁶ The believers were so numerous that they attracted the attention of the Gentile inhabitants of that profligate city, who first gave them the name of Christians,—a name which in later times was assumed by the brethren themselves.

It has been shewn in the previous chapter that the Jews had erected an almost insuperable barrier between themselves and the world; and St. Peter testifies to the rigidity of the separation of Jews from all intercourse with the Gentiles when he tells Cornelius and his companions, "Ye know that it is unlawful for a man

1. Renan, *Les Apôtres*.

2. πάντες τε διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων, Acts viii. 1.

3. Where Saul was sent, Acts ix. 2.

4. Acts ix. 32.

5. Ib. 36.

6. Westcott and Hort (Acts xi. 20) adopt the reading Ἑλλημιστάς and give weighty reasons for rejecting the reading Ἑλληνας which seems at first sight the simplest.

that is a Jew to join himself, or come unto one of another nation."¹ (*ὁμοῖς ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστι ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἄλλοφύλῳ.*) It needed a vision from on high to induce the Apostle to overcome his prejudices by preaching the Gospel to the centurion Cornelius, and on his return to Jerusalem the stricter party² called him to account for his conduct. The conversion of Cornelius, however, seems to have been an isolated case sanctioned by a special manifestation of the divine will. The real movement in the direction of the Gentiles came from Antioch. The Christians in that city seem to have been wealthy and charitable. Barnabas, the emissary of the Church of Jerusalem to Antioch, had recognised the marvellously spiritual power of Saul of Tarsus, whose conversion from a persecutor to a zealous Christian had taken place a few years before, and had brought him to work among the Hellenistic population at Antioch.³ Saul accompanied him to Jerusalem with alms for the poorer brethren in the time of the famine, which happened in the reign of Claudius.⁴

Persecution by
Herod Agrippa
at Jerusalem.
A. D. 41.

Another persecution at Jerusalem was destined to precede the great work of the conversion of the Gentiles. Herod Agrippa was the son of that Aristobulus who had been put to death by his father Herod the Great. His sister was Herodias the infamous wife of his uncle Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee. He passed an unhappy youth, partly living at the court of Antipas, partly in wandering about the world to borrow money or evade his creditors. At Rome he ingratiated himself with Caius, afterwards better known as Emperor by his nickname of Caligula, and was thrown into prison by the suspicious Tiberius. On Caligula's accession in A. D. 37 he was liberated; Judaea, with the title of king, was added to his dominion by Claudius in A. D. 41, when he was proclaimed Emperor. As he had taken

1. Acts. x. 28. See Dobschütz, *Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 150, Eng. Transl.

2. Acts xi. 2, *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς.*

3. Acts xi. 26.

4. Acts xi. 28, 29.

part in the protest of the Jews against the erection of Caligula's statue in the Temple,¹ he was considered a man of piety. As grandson of Mariamne he represented the Asmoneans as well as the Herods. One of the earliest acts of his reign seems to have been to slay James the brother of John with the sword and to arrest Peter. He died, like his grandfather Herod, of a loathsome disease, which attacked him suddenly at Caesarea in the midst of a splendid festival.²

A. D. 44. The important decision to preach to the Gentiles was made at Antioch under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost.³ Barnabas, the leader of the expedition, was accompanied by Saul, and by his relative, the youthful John Mark, who acted as their minister (*ὑπηρέτης*). It is not necessary to follow the Apostles on this memorable journey, first to Barnabas' native Cyprus, and afterwards through the southern portions of Asia Minor. The conversion of Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus, shewed clearly that Saul, who is henceforth known by his Gentile name of Paul, must take the first place in missionary enterprise; and from this time the Acts of the Apostles records his individual labours. |

The Council of Jerusalem. Now begins the first of those disputes which had such an important effect on the history of early Christianity. The Pharisees who believed⁴ insisted that the Gentiles should be circumcised when they became Christians. They regarded Christ's religion as a mere extension of Judaism and considered that in converting the Gentiles the great object was to increase the observers of the Law of Moses. What happened is not very easy to determine. According to the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul went up to

1. Herod Agrippa I. won great favour from the Jews for the part he took in the matter of the mad proposal of Caius to place his statue in the Jewish Temple. Grätz in speaking of the reign of this Herod is reminded of the days of Josiah. *Hist. of Jews*, vol. II. Eng. Trans., p. 195.

2. Acts xii. 20—23. Josephus (*Antiq.* XIX. viii. 2) gives an account of Herod's death very similar to that of St. Luke.

3. Acts xiii. 2.

4. Acts xv. 5.

Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus with him, and set before the Apostles the Gospel which he preached. They recognised that he was the Apostle of the Gentiles, as Peter was of the Jews, and accordingly James and Cephas and John gave to him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship. On the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch they adopted a less strict rule of life and ate with the Gentiles.¹ Cephas (for St. Paul calls St. Peter by this name) approved of their conduct and followed their example, till some of the stricter Jewish Christians came from James. Then St. Peter seeing he had rendered himself liable to suspicion gradually withdrew² from the Gentiles, and even St. Barnabas was carried away. St. Paul alone stood firm and rebuked Cephas because by this conduct he stood self-condemned³ by his own previous action in the matter.⁴ According to St. Luke a council was held at Jerusalem, at which, after a speech by St. Peter, St. Paul and St. Barnabas stated what had been done among the Gentiles. St. James, in his capacity of president, pronounced a judgment which was embodied in a letter to the brethren of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. Gentile converts to Christianity were not to be forced to observe the Law of Moses, but in deference to Jewish prejudices they were to abstain from meats offered to idols and from things strangled and from blood, they were also to beware of the constant moral impurity of heathen life.⁵

A more momentous decision could hardly have been made. Had the opinion of the Pharisaic Christians prevailed, the Christian religion would have been a mere Jewish sect. St. Paul, though very tender to Jewish prejudices, would never yield the principle of Gentile liberty, since on it the whole success of Christianity as the religion of the world depended.

1. Gal. ii. 1—14; ver. 12. μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθην.

2. Ib., ὑπέστειλλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν, φοβούμενος τοῦ ἐκ περιτομῆς.

3. Gal. ii. 11, κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.

4. I am aware that many commentators consider that the visit to Jerusalem described in Gal. ii. was not the same as that on the occasion of the council recorded in Acts xv. Bp. Lightfoot in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* makes out a strong case for the identity.

5. Acts xv. 14—29. For the explanation of these precepts see Dr. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*.

After visiting the churches which he and St. Barnabas had planted in Asia Minor, St. Paul, accompanied by Silvanus and Timotheus, passed through Phrygia and Galatia, and possibly founded a church of believers in the latter country.¹ The spirit of Jesus² would not suffer them to preach in the province of Asia nor in Bithynia nor Mysia, and a vision by night of a Macedonian saying "Come over into Macedonia and help us," decided St. Paul to cross over into Europe. The object of this journey was to sow the seeds of the Gospel in the trading cities, his point being Corinth, through which city the trade of East and West passed, making it a most important centre for the diffusion of a new doctrine. Churches were established at Philippi and Thessalonica, the one being a Roman colony, the other a Greek city of commercial importance. The only prominent church founded by St. Paul in the East seems to have been that of Ephesus, which was destined to play so important a part in early Christian history; he seems to have planted Christianity at a later period in Crete.³

The earliest evidence of the Gospel being preached in Rome is the somewhat obscure expression of Suetonius that Claudius A.D. 54 expelled the Jews from the city for raising incessant tumults about Chrestus. This is confirmed by the presence of Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth "because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome".⁴ St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, written in A.D. 58, presupposes a large and influential church consisting not only of Jews but of Gentiles.⁵ In

1. Gal. iv. 13, 14. The question is, Were the Galatians to whom St. Paul wrote the Roman inhabitants of the great province of Galatia who were evangelised on the first journey, or the Celtic inhabitants of the northern portion of that province? Bp. Lightfoot favours the latter view and says that St. Paul deflected from the main road on his second journey and went to Northern Galatia for the benefit of his health. Professor Ramsay in his *Church in the Roman Empire* supports the South Galatian theory.

2. For an extraordinary explanation of this see Dr. Selwyn, *St. Luke the Prophet*.

3. Titus i. 5.

4. Acts xviii. 2.

5. Rom. i. 13, xi. 13; and see Neander, *Planting of Christianity*, vol. i., p. 282. The Tübingen school consider the Roman Church to have been almost entirely composed of Jews.

his Epistle to the Philippians, A.D. 63, he speaks of his preaching the Gospel whilst a prisoner in the imperial city.

Extent of the Church in the Apostolic Age.

It has been the object of the present chapter to define the extent of the Christian Church in the apostolic age according to the narrative of the New Testament, in order to shew how far Christianity had progressed before the authentic records of the Apostles ceased. St. Luke evidently regards the arrival of St. Paul at Rome as the consummation of the work of the Apostles, and closes the Acts with this event, as if to shew that when the Gospel had reached Rome its world-wide diffusion was assured.¹ It may be observed that, though the number of Christians was doubtless very small, the Church had already covered a very wide area and had seized on most of the cities which contained a fluctuating population of strangers. Thus every pulsation of the current of trade in the Roman empire was a means of diffusing Christ's religion throughout the system. The merchant from the East, for example, who crossed the Isthmus of Corinth, heard of Christ, and carried His name to Gaul and even to Britain. The ever shifting population of Jewish craftsmen contained unknown missionaries of the Gospel who spread it in every city of the empire. The secret influence of the kingdom of heaven worked like the leaven which the woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened.²

Apostolic Churches : at Jerusalem ;

The great centres of evangelization formed by the Apostles were Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome. Each in its way was typical of a different aspect of Christianity. The Church at Jerusalem is a reflection of the Church as an historical development of Judaism. The Gospel representing it is that of St. Matthew, which is ever looking back on the old dispensation. It was the work of the Hebrew-speaking Christians to initiate the movement, and then to be lost in the obscure sects of the Judaizing followers of Jesus.

1. Notice the importance St. Paul attaches to reaching Rome ; *δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν* (Acts xix. 21) seems the key-note of his later labours.

2. Matth. xiii. 33.

Antioch; The Church of Antioch represented Syrian Christianity; its earliest representative was Ignatius, the martyred follower of the Apostles. It is a noteworthy fact that Ignatius has proved himself in his Epistles a thorough student of St. Paul. In spite of the strong Syrian element in the city, Greek culture was a characteristic of the Antiochene church in later days, and it can boast of the eloquence of Chrysostom and of the production of the most popular, if most incorrect, revision of the Greek Text of the New Testament.¹ St. Luke, the most educated of the four evangelists, is said to have been a native of Antioch. †

Ephesus; The Churches of Asia, with Ephesus at their head, represent the mysticism of the Phrygians. Ephesus became the apostolic capital after the fall of Jerusalem. It is to the Asiatic Churches that St. John addressed his Apocalypse, and from Ephesus that the fourth Gospel, with its doctrine of the divine Logos, proceeded. St. Paul when writing to Ephesus and Colossae, dwells specially on the heavenly hierarchies and reproves the tendency to worship the angels.² The Churches of Asia were connected with those of Gaul by Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, the disciple of Polycarp, that great link which binds together the Church of history and the Church of apostolic tradition.

Corinth; The Church of Corinth reflects the subtle activity of the Greek mind. It is the church of factions and disputes, composed of Christians 'enriched with all utterance and all knowledge,' but at the same time striving against one another, and using the names of their teachers and even of Christ as party watchwords.³

Rome. The Church of Rome from the first caught the Roman spirit of discipline. The Roman Christians, though Greeks rather than Romans by language and race, strove from the first to legislate for other churches. It is not without significance that in A.D. 96 St. Clement writes in the name of the

1. Westcott and Hort's *Greek Test.*, vol. II. p. 547.

2. Col. ii. 18, θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων.

3. 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.

Church of Rome to exhort the Church of Corinth to cease from faction and to restore their rightful rulers.

Traditional
labours of the
Apostles.

Although we must not give undue weight to the traditions which represent the Apostles as having preached in various countries, it is not right for an historian to ignore them altogether, since they shew at least the existence of a widespread belief that the immediate followers of our Lord literally obeyed His injunctions, and, as far as possible, preached the Gospel to every creature.

A curious legend is related by Eusebius, who declares he examined and translated the original documents.¹ Abgarus wrote a letter to our Lord asking Him to leave Judaea and preach in his kingdom. Our Lord replied by promising that He would, when He had fulfilled the things for which He was sent, despatch one of His disciples to heal the king, who was sick. Accordingly, after the Ascension, Thomas, one of the Twelve, sent Thaddeus, one of the Seventy, who healed and converted Abgar.² Eusebius says, "this happened in the year 340" (of the Seleucidae), A.D. 28—29. The legend is no doubt due to the desire of the Christians of Edessa to prove the antiquity of their really ancient Church. The first Christian king of Edessa was Abgar VIII., A.D. 176—213.³

It was the universal belief of the Church that St. Peter visited Rome. Eusebius says he went there to refute Simon Magus in the reign of Claudius,⁴ and the martyrdom of St. Peter at Rome is repeatedly asserted. Clement of Rome, however, who is cited as the earliest authority for this, does not say that St. Peter was martyred at Rome. His words are: "There was Peter who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one nor two but many labours,

1. Euseb., *H. E.*, I. 13.

2. In the Edessene document translated by Eusebius from the Syriac we read, "Judas, who is also called Thomas, sent him Thaddeus, the apostle, one of the Seventy."

3. Smith and Wace's *Dict. Christian Biography*, art. Thaddaeus. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 12. The Abgar of the Legend is Abgar Ukkâma or 'the Black'. See the *Doctrines of Addai*.

4. Euseb., *H. E.*, II. 14.

and thus having borne his testimony went to the appointed place of his glory."¹ It is true that St. Clement is writing from Rome and that he goes on to mention St. Paul's martyrdom, but he does not expressly state that St. Paul was martyred at Rome.

St. John. Of the Apostle St. John it may be truly said that he forms the link between the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages. He settled at Ephesus, and appears to have organized the Asiatic churches on a pattern somewhat dissimilar from that of either the Pauline or Hebrew churches.² The episcopate seems to have assumed its present form, in proconsular Asia, in St. John's time, and Tertullian, speaking of that province, asserts in his treatise against Marcion, "The sequence of bishops traced back to its origin will be found to rest on the authority of John."³ Clement of Alexandria relates the story of St. John and the robber chief.⁴ He tells us how the Apostle followed his convert, who had become a bandit, and converted him again. St. Jerome in his commentary on the Galatians gives the well-known words of St. John, in extreme old age, "My children, love one another," and the answer to the enquiry why he so often repeated them, "That if this one thing were attained it would be enough."

Of the other Apostles it is sufficient to remark that to St. Matthew has been assigned the honour of first preaching in Ethiopia; to St. Bartholomew, in Asia and Arabia. The Persian Church claimed St. Thomas, and St. Andrew has the credit of having laboured in Scythia. It is a remarkable fact that the evangelist of the province of Africa is not known, and that St. Mark is the only apostolic man connected with the important Church of Alexandria.

**SS. Matthew,
Bartholomew,
Andrew, Thomas.**

1. *Ep. to Cor.*, ch. 5, Lightfoot's Transl.
2. Neander, *Planting of Christianity*, vol. 1., p. 388.
3. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 212.
4. Euseb., *H. E.*, 111. 23.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT.

THE Christian society grew silently, unnoticed at first by the rulers of mankind. Of the emperors, statesmen, lawyers, and men of letters who influenced public affairs after the coming of Jesus Christ, hardly one so much as recognised the existence of a body of men whose views were destined to work the greatest revolution in human life and thought that the world has ever known. Tacitus, who was a boy when St. Paul was a prisoner at Rome and who wrote his *Annals* during the reign of Trajan, does not trouble to enquire whether those whom "the vulgar call Christians" were criminals or not.¹ Suetonius dismisses the subject with a few words of disparagement,² and Dio Cassius who wrote at a much later date evidently deems it below the dignity of history.³

In spite, however, of the lofty indifference of the pagan historians, the influence of the Church made itself felt at a very early period in the very palace of the Caesars. Nothing is more striking in the history of the early Christian Church in Rome than the strong

1. Tac., *Ann.* xv. 44. "Quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat."

2. Suet., *Nero* 16. "Superstitio nova et malefica."

3. For the contempt for Christianity of the heathen writers of the first and second centuries see Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xv.

support it received from the *familia* of the Emperors. "They of Caesar's household" are the only Roman Christians who salute the Philippian church¹ in St. Paul's epistle. St. Clement of Rome was probably a dependent of the Flavian family,² one of whom, Flavius

A.D. 95. Clemens, suffered, possibly as a Christian,³ under the tyrant Domitian. Even in the

time of Diocletian, A.D. 303, the imperial palace was a stronghold of Christianity, and that emperor commenced his persecution by compelling his wife and daughter to defile⁴ their baptismal robes by sacrificing to the gods.

The presence of Christians in the palace of the Emperors is a proof that the Roman government was naturally disposed to extend a certain amount of toleration to the Church, for by the behaviour of the Christian slaves and dependents on festivals and similar occasions it must have been evident that they professed the Faith; nor need this toleration cause wonder if we consider how many religious rights must have been practised in the vast concourse of men of all nationalities which composed the household of a Caesar. Indeed anyone unacquainted with the precise attitude of the Roman magistracy towards religion may marvel at the undoubted severity with which the Christians were from time to time treated. To understand the persecutions of the primitive Church it is necessary to divest the mind of all modern ideas of religion. To us, religion appears to be the highest duty of every man, and his relation to God a matter of primary importance. To a Roman legislator it was quite otherwise. The first duty of a man was to the State, and religious duties were subordinated to civil obligations. Hence persecution in modern days has had for its avowed object the bringing of a misguided individual into a proper relationship with his God, whilst that of the Roman

Reasons for the persecution of the Christians by the Government.

persecution of the Christians by the Government.

1. Phil. iv. 22.

2. Lightfoot, *Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 259. *Philippians*, p. 20.

3. He was accused of Judaism and atheism. Flavia Domitilla, his wife, was banished for the same offence. Suetonius, *Domit.* ch. 18: Dio Cassius, lxxvii. 14.

4. Lact., *Mort. Per.* 15, "sacrificio pollui coegit." This implies that these ladies were baptized, or at the least, catechumens.

government aimed at compelling him to return to his duty to the Republic. This helps to account alike for the absence of bigotry and for the severity which characterised the Roman officials in their dealings with the Christians.

The State, in fact, claimed the right to decide what gods might be worshipped, and although it did not trouble itself about a man's private opinions, it prescribed the objects of public adoration, and from time to time insisted on due reverence being paid to them. Cicero lays it down as a legal maxim that no one ought to have gods apart from the State, and that new and foreign gods should not be worshipped unless they had been publicly acknowledged.¹ Till therefore the religion of the Christians had received legal recognition, it was not lawful to practise it, and those who did so became liable to pains and penalties: according to Tertullian, the heathen taunted the Christians with the words '*non licet esse vos*,'—the law does not allow of your existence. But it may be asked why the Christian Church did not seek to obtain legal recognition. The Jews had done so, and the Christian apologists demanded no more than toleration from the State. The obstacle lay in the Roman idea that religion was a matter of race rather than of conviction. "The Jews" says Celsus "are not to be blamed, because each man ought to live according to the custom of his country; but the Christians have forsaken their national rites² for the doctrine of Christ."

A religion that was thus outside the law was sure to be exposed to the attacks of both private malice and popular frenzy. Wealthy members of the Church were especially liable to be accused by the delators or spies, employed by the suspicious policy of the Emperors, and, as Trajan hints in his reply to Pliny's letter about the Christians, the charge might easily be made anonymously.³ A Christian before the Edict of Milan was in a position somewhat resembling that of a Popish recusant in

1. "Nisi publice adscitos." Cicero, *Leg.* 11. 8.

2. "τὰ πάτρια καταλιπόντας καὶ οὐκ ἐν τι τυγχάνοντες ἔθνος ὡς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι." Origen *c. Celsum* v. 25. Quoted by Neander, vol. 1., p. 123, Eng. Transl.

3. "Sine auctore libelli." C. Plinii et Trajani *Epistolæ*, 97.

England in the 18th century, liable to laws which might at any moment be put in force against him.¹ The early Church moreover had in the Jews ever watchful enemies, ready at all times to set the law in motion against her children.² The unreasoning populace was easily excited, especially in times of public calamities, which were ascribed to the 'atheism' of the Christians. Tertullian in a well-known passage says that any affliction caused the mob to raise the cry "*Christianos ad leonem!*"³ The public burdens imposed by the State occasionally exposed the wealthier Christians to persecution. An example of this is found in the Acts of the Council of Elvira. If a baptized Christian held the office of Flamen he was expected to provide the sacrifices and sacred games, and, as this was a function hereditary in certain families, the duties could not be avoided. The second, third, and fourth canons of the Council decide the penalties to be imposed on those who from fear of persecution had either paid a sum of money, or taken an active part in these idolatrous practices. In the latter case all hope of re-entering the Christian Church was sternly interdicted.⁴

We may well ask how it was that the government did not crush the Church at once,—why if our religion was illegal it was not immediately stamped out by authority. Origen in his reply to Celsus rightly attributes the preservation of the early Church

Reasons for the comparatively tolerant attitude of the Roman Government towards Christianity.

1. Professor Ramsay in his *Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, draws a parallel between the Christians under Nero and the Romanists in England during the 'Popish Plot' of 1679. "The action of the English law courts and people in brutality, injustice and unreasoning cruelty, furnishes a fit parallel to the Neronian trials." Both in Rome and England this cruelty of the government occasioned a revulsion of feeling.

2. The Jews were especially active in the martyrdom of St. Polycarp. Renan (*L'Antichriste*) suggests that Nero was induced to select the Christians as victims by the intrigues of the Jewish courtiers about his person. See also Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, ch. iv. Clement of Rome says that the Christians suffered *through jealousy*. Ep. to Cor. ch. 5.

3. *Apol.* 40. "Si Tiberis ascendit in moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si coelum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim Christianos ad leonem."

4. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. 1. p. 138, English Translation. Bingham, *Ant. Christian Church*, xvi. 6. 4.

to the providence of God, and remarks that but a few at wide intervals had suffered for the Faith.¹ But though Christians naturally recognise God's special providence in the protection of His Church, we may also be permitted to examine what purely natural causes contributed to secure this comparative immunity. It is seldom that a society which, though illegal, does not disturb the tranquillity of the State, or interfere with the collection of the revenue, is subject to continuous molestation. Occasionally, over-conscientious magistrates may put the laws in force, but wise or negligent rulers are content to leave them in abeyance or even to allow them to be evaded. Nor was a military despotism like that of the Roman empire likely to enquire very deeply into actions, on which no possible suspicion of treason could rest. No doubt the Christian Church was regarded, by superficial observers like (in this instance) Tacitus, as an immoral society: but most of the emperors had to consider primarily how to keep the army in good humour, and had little time to regulate the religion or morality of their subjects. Nor should it be forgotten that many Christians belonged to a class which no wise government is willing to annoy. The taunt of Celsus and other opponents of the Faith was that it was a religion of women and slaves, but nevertheless it seems to have taken a strong hold on the commercial classes, and on professional men,—in a word, on the chief taxpayers of the State.² Added to this there was the extreme disorganization of the Roman empire from the death of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 180, to the accession of Diocletian, A.D. 283. As during this period there were no less than twenty-four changes of government, and thirty-five emperors, no settled policy towards the Church was possible or even conceivable.

1. Origen, *c. Celsum*, III. 8. *ἄλλοι κατὰ καιροῦ καὶ σφόδρα εὐαριθμοῦ ἕπερ τῆς Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας τεθνήκασιν.*

2. See Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, p. 209, note; Tertullian, *Apol.* 37; and Conybeare's *Bampton Lectures*, 345: "It seems unquestionable that the strength of Christianity lay in the middle, perhaps in the mercantile classes." Tertullian is a good example of the professional men who embraced our Faith.

Individual Emperors and their policy towards the Church.

The three great divisions into which the history of the Empire falls from the accession of Augustus to that of Diocletian, almost coincide with the centuries of our era. The first may be said to terminate with the death of Domitian, A.D. 96; the second with that of Commodus, A.D. 192; and the third with that of Numerian, A.D. 283. In the first of these periods the Church had chiefly to dread the personal fears or jealousy of a tyrant; in the second, the operation of laws, generally put into force by the mistaken policy of good rulers; whilst during the last, the Christians were alternately ignored, caressed or persecuted, according to the caprice of the successful soldier who for the time held the empire.

**Tiberius.
A.D. 14—37.**

According to Tertullian, Tiberius consulted the Senate on the propriety of admitting Christ into the Pantheon of Roman divinities. The Senate rejected the Emperor's proposal. But Caesar remained unaltered in his view of the case and threatened the accusers of the Christians with penalties.¹

Passing over the reigns of Caius, in which the Jews resisted the Emperor's blasphemous attempt to erect a statue of himself in their Temple, and of Claudius, whose edict, as Suetonius tells us, drove the Jews from Rome² for their tumults about the Christ,³ we come to definite facts in connexion with the Christian Church in the time of Nero.

1 Tertullian, *Apol.* 5. "Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in saeculum introivit, annuntiatum sibi ex Syria Palaestina, quod illic veritatem illius divinitatis revelaverat, detulit ad senatum cum praerogativa suffragii sui. Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit; Caesar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum." In ch. 21, he says:—"Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Caesari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit." Justin Martyr twice speaks in his Apology of the records of what was done under Pontius Pilate. (*Apol.* 45, 63.) [Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, part 1.] He says nothing of these records being sent to Tiberius. Eusebius (II. 2) merely translates Tertullian. Bishop Kaye (*Tertullian*, p. 110) discusses the fact mentioned by Tertullian.

2. Acts xviii. 2.

3. Suet., *Claud.* 25. "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit." This is a very vague statement and may be due to Suetonius confusing what he had heard about Christ in his day with what happened in the time of Claudius.

St. Paul
and
Thecla.

We possess an account of a proceeding against Christians, which is perhaps the earliest on record, in the very strange romance of St. Paul and Thecla. The latter was a noble maiden of Iconium who was converted by hearing the Apostle in his second missionary tour preach as she sat at a window of her mother's house. The conversion of Thecla caused the imprisonment of St. Paul, who was visited by Thecla in his dungeon, the damsel having bribed the jailor with her ornaments and silver mirror. Paul was beaten and driven from the city; and Thecla after various adventures appears at Antioch, where Alexander the high priest of Syria offered her insulting proofs of admiration, though she told him she was a stranger, who had vowed chastity to God. Thecla finding her protests futile attacked Alexander and tore the crown from him. For this she was arrested and condemned to die as guilty of sacrilege. A queen named Tryphaena received Thecla into her house after her condemnation on promising to produce her that she might undergo her sentence. Thecla was brought into the amphitheatre with no garment save the cincture which the Roman law allowed condemned criminals. The people, especially the women, we are told, greatly sympathised with her. The accusation over Thecla's head was the word SACRILEGA, and she stood with her arms extended in the form of a cross. A series of miracles rescued Thecla on this occasion from death. Absurd as parts of the story are, the Acts of Paul and Thecla contain some undoubted traces of genuine antiquity. Queen Tryphaena is a personage who was well known in Asia Minor in the first century. Thecla's condemnation—not for Christianity but for sacrilege—together with the fact that the people sympathised with her in her punishment, is an evidence of an early date, and a very convincing argument for the antiquity of the story is the fact that Thecla was able by the use of her needle (*βύψασα*) to change the appearance of her dress when she wished to pass as a boy. This could

more easily have been done in the first century of our era than later.¹

Nero. The Neronian persecution, during which
A. D. 54-68. probably both St. Peter and St. Paul suffered martyrdom, furnishes a good illustration of the general policy of the Government towards the Church, which had been allowed to grow in obscurity, and was only attacked by the Emperor when it was convenient for him to attract public indignation away from himself. It is possible that the trial of St. Paul may have called Nero's attention to the fact of the existence of the Christians in Rome. The vast multitude who suffered² is a heathen testimony both to the rapid increase of the Church, and to the severity of the persecution. Nero lent his gardens for the purpose of exhibiting the tortures of the wretched victims, and at night he illuminated his grounds by the flames of the burning Christians.³ The cruelty of these tortures and the flagrant injustice with which the Christians were treated caused, we may infer, a reaction in their favour, and the fact that many of them had been Nero's victims may have saved them from molestation after the tyrant's death.

The reign of Nero is the most important crisis in the history of the Church in the first century, and it is also the key to many difficulties in the New Testament. There can be no stronger contrast than the language employed by St. Peter and St. Paul on the subject of the duty of Christians to obey the Roman Government and the abhorrence with which St. John in the Revelation speaks of the Empire.⁴ This is only to be accounted for by the fact that a terrible outbreak of persecution had intervened between the last of the

1. Ramsay's chapter (xvi.) on the Acts of Paul and Thecla, in his *Church and the Roman Empire*. Le Blant, *Actes et Martyres*. Lipsius has published an edition of the text.

2. Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44. I cannot but believe that the discovery of a 'secret society' like the Christians must have been a godsend to the government at this time. The Italians have a genius for secret combination: witness the power of the *Carbonari* and the *Mafia* in recent times.

3. Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44. "Aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis urerentur."

4. Rev. xvii. 9 foll.

Pauline Epistles and the Apocalypse. St. Paul at least had no cause to feel any bitterness against the Roman rule—Caesar was to him the supreme embodiment of justice on earth, to whom he was able to appeal when no other judge had the courage to protect him.¹ It is conceivable that St. John had actually witnessed the persecution of the Christians at Rome, and had perhaps himself been in great danger.² In this case it is not unnatural that the Apostle of the Gentiles should speak of the Roman Empire as the restraining influence in the world,³ and that St. John should rejoice at the prospect of the fall of the Babylon of his day the abominable city of Rome which was drunk with the blood of the saints.⁴ From Nero's persecution also dates the almost fanatical hatred with which the Christians regarded idolatry. In St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians a singular absence of invectives against worshipping idols is noticeable, especially as the Epistle treats at some length of the question of eating meats offered to idols.⁵ Before, however, the Canon of the New Testament had closed, this contemptuous silence on the subject of images gave way to a furious and more than Jewish hatred of idolatry,⁶ and it became a point of honour among Christians to embrace the opportunity of martyrdom sooner than risk the least contamination from the worship of heathen gods. This seems properly attributable to the effect of the Neronian persecution.

The reign of Vespasian was unsullied by any public persecution, as this ruthless conqueror of the Jews left the Christians in tranquillity.⁷ Suetonius says that Vespasian never took pleasure in anyone's death, and used to be moved to tears even when criminals were deservedly executed. It has been supposed that this refers to the sufferings of people like the Christians, whose punishment Vespasian

1. Acts xxv. 10, 11.

2. The story of St. John being plunged into boiling oil is in Tertullian, *Praescrip.* ch. 36.

3. II Thess. ii. 6.

4. Rev. xvii. 6.

5. I Cor. viii. passim.

6. Rev. ii. 20.

7. Tert. *Apol.* 5. "Judaeorum debellator."

felt bound to accept, while he regretted it.¹ The rigid enforcement of the tax called the *fiscus Judaicus* on all Jews by this emperor may however have revealed how numerous the Christians were, and have resulted in several executions. The abominable *regime* of informers which flourished under the patronage of Domitian was felt by the Church. A charge of 'atheism' might easily be magnified into one of treason, and the greed and suspicion of the Emperor combined to strengthen his determination to visit those accused of Christianity with the penalty of death.² If, as is not improbable, St. Clement's first epistle was written during the reign of this emperor, the persecutions endured by the Christians at the time are described as sudden and repeated.³ Bp. Lightfoot in his note on this passage remarks that "Domitian made use of legal forms and arraigned the Christians from time to time on various paltry charges."

The most important victim to the suspicious jealousy of Domitian was Flavius Clemens, the Emperor's cousin-german and his colleague in the consulship, who was suddenly accused of atheism and Jewish superstition. His wife Flavia Domitilla was banished to an island.⁴

1. Ramsay, p. 257. I am afraid I cannot read this meaning into Suetonius' words. The chapter (xv.) in which they occur begins with the history of Vespasian's treatment of Helvidius Priscus, who had behaved to the Emperor with the utmost discourtesy. Vespasian condemned him, but changed his mind and countermanded the order when too late. The historian concludes with the remark that the Emperor was greatly moved (*inlacrimavit atque ingemuit*) even when men were justly executed. Professor Ramsay says "it is inconceivable that Vespasian, a Roman, a soldier of long experience in the bloody wars of Britain and Judaea, 'wept' and groaned at every 'merited' execution." It is possible however that as a general Vespasian may have regarded the massacre of Celtic barbarians and Jewish fanatics in war time with callous indifference, and yet have shewn extreme sensitiveness at the sight of the execution of criminals in time of peace.

2. See Neander, *Hist. Church*, vol. I. p. 132.

3. *Ep. to Corinthians*, ch. i. *διὰ τὰς αἰφύδιους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους γενομένας ἡμῖν συμφορὰς*. Yet we hear no complaints of apostasy. Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*. Domitian posed as a strict reformer of religion. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 54.

4. Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 18) calls her his niece, and Bp. Lightfoot (*Philippians*, p. 22sq.) concludes that there were two ladies of this name who suffered for their Christianity. Dion Cassius (lxvii. 44) says:—*ἐπηνέχθη δὲ ἀμφὸν ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι εἰς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθη ἐξεκέλευσαν πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον οἱ δὲ τῶν γούν οὐσιῶν ἐστερήθησαν*. Prof. Ramsay gives some valuable suggestions as to Dion

There is a story related by Hegesippus which though it has decidedly fabulous air¹ shews the watchfully suspicious nature of the tyrant. Hearing that some of David's descendants were alive in the persons of the grandsons of Jude the Lord's brother, Domitian ordered them to be brought to Rome and questioned them as to their lineage. They said that though really descendants of David, they were poor farmers working on a small property they owned in Palestine. In proof of this statement they showed their hands hardened with toil, and the Emperor dismissed them with contempt. As they asserted that the kingdom of Christ was spiritual and not temporal, the Emperor ordered the persecution of the Christians to cease.²

Christianity
under the best
Roman
Emperors.

After the death of Domitian the empire fell into the hands of a succession of good and able rulers. With the exception of Nerva they each reigned for some years, and their administrations secured a period of prosperity, marked by the very rapid growth and progress of the Christian Church. It was inevitable that the Church and the Empire should now from time to time come into conflict with one another, and we must attribute to the watchful providence of God the fact that this most critical period of the Church's existence coincided with the wise and moderate administrations of four successive emperors. Hitherto the law had been strained to persecute the Christians at the caprice of the worst rulers, but henceforth all irregular attacks on the Church were checked by the prudence of emperors, who in their mistaken zeal for justice resolved to substitute for popular violence the regular process of the laws, and to specify the profession of Christianity as unlawful.³

Cassius's reasons for saying that they suffered for Judaism. Either he gives the charge that was brought at the time, or he in conformity with the fashion of his age ignores Christianity. *Op. cit.* p. 263. For the heroism displayed by women in the darkest days of Caesarian despotism, see Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 47.

1. Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. II., p. 10.

2. Hegesippus, quoted in Euseb., *H. E.* III. 20. Tertullian (*Apol.* 5) confirms the statement that Domitian stopped a persecution. The brethren of our Lord were called the *Desposyni*.

3. It is a disputed question whether the reply of Trajan to Pliny inaugurated a system of persecution by law or modified the rigour of the

Trajan.
A. D. 98-117.

It is difficult to decide from the testimony of the Fathers whether Trajan was the friend or foe of the Christian Church. As a rule they are favourable in their view of his reign. Even Tertullian,¹ who severely criticises his rescript in answer to Pliny's famous letter, alludes to the laws against the Christians *quas Trajanus ex parte frustratus est*. Melito of Sardis,² an earlier Apologist, in his address to Marcus Aurelius evidently includes Trajan among the good emperors who protected the Church. "Thy pious fathers" he tells the Emperor "often set right the ignorance (of the adversaries of the Christians), blaming those who dared to devise any new evil against us often in repeated rescripts. Among whom³ thy grandfather Hadrian with many others also appears, writing to Fundanus the proconsul ruling in Asia." Eusebius says that the prosecutions during this period were rare and widely distributed,⁴ and in later times Trajan is supposed to have been allowed to enter heaven owing to the prayer of Pope St. Gregory the Great.⁵ It is noticeable however that the Apologists always asserted that the good emperors favoured the Christians and that those who persecuted them were bad men who generally came to bad ends. The facts are rather against Trajan, as during his reign Pliny wrote his well-known letter to the Emperor, and Ignatius was martyred.

Pliny's Letter to Trajan.

The younger Pliny, proconsul of Bithynia A. D. 110, finding that the Christians were very numerous in this province, wrote a letter to the Emperor asking his advice as to the

former procedure. Prof. Ramsay says "The real importance of the letter to Pliny is very different. It marks the end of the old system of uncompromising hostility."

1. *Apology*, 5.
2. Apud Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26.
3. *ἐν οἷς* must include Trajan. See Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1.
4. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 32. *μερικῶς καὶ κατὰ πόλεις*.
5. This legend is very fully discussed by Bp. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. 1. p. 6. It was a favourite story in the middle ages, and is alluded to by Dante, *Paradiso* xx. 44 sq., 106 sq. St. Thomas Aquinas ingeniously attempts to solve the question of how an unbaptized heathen could have been saved. Baronius (sub anno 604) refutes the story,

method of dealing with an illegal association like the Church;¹ the chief points of which are as follows:—

Pliny says that according to his custom he refers any difficulty he has to Trajan and desires his advice. As he had had no previous experience of the judicial enquiries about the Christians he does not know how he should proceed.² Up to the present time he examined some who had been brought before him whether they were Christians, on their confession he threatened them, and if they persisted he condemned them to death. For as he remarks with true Roman contempt, 'pertinacity and inflexible obstinacy ought at any rate to be punished.' A few who were Roman citizens and had fallen into this madness³ Pliny sent to Rome. An anonymous information had been laid containing the names of many supposed Christians.⁴ Pliny summoned these and made them offer sacrifice and curse Christ, which he remarks real Christians can never be forced to do. A few said that they had been Christians, but had left the Church some as long ago as twenty years; they also declared that the Christians were accustomed to meet on a particular day before dawn and to sing an antiphonal hymn to Christ as though to a god.⁵ They also, says Pliny, bound themselves by an oath (*sacramento*) to abstain from crime and to behave honestly.⁶ By this the baptismal oath is evidently meant, which Pliny, not unnaturally, misunderstood, considering that it was administered not once but frequently to the same persons. After this the assembly broke up and did not meet again till the evening, when they partook of a common meal, apparently the Christian *ἀγάπη*. This however they at once consented to abandon in obedience

1. *Plinii et Trajani Epistulae* 96, 97. For these letters with notes see Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, vol. I., p. 50.

2. Pliny was praetor A.D. 93 or 94. He knew that Christians had been previously tried, though he himself never assisted at such a trial.

3. *Plinii et Trajani Epistulae*, 96, 4: "similis amentiae."

4. *Ib.* 5: "Propositus est libellus sine auctore, multorum nomina continens."

5. *Ib.* 7: "carmenque Christo, quasi deo, dicere secum invicem."

6. The Christian baptismal vow of renunciation seems to have been taken from the Commandments: "ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fideum fallerent" &c. *Ib.* 7.

to the imperial edict about clubs.¹ Being determined to ascertain the whole truth, Pliny tortured two female slaves, termed by the Christians *ministrae* or deaconesses, but found that the religion was nothing worse than a base and degrading superstition. He admits, however, that a vast number of people were in danger of being accused of Christianity, and that the temples had been almost abandoned, a sure sign that the new religion had the effect of creating scepticism as to the efficacy of the heathen rites.² Nevertheless he had caused many to return to the worship of the gods by his salutary severity, and is of opinion that giving opportunities for expressing regret at having been Christians is both a wise and merciful policy.

The great importance of this letter justifies a full abstract of its contents, although in the present instance we are only concerned with the attitude of the Roman government towards the Christians. The most noticeable feature it presents is the total absence of intolerant fanaticism. Although the new superstition seems in Pliny's eyes to be "*prava et immodica*"³ he has no desire to proceed with unnecessary severity. Equally conspicuous is the fact that it was illegal to profess Christianity, even though no special edict had been issued against it, and that once the Christians ceased to be identified with a body like the Synagogue, which was recognised by law, they became liable to prosecution. Most creditable is it to Pliny's sense of justice that he refused to accept the popular charges of abominable practices, even in the case of an unlawful association, without full investigation by all means that lay within his power. Lastly it may be observed that the silence of the Christian writers on the subject of a persecution so

1. The abandonment of the *δύστην* shews that it could not have been the Eucharist: cf. the remark of the martyr Felix; "As if a Christian could live without the Lord's ordinance! knowest thou not, Satan, that a Christian's whole being is in the sacrament?" Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 151.

2. *Plinii et Trajani Epistulae*, 96, 9: "contagio."

3. Professor Ramsay explains these words: "It was a *superstitio* (in other words a non-Roman worship of non-Roman Gods), in the first place a degrading system (*prava*) and in the second destructive of that reasonable course of life which becomes the loyal citizen (*immodica*)."

evidently severe as that in Bithynia, is in itself a refutation of the malignant assertion that in speaking of their persecutions the Christians forgot nothing and magnified everything.¹

Trajan's reply. The answer that Trajan returned to Pliny's letter shews the statesmanlike moderation of that emperor. His policy was to put down all clubs and associations, as he considered that they might easily become centres of political disaffection.² The description Pliny had given him of the Christian society was sufficient to convince him that it bore some resemblance to a *hetairia* or club, and this was enough to prejudice it in his eyes. As however the members of the Church appeared to Pliny to be mere harmless fanatics, though belonging to an illegal society, the Emperor had no desire to treat them with undue severity. In spite of the satirical comment of Tertullian,³ Trajan shewed a desire to act as mercifully as possible, consistently with his policy of suppressing all secret societies in the empire. In his reply to Pliny he approved his action in the matter of the Christians, forbade that they should be sought for, but if they were accused and found guilty they were to be punished, if they denied that they were Christians they were to prove the fact by supplicating the gods. As for the anonymous accusations alluded to by Pliny, they were to be treated with the contempt they deserve; for says Trajan nobly, 'they are the worst possible precedent and unworthy of our age.'⁴

**Martyrdom of
Ignatius.**

The martyrdom of Ignatius with its attendant circumstances is involved in obscurity. We are entirely ignorant of

1. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol. i., p. 16.

2. See the letters of Pliny and Trajan quoted by Bp. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 19. Trajan will not even permit a guild of fire-men.

3. *Tert. Apol.* 2. "O sententiam necessitate confusam! Negat inquirendos ut innocentes et mandat puniendos ut nocentes."

4. *Plinii et Trajani Epistulae*, 97. "Nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est." Prof. Ramsay denies that Trajan regarded the Christian Church as an unlawful guild. The Christians gave up the evening meal which made them a *sodalitas*. "The fact is one of the utmost consequence. It shews that the Christian communities were quite alive to the necessity of acting according to law and of using the forms of law to screen themselves as far as was consistent with their principles." p. 219—220.

the events which led to his trial and condemnation. The light of history only shines on him when he has received sentence of death and is on his way to Rome to be exposed in the amphitheatre to the wild beasts. On his journey he received numerous visits from his friends and was allowed to send letters to the different churches, and to Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, the disciple of St. John; he even was able to despatch a letter to the Roman Christians, imploring them not to rob him of the glory of martyrdom by their intercessions.¹ A tone of passionate exultation at the prospect of his sufferings is audible throughout the letters, in marked contrast to the calm utterances of the writers in the New Testament when they anticipated the trial of a martyr's death.² The Ignatian Letters breathe a spirit of uncompromising hostility to the Roman empire, which reminds us of the Apocalypse. The world (*κοσμος*) is used in the Johannine sense as the human order of affairs which is in irreconcilable hostility to the Church. All compromise with the powers that be is unworthy of the spirit of Christianity. "The work" says Ignatius to the Romans "is not of persuasiveness, but Christianity is a thing of might when it is hated by the world."³ Although the account of the trial before Trajan exists only in the doubtful Acts of the Martyrdom, it is supposed that the Emperor was at this time preparing for his invasion of the East and that the conduct of the Jews, who revolted in the reign of Hadrian, had made him extremely suspicious. In spite of Ignatius' vehement denunciations of the Jews, the Emperor may have confused Christianity with Judaism, and the martyrdom of Symeon son of Cleopas, the second bishop of Jerusalem,⁴ may have been due to the same cause.⁵

1. The letter to the Romans is interesting as shewing both the position of influence which that Church possessed even at that time, and the spirit which animated the Christian martyrs.

2. *Ign. Rom.* 4. σίτος εἰμι Θεοῦ, καὶ δι' ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλθίβομαι, ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄγρος εὐρεθῶ [τοῦ Χριστοῦ]. μᾶλλον κολακεύσατε τὰ θηρία ἵνα μοι τάφος γένωνται..... λιτανεύσατε τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα διὰ τῶν ὀργάνων τούτων Θεοῦ θυσία εὐρεθῶ.

3. *Romans*, 3. Ramsay, p. 314.

4. Euseb., *H.E.* III. 32.

5. See Dean Milman's *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. II., p. 101.

Hadrian.
A. D. 117—138.

Under Hadrian the Christians began to make themselves known to the heathen world by the Apologies which they addressed to the Emperor. The revolt of the Jews under Barcochab made it necessary for the Christians to remove all misapprehensions as to their relations with Judaism. Eusebius says that the Jews of Cyrene in the eighteenth year of Trajan (A. D. 115) had caused very serious trouble, and there had also been disturbances in Alexandria and elsewhere which were put down with great severity.¹ It was no doubt partly on this account that Quadratus and Aristides addressed their Apologies for the Christian faith to Hadrian when he was admitted to the Eleusinian mysteries at Athens² in A. D. 133. The Emperor himself recognised the injustice of punishing the Christians for the sake of gratifying popular caprice, and in reply to the representations of Serennius Granianus proconsul of

Asia on this subject he addressed a rescript to his successor Minucius Fundanus enjoining that the Christians should not be put to death without a formal accusation and a proper hearing of their case.³ This rescript placed the Christians under the protection of the law in so far as it exempted them from the danger of popular fury, but it also recognised the illegality of their religion, which from this time was formally condemned by the laws of the empire.

Rebellion of
Barcochab.

Under Barcochab (A. D. 132—135) the Jewish nation made a last despairing effort to throw off the Roman yoke. The Christians of Palestine were among the chief sufferers in this terrible revolt, as the Jewish insurgents persecuted with all the cruelty of fanaticism those who refused to join them in the rebellion. On its suppression Jerusalem was made a pagan city

1. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 2.
2. Euseb., *ib.* iv. 3.
3. Euseb., *ib.* iv. 9. The genuineness of this rescript has been denied, but the evidence in its favour is very strong; it forms the conclusion of Justin Martyr's first Apology and it is quoted by Melito. The vagueness with which the rescript alludes to the crime of being a Christian is the sole cause for suspecting its genuineness.

with the name of Aelia Capitolina, and the Jews were forbidden to approach it. The Christians having to choose between abandoning the city or their Jewish rites, decided upon the latter alternative by electing a Gentile bishop by name Marcus to occupy the seat of St. James and Symeon.¹

Antoninus Pius.
A.D. 138—161.

It is noticeable that a period of severe trial of a nation or institution is frequently preceded by one of unusual calm. Under the contemptuous indifference of Hadrian and the mild administration of Antoninus Pius, the Christians seem to have enjoyed a comparatively uneventful period of tranquillity. Eusebius quotes a rescript to the assembly of Asia, published in the name of M. Aurelius but ascribed to Antoninus, ordering the Christians not to be punished except for crimes against the State;² but as Melito of Sardis does not give the words of this edict in the fragment preserved by Eusebius, though he quotes one far less favourable to the Church, Neander considers that in all probability there was no such rescript.³ In spite however of the lenity of the Emperor's policy

Martyrdom of Polycarp,
A.D. 156.

towards the Church, a famous martyrdom happened in his reign.⁴ The venerable Polycarp, the last link that bound the Church to the Apostolic age, the pupil of St. John and the master of Irenaeus, was burned at Smyrna. The church at this place, in a letter addressed to the church at Philomelium, gave a very full account of the persecution they had just endured. The martyrs were tortured in a most horrible manner and then given to the beasts. One of them, a youth named Germanicus, actually encouraged the beasts to attack him, and his courage so amazed and angered the multitude that they clamoured for Polycarp's execution. Quintus, a Phrygian who had provoked persecution by rushing forward to the

1. Euseb., *H.E.* IV. 6. Neander, *Church History*, vol. 1., p. 143.

2. Euseb., *id.* 13.

3. *Church History*, vol. 1., p. 144.

4. Eusebius (*H.E.* IV. 15) places the martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Bp. Lightfoot considers it took place A.D. 155. Mr. C. H. Turner, in an essay in the *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. II. (Oxon., 1890) prefers A.D. 156.

tribunal, was ordered to be thrown to the beasts, but was so appalled by them that he renounced Christ. Polycarp had decided on the advice of his friends not to remain in the city but to retire to a farm belonging to him in the country. He allowed himself to be arrested though he might easily have escaped, ordered food to be prepared for the use of the police sent to seize him, and requested only an hour for prayer. As he was being conducted to the city, Herod the Irenarch and his father Nicetes met him and took him into their carriage to remonstrate with him for his obstinacy in refusing to say 'Lord Caesar' and to sacrifice to save his life. As however Polycarp persisted in his refusal they thrust the old man out of the carriage so violently that his shin was injured. He was brought to the stadium where the sacred games and shows were being exhibited, and asked to swear by the genius of Caesar and to curse Christ. His reply is one of the noblest answers ever given by a martyr: "Eighty and six years have I served Him and He never did me wrong, how then can I blaspheme my King who has saved me?" He was condemned, and a herald made proclamation "Polycarp confesses that he is a Christian!" whereupon the whole multitude Gentiles and Jews dwelling at Smyrna cried out, "This is that teacher of Asia, the father of the Christians, the destroyer of our gods; he that teaches multitudes not to sacrifice nor to worship." He was condemned to be burned, and the Christians of Smyrna believed that the flames would not touch the body of the saint. The executioner plunged his sword into the body and the great quantity of blood which poured forth extinguished the flames.¹ The Jews were particularly active in promoting the execution, and the body was refused to the Christians lest they should abandon the worship of Christ for that of their new saint. The letter remarks very beautifully, "They did not know that we can never abandon Christ who suffered for the salvation of those who are being saved from all the world, nor even worship any other."

1. For the many parallels between the martyrdom of Polycarp and the Passion of our Lord, see Lightfoot, *Ignatian Epistles*, vol. I., p. 595.

With the death of Polycarp the persecution ceased. Eusebius says that several Asiatic Christians had suffered death, among them a follower of Marcion by name Metrodorus; but this is not correct, as Metrodorus suffered in the Decian persecution at the same time as Pionius (A.D. 250). The historian found the account of these martyrdoms in the same volume (*τῇ αὐτῇ γραφῇ*) as the letter of the church of Smyrna.¹

1. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 15. Bp. Lightfoot (*op. cit.* p. 624) thinks that Eusebius must have been misled by the phrase *ἡ αὐτῇ περίοδος τοῦ χρόνου* which possibly stood at the head of the *Acta Pionii*, and which expression he himself uses in this passage. The words may mean 'the same epoch' as well as 'the same recurring period of the year', *i.e.* the same time of year as when Polycarp was martyred, and Eusebius has taken it in the former sense.

CHAPTER V.

THE CONQUEST OF HEATHENISM BY CHRISTIANITY.

A. D. 161—A. D. 313.

ECCLESIASTICAL history sometimes has epochs not exactly synchronising with political events. The age of the Antonines which closes with the death of Marcus Aurelius does not conclude an era of Church history, whilst the accession of that emperor distinctly marks a new period in the development of Christianity. The Roman Government began to regard the Church as an institution which must be suppressed by force, and persecuted, not merely in order to gratify the people, but to extirpate an unlawful association. In spite of long truces and temporary agreements, Christianity and the State had become two rival powers striving for the mastery of the world, and until the close of the final contest under Diocletian there could be no real peace between them.¹

The Church was herself fully prepared for the struggle. During the first century of her existence she had perfected her organization, and her leaders, the bishops, had obtained unquestioned authority. Her contests with heresy had forced her to give her teaching a clearer and more dogmatic form, and as a consequence of this she had almost come to a final decision as to the composition of her Bible. The

1. It is well to remember that besides the public persecution of Christians, believers were subject to the family tribunals over which the head of the household presided with almost unlimited power. Fathers disinherited their sons, and threw their most valued slaves into the horrible *ergastula* for professing the Faith. Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, l. 4.

constant communication maintained by the various churches throughout the empire gave her a strength and unity which contributed greatly to her final triumph. We cannot fail also to notice that the age which succeeded the conflict of the persecution under Marcus Aurelius produced really great men in every part of the Christian world. Gaul, which had been visited by the severest trial, could boast of St. Irenaeus bishop of Lyons. Rome had the learned St. Hippolytus and Caius;¹ Africa was famous for Tertullian, and Egypt for Clement of Alexandria. All these Fathers flourished towards the close of the second century or the beginning of the third, and proved conclusively that the Church was capable of attracting not merely slaves and women but the leading minds of the age.

The Emperor M. Aurelius, in whose reign the Church endured the most severe trial she had hitherto undergone, differed greatly in character and disposition from persecutors like Nero and Domitian. He seems to have reconciled in his person the virtues of the Porch with the gentler grace, of the gospel, for the tone of his writings is sometimes marvellously Christian. Perhaps no sovereign ever reigned more exclusively for the welfare of his people than Marcus Aurelius, while his personal life appears to have been singularly blameless. His virtues were however precisely those which would be most likely to make him dislike the Christian system. He was naturally of a religious disposition, and this had been fostered by the piety of his mother. His philosophy attempted to steer a clear path between infidelity and superstition, and his desire was to restore the ancient reverence both for the gods and for the virtues of antiquity. Believing, as he did, that the gods communicated with men by dreams and other means, he did all in his power to introduce the ancient ceremonies, and his sacrifices before the war with the Marcomanni provoked the

1. Who Caius was is extremely difficult to say. He is quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* II. 25, and mentioned in VI. 20 and III. 28. He has been identified with Hippolytus, see the note in the edition of Eusebius in *The Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, by Dr. McGiffert, p. 229, on bk. II. ch. 25.

ridicule of the heathen epigrammatist: *οἱ λευκοὶ βόες Μάρκῳ τῷ Καίσαρι ἄν σὺ νικήσῃς, ἡμεῖς ἀπωλόμεθα.*¹ The Stoic philosophy of the Emperor also tended to prejudice him against the Church, and he specially condemns the obstinacy with which the Christians met death, contrasting it with the calmness of the philosopher whose judgment is guided by reason.²

To this must be added the prejudices against the Christians which had been instilled into the Emperor's mind by his preceptors. Fronto of Cirta, the tutor of M. Aurelius, for example, lent his name to the vulgar libels which charged the Christians with shameful orgies at their love feasts.³ Nor must we forget that the reign of Marcus Aurelius was marked by many frightful calamities, the year 166, during which a serious outbreak of persecution occurred throughout the Empire, being known as the *annus calamitosus*. Every evil which the prudence of man could not avert seems to have afflicted the world; famines, pestilence, the overflow of the Tiber, the invasion of the Marcomanni and Quadi. No wonder that the populace should have sought to propitiate their offended gods by attacking the men whom they in their ignorance styled atheists.⁴

At Rome several Christians suffered martyrdom, the most notable being St. Justin the Apologist. He was tried with six others by Q. Junius Rusticus,⁵ who entered upon his duties as prefect of the city in A.D. 163.

Persecutions in
the reign of
Marcus Aurelius.

1. Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. I., p. 148. The epigram is preserved by Ammianus Marcellinus, xxv. 4. 17.

2. Neander, *l.c.*, p. 146.

3. Bp. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, part II., vol. I., p. 513) quotes from Minucius Felix, *Octav.* 9: "Et de convivio notum est. Passim omnes locuntur. Id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio. Ad epulas solenni die coeunt," etc. *Ib.* 31: "Et de incesto convivio fabulam grandem adversum nos daemonum coitio mentita est...sic de isto et tuus Fronto, non ut affirmator testimonium fecit, sed conuicium ut orator, aspersit."

4. Prof. Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 336) says that "during this reign the active pursuit of the Christians had become a marked feature," and gives the evidence of Celsus (Origen, *adv. Cel.* VIII. 69), of Melito (who, as quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* IV. 26, speaks of the new decrees by which the Christians were sought out), and of Athenagoras and Theophilus of Antioch.

5. These martyrdoms are taken from Bp. Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. I., p. 493; see also Euseb., *H. E.* IV. 16.

Justin had long complained of the plots of a certain Crescens, a philosopher, who desired his death and also tried to compass the death of Justin's pupil Tatian,¹ afterwards the founder of the sect of the Encratites. Polycrates of Ephesus mentions a martyr by name Thraseas and some others, from which it is inferred that the persecution in which Polycarp suffered was renewed under M. Aurelius.² The Acts of the Martyrs also relate that the widow Felicitas and her seven sons were executed at Rome; probably in A.D. 162.

Persecutions occurred at Madaura in Africa and also at Scillium or Scilla in the same province. (A.D. 180.)³ But though our list of martyrdoms is somewhat meagre, we may attribute this to the absence of direct information. All the Apologists, Justin Martyr, Melito, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, tell the same tale,⁴ and we are told that in the reign of Commodus a large number of Christian confessors were liberated from the Sardinian mines. Perhaps however the best way of estimating the severity of the persecution is to take the record of the one well-known persecution of this reign, which took place at Lyons and Vienne. 'Ex uno disce omnes,' and the cruelty exercised in Gaul with the Emperor's permission was probably not confined to one province.⁵

1. There is a difficulty in the text. In Tatian's *Cohortatio ad Graecos* he says that Crescens plotted against both Tatian and Justin. Eusebius in quoting him reads *μεγάλη* for *καὶ ἐπὶ ὧς*, completely altering the force of the passage: see Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte* iv. 1, and the note on Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 16 in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.

2. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 24. Bp. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 495—499.

3. The Acts of the Scillitan martyrs are published in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies* edited by Dean Armitage Robinson in his Appendix to the Acts of St. Perpetua. Now that the disputed reading in the Latin recension as to the name of the Consul or Consuls has been decided, it is certain that the persecution was in A.D. 180. Sentence was pronounced in the following form: "Speratum, Nartzalum, Cittinum, Donatam, Vestiam, Secundam et ceteros ritu Christiano se vivere confessos, quoniam oblata sibi facultate ad Romanorum morem redeundi obstinanter perseveraverunt, gladio animadverti placet."

4. Lightfoot, *op. cit.* 510. Bp. Lightfoot's first volume of *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. (St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp), is worth reading if only to shew how materials ought to be collected by the historian. The vastness of the labour of this great theologian, if fully realised, might well deter the boldest from presuming even to follow him afar off.

5. Euseb., *H. E.* v. introd.

Persecution at
Lyons and Vienna.
A.D. 177.

The persecution began, to all appearance, with the mob, at whose hands the Christians were exposed to every kind of insult.¹ They were then arrested, and imprisoned till the governor arrived. Vettius Epagathus, a man of high rank, protested before the governor, confessed himself a Christian, and was condemned with his brethren. He was styled the advocate of the Christians,² and was the first to suffer execution. Ten of those arrested recanted, to the inexpressible grief of the others. In their letter to the churches of Asia it is said that the martyrs were never left by their brethren who were still at liberty. Arrests continued, and some of the slaves confessed that their Christian masters were guilty of Thyesteian banquets and Oedipodean incests,³ crimes which had long been attributed to the Christians through the ignorance of the people. These confessions, extorted by torture from slaves, made the people rage like wild beasts against the Christians.⁴ A female slave, however, named Blandina, was tortured for a whole day, so cruelly that her tormentors wondered that she still continued to live. She died some days later in the amphitheatre, firm to the very last. Sanctus, a deacon of the Church of Lyons, was tormented by having plates of red-hot brass attached to his body;⁵ he said nothing but '*Christianus sum.*' A slave girl named Biblias had charged the Christians with

1. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 1. *ἡγριωμένῳ πλήθει*. It seems as though the mob had been worked up to a state of frenzy by tales of abominations practised by the Christians. For some time before the persecution no Christian dared to shew himself in public.

2. *παράκλητος Χριστιανῶν*. It is not quite certain whether he was put to death: Renan thinks he was not. Eusebius' words are 'he was received into the number of the martyrs.'

3. *Θυέστεια δείπνα, καὶ Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις*. The manner in which the early Fathers defended the Church against these horrible charges, was to say that the evil conduct of some heretics gave a sort of justification to them. See Justin, *Apol.* i. 26; Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 7; Iren., *Haer.* i. 25. 3. It must be remembered that in the middle ages the Jews were accused of sacrificial murder throughout Europe, and in obscure and ignorant communities the charge is still made from time to time.

4. *ἀπεθριώθησαν εἰς ἡμᾶς*. The torturing of slaves to obtain evidence against their masters is a proof that Christians were proceeded against under the laws against treason. Gaston Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, i. 422.

5. *τοῖς τρυφερωτάτοις μέλεσι*.

great crimes; she was again tortured, recanted all she had said, and met her death as a Christian. A large number died in prison, especially those who had not been previously disciplined.¹

Pothinus, the bishop of Lyons, who was over ninety, was beaten and ill-used in a most brutal manner, and died in prison. Sanctus, Maturus, and Attalus were all tortured again in the amphitheatre. Blandina after surviving her earlier tortures was bound to a stake and exposed to wild beasts. Attalus was roasted alive before the people. A youth, aged fifteen, called Ponticus, and the slave girl Blandina were brought out every day to see the tortures of the rest; the latter was the last to die. She was thrown into a net and gored to death by a bull. The bodies of the martyrs were denied burial, and finally burned to ashes and cast into the Rhone. The Emperor approved of this shocking persecution when the governor of the province consulted him about some prisoners. Such then were the horrors perpetrated in Gaul, partly through the cruelty of the governor, but mainly to gratify popular odium against the Christians. The fanaticism of the Gallic mob is a noteworthy feature of one of the most terrible persecutions on record. Gregory of Tours estimates the number of victims as forty-eight but gives only forty-five names.²

The letter of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne is justly considered as one of the most beautiful and touching monuments of Christian antiquity. Although the martyrs are full of a spirit of mysticism scarcely comprehensible to us, and despite other extravagances of language, it is impossible for us not to recognise a truly Christian spirit in almost every line of their letter. There is no hatred for those who fell away unable to endure the torments inflicted on them, no self-glorification, but most wonderful tenderness to the fallen accompanied by singular humility.³

1. οἱ δὲ νεαροὶ καὶ ἄρτι συνειλημμένοι, ὧν μὴ προκατήκιστο τὰ σώματα, τὸ βάρος οὐκ ἔφερον τῆς συγκλείσεως ἀλλ' ἐνδοῦ ἐναπέθνησκον. For the horrors endured by the martyrs in prison see Pillet *St. Perpetua, Le Blant Les Persecuteurs et les Martyres*.

2. Quoted by Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 500.

3. Kenan, *Marcus Aurelius*, ch. xix.

The Emperor Marcus Aurelius is said to have shewn favour to the Christians on account of the wonderful deliverance of his army in his war against the Quadi. The story is too remarkable to be classed contemptuously among the ecclesiastical legends of the period: it is related within five years of the occurrence of the miracle and is supported by heathen as well as Christian testimonies.¹ At the same time there are many and grave reasons for rejecting a considerable part of the narrative. The story is as follows: When Marcus Aurelius was engaged in the war against the Quadi the enemy had succeeded in cutting off the water supply for the Roman army, and it seemed to be threatened with destruction. The soldiers of the twelfth legion, which at that time had its head quarters at Melitene on the Euphrates, were all Christians. They fell on their knees and prayed for rain. Instantly a terrible storm discomfited the barbarians, and gave the water the Romans so sorely needed. Marcus obtained a splendid victory.

Everybody believed it was a miracle. Dion Cassius (A.D. 220) says that an Egyptian magician procured the rain by his prayers. Themistius (A.D. 389) says the rain was in answer to the prayers of the Emperor, who said 'With this hand I invoke and supplicate the Giver of life—this hand which never took away life.'² Even the Christian Sibyl attributes the rain to the piety of the Emperor, to whom the God of heaven would refuse nothing.³ The poet Claudian (A.D. 404) doubts whether it was the magic or the piety of Marcus that caused the rain.⁴ Contemporary art confirmed the narrative: on the Antonine column at Rome, Jupiter Pluvius is there represented, and the soldiers catch in their shields the rain which falls from his hair and beard. The

1. The evidence has been most carefully sifted by Bp. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. II., pp. 469—476.

2. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 472.

3. *Orac. Sib.*, XII. 196, quoted by Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 473.

4. Claudian *de VI. Cons. Honor.*, 348—350:

Chaldaeae mago seu carmina ritu

Amavere deos: seu (quod reor) omne Tonantis

Obsequium Marci mores potuere mereri.

Christian account is substantially the same as the Pagan, only it attributes the deliverance solely to the prayers of the Christians. The letter of Marcus to the Senate describing the event is a palpable forgery, but on the other hand the writer shews considerable acquaintance with the men of his time. Eusebius relates that Claudius Apollinaris, who was a contemporary, says that the Emperor called the legion 'the Thundering'¹ in memory of the event. Tertullian is equally explicit. He cites the incident as one familiarly known in his time as the cause of Marcus Aurelius having treated the Christians with lenity.² But in spite of there being a large consensus of evidence in support of the fact, several questions must be raised. For the name 'Thundering' was given to the twelfth legion as early as the time of Augustus. Dion Cassius speaks of it as the twelfth legion in Cappadocia τὸ κεραυνοφόρον.³ Inscriptions also confirm this and shew that Dion does not give the title by anticipation. Again the legion was called in the Latin Fulminata not Fulminatrix, probably because of the emblem worn by the soldiers. The fifth legion was called Alauda from the larks which adorned the soldiers' helmets. And lastly the station of the twelfth legion was in the East, as far as possible from the seat of the Marcomannic war. Bp. Lightfoot is, however, disposed to think that there is some truth in the Christian narrative: a legion from Melitene would be likely to contain many Christian soldiers; the transmission of legions to great distances was not uncommon in time of war. That Christians should pray for rain in time of drought was to be expected. The rest of the story is fictitious: the Emperor certainly never asked for their prayers, and the persecution at Lyons and Vienne in A.D. 177 proves that he did not mitigate the severity of his treatment of the Christians.

1. *H.E.* v. 5. The word used by Cl. Apollinaris, whom Eusebius quotes, is κεραυνοβολον. The meaning depends on the accent: κεραυνόβολον = thunderstruck (Fulminata); κεραυνοβόλον = Thunder-Striker (Fulminatrix). Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 474. See also the preface to the Translation of the *Meditations* of M. Aurelius, by G. Long.

2. *Apology*, ch. v.

3. Dion Cass. lv. 23.

Survey of the
beneficent policy
of the reign of
M. Aurelius.

It is not right to narrate the only blot on the reign of this good emperor without at least a cursory allusion to his many virtues and to the benefits he strove to confer upon his subjects. The laws of slavery were mitigated so far that to kill a slave was a crime; nor was it allowable to sell separately husband, wife, and children. The enfranchisement of slaves was in every way favoured. Criminal law was softened, fiscal abuses were put down. Marcus Aurelius hated the gladiatorial games and armed the gladiators for the public service during the Marcomannic war. M. Renan says that during this reign we even hear of mattresses being placed under rope-dancers and of people not being allowed to fight except their arms were covered.¹ All these acts of Marcus make us regret the more the fatal mistake he made in regard to his Christian subjects.

Commodus.
A. D 180—192.

The son of Marcus Aurelius was in every respect the opposite of his father, in spite of a most careful education. The philosophers talked to him in vain of virtue and temperance, their fine precepts fell on deaf ears. But the fencing master and the trainer of gladiators found an apt pupil, and their training was the sole education which he appreciated. The reign of Commodus was a disgrace to humanity, and his death (A.D. 192) a blessing to the Empire.² Yet under this monster of iniquity the Church enjoyed peace. Eusebius especially says 'there was peace by the grace of God prevailing in the churches throughout the whole world.'³ This is said to have been owing to the influence of the Emperor's concubine, Marcia, who for some reason shewed herself favourable to the Christians. The Roman confessors condemned to labour in the mines of Sardinia were recalled. One martyrdom, however, is related—that of Apollonius, a senator; but Eusebius tells us that the informer who gave evidence against him was also put to death.⁴

1. Renan, *Marcus Aurelius*, ch. ii.

2. Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, chap. iv.) gives a graphic description of the infamies of Commodus.

3. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 21.

4. Hieron., *Script. Eccl.* 42. mentions the slave Severus as the *delator*, but says nothing of his execution. The whole story is confused.

Pertinax, an excellent and virtuous senator, was chosen to succeed Commodus in A.D. 193, but he was murdered by the praetorian guards, who sold the empire to Didius Julian. Civil war broke out; Pescennius Niger, Claudius Albinus, and Septimius Severus were the rivals for the empire, for no one regarded Julian's claim seriously. Peace was restored by Septimius Severus becoming emperor upon the death of his competitors.

Septimius Severus, according to Tertulian, began by treating the Christians with leniency owing to his having been cured of a disease by a Christian slave named Proculus.¹ In the year 202 this emperor passed a law forbidding people to be made Jews, and ordained the same in regard to the Christians.² It is very questionable whether this gave any legal footing to those already Christians, or merely forbade proselytising. Neander seems to be right in his contention that the Jews were protected as a nation, but that the Christians could not claim any such recognition, and that the date of conversion had nothing to do with the guilt or innocence of those who embraced their tenets.³ A very fierce persecution raged in Egypt, especially at Alexandria; and Leonides, the father of Origen, was one of the martyrs.⁴ It was so severe that many regarded it as a sign of Antichrist.⁵ The Church in proconsular

Africa also suffered severely, and this province was the scene of one of the most famous martyrdoms of the early Church—that of St. Perpetua, St. Felicitas and their companions, in or about the year 202. The number of martyrs was five in all: three young men, Revocatus, Saturninus, and Secundulus, and the two young women. Perpetua, who was only twenty-two years of age, was married and had an infant

**Septimius
Severus.**
A. D. 193—211.

**Martyrdom of
Perpetua and
her companions.**

1. *Ad Scapulam*, c. iv.
2. Aelius Spartianus, *Severus*, c. xvii. "Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit." Neumann denies the existence of any edict by S. Severus. See Ramsay, *op. cit.*, p. 194.
3. Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. 1., p. 166 foll. Bohn's transl.
4. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 1.
5. Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 7, on a writer named Judas who is otherwise unknown, who is said to have written on the seventy weeks of Daniel.

at the breast, but had probably lost her husband, of whom no mention is made in the *Acta*. They were all catechumens, but the clergy obtained access to them and baptized them in prison. Perpetua's father came beseeching her to have pity on her family and recant. The governor begged her to offer sacrifice for the Emperor. But she remained firm, and was condemned with the others to be thrown to the beasts. The day of martyrdom was the birthday of Geta, the Emperor's son. It was usual to dress the victims in priestly robes before they were given to the beasts; but Perpetua and her companions remonstrated, saying they suffered that they might not be forced to take part in such abominations. The reasonableness of the objection was allowed and they were not compelled to wear the dresses. Felicitas, like Blandina of Lyons, was a slave, and her courage shewed the elevation of character imparted to the most degraded classes by the Christian religion. While awaiting her execution she became a mother. In her pangs she cried out, and the jailor asked her how she would endure the beasts if she could not bear this pain. She replied, 'What I now suffer I suffer myself, but then there will be Another who will suffer with me, because I also shall suffer for Him.'¹

Geta. Caracalla.
A.D. 211—217.

The persecution in Africa lasted into the reigns of Geta and Caracalla. Geta was soon murdered by his brother Caracalla, one of the most blood-thirsty tyrants that ever ruled the empire; and his reign was one of terror. It does not seem that the Christians especially were persecuted, but there was no change in the law, and in several provinces they were ill-treated.

Disorders in the
Empire.
A.D. 218—283.

We have now reached a period during which the Empire sank to the lowest state of degradation. The government for nearly seventy years was a military despotism, and the armies of the Republic made their chiefs

1. The Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas have been edited by Prof. Rendel Harris and Mr. S. Gifford (Cambridge, 1890), and in the first of the Cambridge *Texts and Studies* by Dean Armitage Robinson (1891), who has convincingly shewn that the Latin Acts are earlier than the Greek, and has given good reason for supposing that Tertullian may have been the editor of the *Visions* and the author of the *Acts of Martyrdom*. The Abbé Pilet has written a history of St. Perpetua (Lille and Paris, 1885).

emperors and deposed them at pleasure. Roman birth was no longer a necessary qualification for the purple: a Syrian, an Arab, a Goth were acknowledged as emperors. Nearly every one of the seventeen Caesars from Heliogabalus (A.D. 218) to Numerian (A.D. 283) died a violent death. This season of anarchy and misery was marked by the rapid growth of the Church, in which it appeared peace was alone to be found.

An intrigue with the army placed **Heliogabalus,** Elagabalus or Heliogabalus in possession of the Empire. He was by birth a Syrian and a priest of the Phoenician sun-god.¹ The four years he was allowed to reign proved him, if we may believe the historians, to be one of the vilest of mankind, fanatically devoted to the worship of Baal, and given up to the vicious luxury of Syria. But the Christians were rather favoured than otherwise, the Emperor's great desire being to exalt his beloved Syrian deity at the expense of the gods of Rome. The idol of Emesa was brought to Rome, and the Palladium, the sacred image of Minerva, the mystic symbol of the favour of the gods to Rome, was chosen as his consort. After a time, however, the god divorced her, and a more congenial spouse was brought from Carthage.² The fact of the ancient gods of Rome being thus insulted, and of their worshippers being compelled by the Emperor to figure in processions in honour of an oriental god, must have done much to weaken the public belief in their power.

The murdered Elagabalus was succeeded by his cousin, the mild and amiable **Alexander Severus.** This emperor, being an oriental, had not the fanatical hatred towards the Christians which possessed those who desired to restore the ancient severity of Roman discipline. His religion was eclectic, and his Lararium or private chapel is said to have contained busts of Abraham, Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana, and Christ. So leniently was Christianity regarded under Alexander, that Mamaea

1. His official name was Antoninus.

2. Millman, *History of Christianity*, vol. II., p. 174.

the Emperor's mother¹ sent for Origen, when he was at Alexandria, and received instruction from him. Tillemont asserts that the first Christian churches were erected in the reign of Alexander Severus.²

Alexander Severus was of too mild and amiable a character to restrain the insubordination of his army. He was murdered in 235, and Maximin, a Thracian barbarian, seized the empire. The Christians suffered as friends of the late Alexander, but there seems to have been nothing like a general persecution.³

Maximin the
Thracian.
A. D. 235—237.

A season of tranquillity as far as the Church was concerned followed the death of Maximin. Philip is said to have been a Christian. It is added that he tried to enter a Christian church on Easter eve, but was not allowed by the bishop till he had joined the ranks of the penitents. The Emperor obeyed the bishop, thus shewing an edifying example⁴ of his piety. Although the story bears evident traces of being apocryphal, it is none the less interesting as shewing the general impression Philip's reign produced upon the Christians. No act, coin or monument of Philip shews any Christian bias, and the *ludi saeculares* in commemoration of the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of Rome were celebrated with extraordinary splendour and no doubt with many heathen rites.

The three
Gordians.
A. D. 237—244.
Philip.
A. D. 244—249.

The long period of prosperity which the Church had now enjoyed produced a great change in the attitude of the Christians towards the Empire. The writings of Tertullian, for example, breathe nothing but the most implacable hatred towards the persecutors of the Church. The reason why Christians pray for the Emperor, according to his view, is because at the end of the

1. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 21.

2. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xvi. The laws against the Christians were not yet formally relaxed.

3. Neander (*Church History*, vol. 1., p. 175) observes of this reign: "The persecutions were indeed confined to particular provinces, so that Christians could save themselves by flying from one province to another."

4. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 34. Apparently the historian is in doubt. *κατέχει λόγος* is his expression.

Roman empire Antichrist will appear.¹ But a most complete reversal of these sentiments is found expressed by Origen towards the middle of the third century. In the last book of his reply to Celsus he says, "If" as Celsus says "all did as I do, then the barbarians also would receive the Divine Word and become the most moral and gentle of men. All other religions would cease from the earth and Christianity alone would be supreme, which indeed is destined one day to have the supremacy, since the divine truth is continually bringing more souls under its sway."² But Origen was sagacious enough to see that this consummation was not to come without severe persecution. Once the Church entertained the idea of being supreme in the Roman Empire she entered upon a contest, the issues of which were annihilation or a complete triumph. Directly the enfeebled Empire regained even a temporary accession of strength it was bound to try conclusions with the ever increasing Church.

Decius Trajan.
A.D. 249-251.

It was the object of Decius to be a second Trajan and to revive the ancient Roman discipline. For this purpose, shortly before his death, the Emperor restored the office of censor, which had long since fallen into desuetude. Persecution was the natural consequence of such a policy. We have already seen that the ancient Roman ideal was totally irreconcilable with Christianity, and the first attempt to revive it was certain to imperil the Church. The persecution of Decius was the most systematic and successful attempt to stamp out the Faith. Hitherto the attacks of the heathen magistrates had been local, and irregularly directed. The Church in one province might have rest, whilst in another a severe persecution was raging. Marcus Aurelius, for example, seems rather to have sanctioned the horrors of Lyons and Vienne than to have actively encouraged a general onslaught on the Christians. The reason may have been the comparative insignificance of their numbers,

1. Tertullian, *Apology*, ch. 32. See Robertson, *History of Christian Church*, vol. 1., p. 112, ed. 1875.

2. Origen *contra Celsum*, VIII. 68, quoted by Neander, *Church History*, vol. 1., p. 179.

which made the statesmen of the second century but little apprehensive of the progress of their opinions. But by the middle of the third century all was changed. The comparative immunity which the Church had enjoyed during the reigns of the late emperors, and the attractions which she offered amid the miseries of the times, had been the means of greatly multiplying her numbers; and as we have seen, Christians like Origen had begun already to discuss the possibility of converting the entire empire. Accordingly Decius regarded the spread of the Faith as a very serious public danger, and determined to proceed to deal with it as such. It was his design totally to suppress Christianity,¹ and it is this which helps us to account for the character of his persecution, and for the policy of such great Christian leaders as St. Cyprian, in taking prudent measures for their own safety instead of courting the glories of martyrdom. They recognised the extreme seriousness of the crisis, and saw that the real need of the Church was not so much of heroes who were ready to rush upon martyrdom, as of the counsels of moderate men to check the rash enthusiasm of those whose zeal imperilled her very existence. We can also understand why the persecution under Decius produced so many apostasies. In the first place, the blow was struck suddenly, when after a long cessation of annoyances many had grown up as Christians without thinking they might be called upon to lay down their lives for the Faith; and in the second place, whilst the bishops were attacked with unsparing severity, every inducement was offered to the laity to abandon their creed.

Decius in an edict published early in A.D. 250, which has not been preserved, imitated the policy of Trajan towards the Christians.² The order of procedure seems to have been as follows: The magistrates were bidden under severe penalties to assemble all the Christians and to command them to sacrifice. Those who consented to

1. Neander, *Church History*, vol. 1., p. 181.

2. For the edict we have the authority of Cyprian in his treatise *de Lapsis*. Gregory of Nyssa gives an account of it in his life of Gregory Thaumaturgus.

do this were subjected to no further annoyance. Those who fled suffered confiscation of their goods and were forbidden to return on pain of death. Those who refused to sacrifice were to be examined by the magistrate and five citizens, and torture and imprisonment were to be employed to make them alter their resolution. The penalty of death was seldom resorted to; at Alexandria, for example, a boy called Dioscorus was dismissed after he had been severely tortured, in order that he might have time for reflection. It is a proof of the progress of Christianity in public favour, that we hear nothing of the abominable crimes of which believers were accused at an earlier period. Nor do we find that the magistrates tortured the Christians for the pleasure of the mob, as in the persecution at Lyons and Vienne. On the contrary, the magistrates appear to have done all in their power to evade the law by granting for a sum of money certificates to say that persons who had not sacrificed had performed the command of the Emperor.¹ This practice was looked upon with great disfavour by all right-minded Christians. Those who had thus purchased the favour of the government were styled *libellatici*, and they were considered to have in a measure apostatised. In spite, however, of the defection of many, some of the Christians shewed a noble spirit of endurance. What words can express more adequately the spirit of the true confessor than the letter to Cyprian of the Roman Christians who had already been a year in prison: "What more glorious and blessed lot," they say, "can by God's grace fall to man, than, amid tortures and the fear of death itself, to confess God the Lord with lacerated bodies, and a spirit departing but yet free to confess Christ the Son of God; to become fellow-sufferers with Christ in the name of Christ? If we have not yet shed our blood we are ready to shed it. Pray, then, beloved Cyprian, that the Lord would daily confirm and strengthen each one of us more and more with the power

1. Two of these *libelli* have been discovered: one among the Brugsch Papyri now in the Museum at Berlin, first deciphered by Dr. Krebs and published in the 'Proceedings of the Prussian Academy of Science,' Nov. 30, 1893; the other by Professor Wesseley. Both are published in Harnack's *Theol. Lit. Zeit.*

of His might, and that He, as the best of captains, may at length conduct to the battle-field which is before us His soldiers, whom He has trained and proved in the dangerous camp, armed with those divine weapons, which can never be conquered."¹ The martyrs in this reign were for the most part bishops; Fabian of Rome, Babylas of Antioch, who died in prison, Pionius of Smyrna, Polyeuctes of Armenia, Carpus of Thyatira and his deacon, Alexander of Jerusalem, Acacius of the Phrygian Antioch, and many others, are named in the martyrologies, shewing that during the short reign of Decius hardly a province of the empire was exempt from persecution.²

Valerian had been chosen by Decius to fill the ancient office of censor. When he became Emperor he favoured the Christians and stayed the persecution against them. But Valerian was addicted to the practice of magic, and to enquiring into the secrets of futurity, and it is possible that the adepts of the black art, whom he consulted, were more opposed to the spread of Christianity than even the pagan priests. Macrianus, his ablest general and treasurer, whom Dionysius terms an Egyptian magician, is said to have influenced Valerian against the Christians and to have directed the policy of the Emperor in this matter.³ In 257 an edict appeared forbidding the assemblies of Christians and threatening with death the bishops who would not conform. Dionysius, the great bishop of Alexandria, and Cyprian bishop of Carthage, were exiled under this edict; the latter seems to have been treated with the greatest possible consideration. His place of banishment was Curubis or Curobus, a pleasant town by the sea shore, and he was summoned thence by Galerius the proconsul of Africa, who reluctantly condemned him to be beheaded.

1. Cyprian, *Ep.* 26. Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 1., p. 184.

2. Dr. Plumptre, Article 'Decius', *Dict. Christian Biog.* Dr. Harnack in his *Altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. 11., gives a list of Acts of Martyrs during this persecution. He attaches most importance to the *Passio Pionii*, *Acta Disputationis S. Achatii*, *Acta S. Maximi* and the *Acta SS. Luciani et Marciani*. In these Acts no element of the miraculous occurs.

3. Milman, *Hist. Christianity*, vol. 11., pp. 191 foll. Euseb., *H. E.* VIII. 10, quoting Dionysius.

He suffered death, but to the very last he was subjected to no insult by either the government or the populace. The Christians had outlived the unpopularity which had caused the persecutions of the previous century.

Second Edict of
Valerian.

Just before the death of Cyprian, in the summer of A.D. 258, Valerian, at a meeting of all his great officers at *Thermae* near Byzantium, issued his second edict, which is justly considered an important turning point in the history of the early persecutions of the Church. By Valerian's statute the penalties for Christianity were codified in an elaborate and invariable table.¹ For the clergy the punishment was death, apparently without any hope of escape by recantation. All persons of the rank of senators and knights were to be punished by loss of rank and confiscation of property, and, if they persisted, they were to be put to death. Ladies were to lose their property and to be exiled. *Caesariani*, or dependents on the Emperor, if they had at any time professed Christianity, were to be sent to work in chains on the imperial estates.²

Gallienus.
A.D. 260—268.

The policy of Gallienus towards the Christians is another instance of a bad Emperor proving a good friend to the Church. Like Marcus Aurelius, Gallienus was a philosopher, but the philosophy of the son of Valerian made him neglectful of the duties of his station. In Gallienus we have the spectacle of a cynical trifler reigning at a time when a bold and active administrator was required to uphold the Empire in its distress. Gallienus issued edicts staying persecution, and addressed a rescript to "Dionysius, Pinna, Demetrius, and other bishops" in which he declared it unlawful to molest the Christians. In addition to this he granted the bishops permission to recover possession of the Christian cemeteries.³ Thus

1. Mason, *Diocletian Persecution*, p. 113. Healey, *Valerian Persecution*, p. 162.

2. "Caesariani autem, quicumque vel prius confessi fuerant vel nunc confessi fuerint confiscantur et vinciti in Caesarianas possessiones descripti mittantur. Cyp., *Ep.* 80. Cf. Euseb., *H. E.* VII. 10, where he remarks on the number of Christians in Valerian's household.

3. Euseb., *H. E.* VII. 13. In a rescript to Dionysius, Pinna and Demetrius and the other bishops, the Emperor gives orders *ἵνα ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων τῶν θρησκευσίμων ἀποχωρήσωσι*. This may mean that the government officials are to leave the Christian places of worship. See note in Schaff and Wace's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, in *loco*.

Christianity became a '*religio licita*' and the Church a corporation entitled by law to hold property.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, draws a fearful picture of the miseries of the age. Every calamity seems to have fallen upon that city. Inundations of the Nile, encroachments of the sea, famines and pestilence, followed one another with fearful rapidity. The population diminished by nearly one half. It seemed to Dionysius as if the human race was in danger of extermination. The behaviour of the Christians at this time accounts for the ultimate triumph of the Faith over the Empire better than any of the less obvious reasons which have been suggested. Whilst, during the pestilence, the heathen inhabitants in their panic deserted their nearest relations, the Christians attended on one another with the greatest assiduity, and many sacrificed their lives by sucking the virus out of the plague-spots of others. A religion capable of inspiring such heroism could not fail to make a strong impression on the public mind.¹

¶ The effect of the legislation of Gallienus in recognising the Church as a legally existing society is shewn by Aurelian's attitude towards Christianity. The Emperor had no sympathy with the believers. He was a devoted worshipper of the Sun-god, and he is believed to have meditated a persecution at the end of his reign. Nevertheless when the bishops appealed to him about the deposition of Paul of Samosata, Aurelian decided that the buildings belonging to the church of Antioch should be given up to those whom the Christian bishops of Italy and Rome should appoint.² Although the Emperor may have been influenced in pronouncing this decision by the fact that Paul was a friend of the fallen Zenobia, he clearly recognises the right of the Christians to hold property. ¶

1. Euseb., *H.E.* VII. 21, 22.

2. Euseb., *H.E.* VII. 30. Aurelian ordered the church of Antioch to be given 'to those to whom the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome should adjudge it'.

The immediate successors of Aurelian did not interfere with the Church, and we may pass by their reigns without comment, following Eusebius, who says nothing of the period between the death of Aurelian and the accession of Diocletian. The long peace which the Church had enjoyed had been very favourable to her progress in mere numbers; as it was no longer a breach of the law to become a Christian, the Church having ceased to be an illegal association by being legally recognised as a corporation. Before Gallienus the emperors who had not been persecutors had connived at a violation of the law; but after that prince had issued his edict, it had become illegal to molest the Christians. It is therefore necessary to examine with care how it was that towards the close of the reign of Diocletian the Church was assailed by a persecution which, both in duration and severity, threw all earlier ones into the shade.

The Emperor Carus died suddenly in his tent on an expedition against the Persians. The cause of his death remains a mystery. A terrible storm broke over the Roman camp, and it was suddenly announced that the Emperor was dead.¹ He was succeeded by his two sons, Carinus, who was living in idle luxury at Rome, and Numerian, who was with the army. The latter died—murdered, it is said, by his father-in-law Arrius Aper, the praetorian prefect. His death was concealed for some time, and Aper commanded the army in the name of his deceased son-in-law, who was supposed to be ill. As soon as the army discovered that their emperor was dead, a council was held, and Diocletian, the chief of the imperial body-guard, ascended the tribunal, before which Aper was brought in chains. His trial was of the simplest description. Without entering into any investigation, which might have implicated others and perhaps himself, Diocletian, exclaiming "This is the murderer of Numerian," plunged his sword into Aper's breast. The troops saluted the judge and

Tacitus,
A. D. 275—276.
Probus,
A. D. 276—282.
Carus,
A. D. 282—283,
Carinus }
Numerian }
A. D. 283—284.

Accession of
Diocletian.
A. D. 284.

1. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xii.

executioner of Aper as their emperor (Sept. 17, 284), and after a short war, Carinus was defeated and slain, and Diocletian became sole master of the Roman world.

Diocletian was of servile origin, his parents having been slaves in the family of Anulinus, a Roman senator. The mere fact that he was able to rise to the position of emperor proves that his talents were exceptional; but though he had served from his youth in the army, Diocletian's abilities were administrative rather than military. Like Augustus, his ambition was to infuse a new spirit of order into a disorganized world. With him a new era begins in the history of the Roman Empire. Till the accession of Diocletian the emperor had been, in theory at least, the first citizen in the Republic and the chief commander of her armies. The earlier emperors had flattered the Senate; and while they kept the power in their own hands, claimed to be no more than the princes of that body. In theory the emperor was appointed by the Senate, though practically the army both elected and deposed the master of the Roman world. Diocletian's object was to do away with the interference of the one and the caprice and tyranny of the other. The former was divested of the last semblance of real authority by the Emperor's fixing his residence no longer at Rome, but at Nicomedia, and making that city the centre of his government. To deprive the army of the power of imposing a master on the world was a more difficult task; but Diocletian undertook it with success. In the first place, by surrounding himself with all the ceremony of an oriental monarch he gave to the position of emperor a dignity in men's eyes which it had previously lacked. By this means he rendered himself more unapproachable, and consequently less liable to the danger of assassination, than the purely military emperors had been since the time of Gallienus. But he made still better provision for his own safety and the stability of his government, by removing the chief temptation to rebel. As the Empire had too long been the prey of military adventurers, Diocletian made it no longer possible

Diocletian makes
Maximian Au-
gustus, A. D. 286.
Galerius
and Constantius
Caesars, A. D. 292.


for a mutinous officer to rise to the throne by the murder of a master who had usually no one to succeed him but young children, or youths inexperienced in affairs. In A.D. 286 Diocletian raised Maximian, his old companion in arms, to the rank of Augustus, giving him the command of the West, but reserving the East for himself. Six years later, in A.D. 292, two younger men were appointed with the inferior rank of Caesar, to assist Diocletian and Maximian in the administration and defence of the Empire. The former chose Galerius as his own colleague, while Constantius became Caesar under Maximian. The two Augusti gave their daughters to the Caesars and promised to resign the Empire to them when they should have reigned twenty years.¹

This policy was completely successful, at least so long as Diocletian ruled. The Caesars treated the Augusti with respect, and Maximian joined with them in revering Diocletian as their common benefactor. We cannot fail to admire the wisdom that prompted the whole arrangement. The active work of defending the frontiers was given to the younger men. To Constantius were assigned Gaul, Spain, and Britain; to Galerius the Illyrian provinces. Maximian, a rough soldier, was associated with Constantius, a man of education and humanity; whilst Galerius, who possessed even greater military capacity than Maximian, acted as Caesar to the more pacific and statesmanlike Diocletian.²

The Christian Church was to all appearance both secure and prosperous. She had outlived the age of calumny and

1. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xiii. Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, ch. i. Firth, *Constantine*, p. 43.

2. The marriage relationships of the Augusti and Caesars are as follows:



had long enjoyed the respect of both Greeks and barbarians.¹ As usual, the imperial palace was a stronghold of Christianity; Diocletian's wife Prisca and his daughter Valeria being open professors of the Faith.² Dorotheus and Gorgonius, the most influential of Diocletian's chamberlains, were Christians.³ Theonas the bishop of Alexandria wrote to Lucian the *prepositus cubicularum* on the subject of what the duty of a Christian would be if he were appointed librarian to Diocletian.⁴ Churches were rising everywhere and great numbers were being converted to the Faith. This state of things continued for no less than eighteen years after the accession of Diocletian, and did not cease till the abdication of the great Emperor was drawing on apace.

Signs were not wanting that the peace enjoyed by the Christians was not destined to endure. Isolated cases of persecution were from time to time manifesting themselves, especially in the army. Here and there a soldier suffered death for the Faith.⁵ One general called Veturius ordered his soldiers to abjure Christianity on pain of military degradation. Lactantius records that when Diocletian was at Antioch he consulted the omens, and that the *exta* of the victims exhibited none of the usual signs. The master of the soothsayers declared that profane persons were present and had prevented an answer being given by the gods. Diocletian ordered all who were present to sacrifice, but nothing further followed.⁶ Possibly this happened during the Persian war, but the incident may have been only a type of what frequently occurred.⁷

1. Euseb., *H. E.* VIII. 1.
2. Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* c. 15.—'Sacrificio pollui coegit' are the words used by Diocletian in forcing these ladies to sacrifice.
3. Euseb., *H. E.* loc. cit.
4. This letter is preserved in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacrae*. Mason, in his *Persecution of Diocletian*, gives a translation of it.
5. Euseb., *H. E.* VIII. 4. *σπαιτως τούτων εἰς πον καὶ δεύτερος*.
6. Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 41. Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.* c. 10.
7. Milman, *Hist. Christ.*, vol. II., p. 214.

**Enemies of the
Christians.**

With the rise of the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria, headed by Porphyry, the bitterest of literary opponents of Christianity, who died about the time of Diocletian's abdication, a sort of revival had taken place among the worshippers of the ancient gods. The new school sought to explain the ancient superstitions by allegories, and mingled the practice of magic with the study of philosophy. They attacked the Christians, as Gibbon says, with all the fury of civil war, the most active persecutors being the philosophers Hierocles and Theotecnus.¹ The Emperor Galerius was exactly the sort of man to be influenced by such representations as theirs, being by birth an ignorant peasant, the son of an intensely superstitious mother, and himself naturally prone to cruelty against the Christians, whose presence in the army was also very distasteful to him.

**Diocletian
persuaded to
persecute.**

It was not till 302-3 that a deliberate attempt was made to induce Diocletian to order a persecution. The old Emperor foresaw that to suppress Christianity was no easy task, and he hesitated to molest a numerous body of men, who had not only the prescriptive right to exist which more than forty years impunity might reasonably confer, but also the edicts of Gallienus in their favour. Galerius, however, pressed his colleague to consent, and at last persuaded Diocletian, against his better judgment, to allow Christianity to be attacked provided it was done without loss of life.²

1. See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xvi. (end). Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 58. Dr. Mason considers that Theotecnus was the author of the forged *Acts of Pilate*, which Maximin Daza ordered to be taught in the schools.

2. In a short appendix to his Translation of the Church History of Eusebius (Schaff and Wace, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*) Dr. McGiffert discusses the reasons Galerius had for desiring Diocletian to persecute the Christians. He dismisses the idea that he was actuated by religious motives, and suggests that the Christians in the palace of Diocletian were engaged in a scheme to induce that emperor to name a successor less hostile to the Christians than Galerius. This, he considers, accounts for the severity with which Diocletian treated his own Christian dependents. The following weighty words suggest a probable motive for Diocletian's

The first edict was based on the edict of Valerian, but with a few striking differences. The penalty of death was not mentioned by Diocletian, nor were ladies punishable under its provisions. The law of Diocletian falls into three heads: (1) churches are to be abolished, (2) all Christian writings to be destroyed, (3) all persons who profess Christianity rendered *infames* and incapable of holding rank and property, free men degraded to the position of slaves.¹ This edict was torn down by a Christian of Nicomedia, named George, who paid the penalty of his rash act by a cruel death.²

A fire broke out in the palace at Nicomedia; Galerius accused the Christians, and the slaves of the imperial household were tortured in order to discover the culprits. A few days after this a second fire broke out. Galerius declared his life to be in danger, and left the city. The Christians in the imperial household were cruelly tortured; the wife and daughter of Diocletian were forced to sacrifice; the chamberlains Dorotheus and Gorgonius together with the bishop of Nicomedia suffered death.³ Although innocent of causing the fires, the Christians were the chief objects of Diocletian's suspicions, and as the East was in a state of insurrection at the time, the Emperor felt

continuing the persecution: "It had become an earnest matter with Diocletian, and he was beginning to feel—as he had never occasion to feel before—that a society within the Empire whose claims were looked up to as higher than those of the State itself, and duty to which demanded, in case of disagreement between it and the State, insubordination and even treason towards the latter, was too dangerous an institution to tolerate longer, however harmless it might be under ordinary circumstances." M. Gaston Boissier (*La Fin du Paganisme*, p. 15) considers Diocletian primarily responsible for the persecution, and remarks on the Emperor's policy of proclaiming himself an incarnation of Jupiter by assuming the title of Jovius.

1. Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 117.
2. Lactantius (*Mort. Pers.* c. 13) censures the deed; Eusebius (*H. E.* VIII. 5) praises it. Dr. Mason thinks that this injudicious gentleman may be identified with St. George of England.
3. So Eusebius *H. E.* VIII. 6. Dr. Mason thinks that Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, suffered under Maximin. (p. 324.)

that active measures against the Church would have to be taken to prevent the new Christian kingdom of Armenia countenancing a rising of the faithful.¹ A second edict was put forth, ordering the arrest of all the clergy.

Third Edict.
Dec. 21, A.D. 303. When Diocletian had completed the twentieth year of his reign a general amnesty was proclaimed. The Christian clergy however were not to be set free till they recanted, and torture was to be employed, if necessary, to induce them to sacrifice. The prisons emptied rapidly, either because a large number of the clergy did not like the idea of torture, or because the governors of the prisons connived at their obtaining their liberty without sacrificing.

Fourth Edict.
April, 304. In the spring of A.D. 304, Diocletian fell seriously ill, having apparently lost his reason for a time. He had steadily resisted the imposition of the death penalty for Christianity. Maximian and the Roman Senate resolved, now that the great Emperor was politically dead, to persecute in earnest. An edict was accordingly issued by the Western Emperor ordering the Christians to be punished with death.²

Diocletian and Maximian abdicate, May 1, 305. Diocletian, recovered from his sickness, in accordance with his promise, laid down his authority and retired into private life, forcing Maximian to do the same. Galerius persuaded Diocletian to accept two of his nominees as Caesars in place of Maximian's son Maxentius and Constantine the son of Constantius. Accordingly Galerius became Augustus, with his nephew Maximin Daza as Caesar, and Severus was appointed Caesar under Constantius who was promoted to the rank of Augustus.

1. Armenia was converted by Gregory the Illuminator, A.D. 302, and was consequently the first nation to accept the Christian faith. See below, Chapter XX.

2. Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, pp. 212—216. This author hardly brings out clearly enough the anti-Christian feeling which probably animated the Senate. Eighty years later (in the reign of Theodosius) Rome was still the stronghold of Paganism.

Christians under Galerius. A. D. 305-311. The Western provinces were destined to become the scene of civil war for several years; but except in Africa, there was little persecution. In the East the Christians had eight long years of persecution before them. Galerius, unrestrained by Diocletian, committed havoc in the Church at pleasure, and he was ably seconded by his nephew Maximin. The year 308 was a veritable 'Year of Terror', and the severity of the trial lasted for two years longer. Affairs in the West were, however, tending to bring these horrors to an end.

Civil War in the West from the death of Constantius, 306, to the death of Maximian, 310. While the Christians in the East were enduring all the tortures which the malice of their enemies was able to suggest, the Western provinces were witnessing the complete failure of Diocletian's scheme. Constantius the recently appointed Augustus died on July 25, 306. His son Constantine, who was with Galerius at the time, made his way to Britain in great haste, maiming all the post-horses, says Lactantius, on the road to prevent capture. The army proclaimed him Emperor at York. Galerius gave a grudging assent to the choice of the soldiers by conferring on Constantine the title of Caesar, and raising Severus to the dignity of an Augustus. But the latter had not the power to support his position; Maxentius proclaimed himself emperor at Rome, his father Maximian hastened to his assistance, glad enough to leave his retirement for another chance of exercising authority. The generalship of the old man was sufficient to drive Severus to capitulate on the assurance that his life should be spared. The conquered emperor was allowed to kill himself by opening his veins.¹ The usurpers in Italy hastened to secure the alliance of Constantine, who was equally apprehensive of the designs of Galerius. Maximian gave his daughter Fausta to Constantine, thereby securing at least his neutrality in case Galerius should invade Italy. The expedition of Galerius resulted in failure, and on his return to the East he raised Licinius to the purple vacated by Severus, giving him

1. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xiv.

the command over the provinces of Illyricum. This caused Maximian to complain that his claims were overlooked; and he extorted from Galerius the title of Augustus. The scheme of Diocletian had now completely broken down; but in spite of the prayers of both Maximian and Galerius he refused to leave his cabbages at Salona to mingle in the political disorders of the time.¹

There were now (A.D. 308) six emperors, three in the East and three in the West; and the rest of this chapter will shew how these six were reduced to the two who were not persecutors of the Christians. The aged Maximian, after quarrelling

with his son Maxentius, was driven out of Italy, and took refuge first in Illyricum, and then in Constantine's dominions in Gaul. He tried to dethrone his son-in-law, but Constantine was too prompt to allow his schemes to succeed. Maximian was driven to take refuge within the walls of Marseilles. The garrison refused to fight for him, and delivered him to Constantine. His justly offended son-in-law allowed Maximian the same privilege as had been granted by him to Severus, and the former colleague of Diocletian committed suicide.²

In the following year the author of the persecution lay on his death-bed. Galerius suffered from the same loathsome disease as had previously afflicted Herod, and of which Philip II. of Spain, the prince of persecutors, was destined to die. That unamiably African, Lactantius, gloats over the agonies of the dying Emperor,³ who at least made an effort to atone for his error in persecuting the Christians. He restored

Six Emperors.
East { Galerius.
 { Maximian.
 { Licinius.
West { Constantine.
 { Maximian.
 { Maxentius.

Edict of Toleration
by Galerius
A. D. 310, and
his death A. D. 311.

1. Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 274. The memorable remark about the cabbages is recorded by Aurelius Victor, *Ep.* 39.

2. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xiv. Lactantius (*De Mortibus*, c. 30) says that several attempts on the life of Constantine were made by Maximian; but as no other historian records them, Gibbon (rightly, I think) ascribes them to the partial bigotry of the author of the *Deals of the Persecutors*.

3. Lact., *Mortibus Pers.* xxxiii. His description of Galerius' sufferings is too terrible to record. Lactantius records his repentance as follows: 'Et haec facta sunt per annum perpetem; cum tandem malis domitus Deum coactus est confiteri; novi doloris urgentis per intervalla exclamat, se restitutum Dei templum, satisque pro scelere facturum.'

to the Christians their privileges by a proclamation, in which his own name appears with that of Constantine and Licinius. This strange edict says that the original cause of the persecution was the factiousness of the Christians among themselves and their refusal to follow the good customs of their fathers, so that they neither worshipped the gods of Rome nor paid heed to the God of the Christians.¹ As, however, many people had suffered greatly in the persecution, the Emperors in their clemency allowed the religion of Christ to be practised once more and the churches to be rebuilt. The edict concludes with a request for the Christians to remember the dying Emperor in their prayers.²

The embers of persecution still smouldered in the East. Maximin Daza was not merely a political opponent of Christianity; he anticipated the work of Julian in trying to create a Pagan organization similar to that of the Christian Church. He was assisted by Theotecnus, a philosopher of the Neo-Platonic school. Despite the edict, a persecution was permitted, of which the most illustrious victims were Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, the greatest

1. Eusebius bears testimony to the divided condition of the Church before the outbreak of the persecution: *ὡς δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας ἐπὶ χαυνότητα καὶ νωθρίαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς μετηλλάττετο, ἄλλων ἄλλοις διαφθουμένων καὶ διαλοιδορουμένων, καὶ μονουχι ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἑαυτοῖς προσπολεμούντων.* κ. τ. λ. (*H. E.* VIII. 1.)

2. I cannot agree with those who say that Galerius intended to insult the Church by alluding to her divisions, nor do I consider his edict a mere piece of hypocrisy. Baur seems correct in his surmise that Galerius and his colleagues were desirous not so much of justifying the previous persecution, as their present policy of toleration. Christianity was henceforth to be reckoned among the *instituta veterum*. It was to be tolerated so long as it remained what it had been from the first and did not degenerate into any caprice of innovation. This was the true notion of a *religio licita*. Baur, *First Three Centuries*, vol. II., p. 217, Eng. transl. Speaking of Prisca and Valeria, the wife and daughter of Diocletian, and their possible influence over Galerius to whom the latter had been married, Dr. Plumptre remarks that "though he (Galerius) was the author of the whole scheme of persecution, the provinces over which he ruled presented hardly any of the instances of martyrdom, which were conspicuous in Egypt and Syria." *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, art. 'Diocletian'. A monograph by Dr. Belser of Ellwangen on Galerius' 'Toleranz Edict' (1890) explains that Galerius meant that the persecution had failed in its object of bringing the Christians back to the state religion and had only resulted in their worshipping nothing. I am indebted for this latter reference to Dr. Mason.

scholar of his age, and perhaps Anthimus of Nicomedia.¹ Maximin encouraged the cities to send deputations inviting him to persecute the Christians, and ordered the children to be instructed in the forged *Acts of Pilate* in order to prejudice the rising generation against the Faith. But Maximin's days were numbered. The Christian kingdom of Armenia declared war against him; and his campaign was unsuccessful. Licinius also advanced to attack him. Their forces met at Adrianople, and Maximin's army was routed (April, 313). The defeated Emperor escaped to the East, and there published an edict of complete toleration to the Christians. But the hand of death was on him: whether he died of a painful disease or by poison is uncertain.

Constantine and Maxentius. Maxentius and Constantine remained at peace till 312, when Maxentius, who had rendered himself most unpopular by his misgovernment, laid claim to the provinces entrusted to Constantine and prepared to invade Gaul. Constantine, however, took the initiative, crossed the Alps, and attacked Maxentius. The war was decided by the battle of the Milvian bridge (A.D. 312). Constantine took the famous labarum² for his standard, proclaiming himself the champion of Christ. Maxentius was utterly defeated. Constantine's victory was the triumph of the persecuted Church. In the same year Constantine published an edict allowing the Christians a certain freedom of worship, which in 313 was succeeded by the more celebrated 'Edict of Milan' granting complete liberty to the Christians.³

1. But see above, p. 87.

2. The labarum was formed thus $\begin{matrix} \text{P} & \text{P} \\ \times & \text{T} \end{matrix}$. The name was not new: both Tertullian and Minucius Felix speak of the *Cantabrum*, or according to some copies *Labarum*, as a Roman standard. Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine* implies that the term had been long in use. Its derivation is obscure: probably it is formed from the Basque word for a standard; the Greek Fathers write *λάβωρον* or *λάβουρον*. Eusebius describes it fully in his *Life of Constantine*, bk. 1. ch. 31. A long spear, overlaid with gold, formed the figure of a cross by means of a transverse bar laid over it. On the top of the whole was fixed a wreath of gold and precious stones; and within this the symbol of the Saviour's name, two letters indicating the name of Christ by means of its initial characters,—the letter P being intersected by X in the centre (*χρῖστος* μετὰ τὸ β̄ κατὰ τὸ μεσαίτατον).

3. See below, chapter XII.

CHAPTER VI.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

OF the history of the Church during the latter part of the first century and the first years of the second very little is known. Here and there a great name appears and some light is thrown on a particular part of the Church, but any attempt to write a continuous history of the period must fail from lack of materials. All that the historian can honestly do is to give a series of biographies of the principal Christians who were personally acquainted with the Apostles and a notice of the most important writings which have been preserved to us.

The Tübingen Theory.

Before entering upon the subject of the sub-apostolic age it may be of advantage to the student to have before him the main points of that ingenious attempt to construct a history of the primitive Church made by the theological school of Tübingen. Baur and his followers acknowledge only five genuine documents in the New Testament, namely, I. and II. Corinthians, Galatians and Romans, and the Apocalypse.¹ They assume that the original disciples of our Lord were never able to emancipate themselves from Judaism, and that their followers were Jews first and Christians afterwards; and further that Gentile Christianity was entirely the work of St. Paul, who was regarded as an arch-deceiver by the Twelve and their disciples. Thus according to their theory there were two Churches of Christians, each bitterly opposed to the other. Ultimately the leaders of both parties saw the need of union, and a compromise was arranged. Peter and Paul took an

1. The Tübingen school of the nineteenth century are regarded as over-cautious by their successors in the twentieth. Dr. Van Manen (*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. 'Paul') denies that the Apostle wrote any epistle at all!

equal rank as the founders of the church of Rome, both sides having made certain concessions in order to secure the unity of the Church. The New Testament, with the exception of the books already mentioned, was declared by this school to consist in part of the works of disciples of the Apostles which bear mainly on the controversy between Jews and Gentiles, and partly of forgeries in the names of the Apostles and their companions, some of which—the Gospel of St. John for example—are assigned to as late a date as the second half of the second century. According to this hypothesis our Lord was merely a moral teacher, very few of whose sayings have been preserved. The Jewish Christians are assumed not to have regarded Him as more than the great prophet of Israel, whilst the Pauline believers deified the memory not of the historical Jesus, but of an imaginary Christ. At last the Johannine school introduced into the Christian teaching the language of the Alexandrian philosophers, and declared our Lord to be the Divine Logos of Philo, or the Memra of the Targums.¹ The groundwork upon which these theories was based consists firstly of the supposed antagonism between St. Paul and the older Apostles, especially St. James. In the New Testament we find frequent indications that the supposed annihilation of Judaism in St. Paul's system was looked on with some suspicion by the Church at Jerusalem over which St. James presided.² We also learn that St. Paul was pursued by the hatred of the Judaizing Christians, who thwarted his missionary labours on all possible occasions.³ The second point on which the divines of Tübingen have constructed their theory is the progressive character of the Christology of the New Testament. They regard the Apocalypse as a Jewish writing which has assumed a Christian form under later hands; they notice the absence of Christian doctrine in St. James's Epistle, and they think they recognise in the Christ of those Epistles of St. Paul

1. Baur, *First Three Centuries of the Christian Church*.

2. Acts xxi. 18 foll.

3. 11 Cor. xi. Gal. ii. 4. Phil. iii. 2.

which they accept, a more human figure than the Heavenly Being above all rule, authority and power, in the Epistles assigned by them to His later disciples.

But the keystone of the entire theory is found in the so-called Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, which appeared during the second century. In these writings St. James is represented as the Head of the Christian Church and St. Peter as his delegate. The enemy of all truth is said to be Simon Magus, but it is evident that this is merely a pseudonym under which the writer disguises his attack on St. Paul.¹

Apart from all purely theological questions, the whole theory was open to grave objections on purely critical grounds, and has been practically abandoned. The New Testament, it is true, represents St. Paul as occupying a different standpoint from that of St. James in regard to the question of the conversion of the Gentiles; but these two Apostles meet on friendly terms at Jerusalem, and it is by no means certain that St. James's denunciation of faith without works is aimed at St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. In the former, faith is the acquiescence in dogma (*πιστεύεις ὅτι εἰς ὁ θεός*); in the latter, faith is that which draws man to God (*πίστις εἰς θεόν*). St. James, when he says that "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep oneself unspotted from the world," means by works, acts of mercy. In St. Paul's Epistles the "works of the Law" are condemned: that which St. James commends as 'works' being called the fruit of the Spirit.² Nor

1. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 340 foll. Dissertation 'St. Paul and the Three.'

2. St. James ii. 19. St. James i. 27. Gal. v. 22. The relation of the Epistle of St. James to those of St. Paul must always be a subject of dispute. J. B. Mayor in his Commentary on St. James considers that the Epistle was written before St. Paul formulated his doctrine of faith in *Romans*. Hort in denying this says "It seems more natural to suppose that a misuse or misunderstanding of St. Paul's teaching on the part of others gave rise to St. James's carefully guarded language"; and again, "Unlike as it is on the surface to that of the other books of the New Testament, it chiefly illustrates Judaistic Christianity by total freedom from it. We find not a word breathing the spirit which chafed at St. Paul's Gospel to the Gentiles." *Judaistic Christianity*, Lecture VIII.

will the hypothesis that the greater part of the New Testament was written in the second century bear the test of criticism. Without entering into a discussion of the Canon, it is sufficient for the present purpose to remark that nearly every important New Testament scripture is attested by respectable evidence as early as A.D. 180,¹ that is to say, within a century of the composition of the earliest. The absence of any

1. The subjoined table, compiled chiefly from Bp. Westcott's *History of the Canon of the New Testament*, may be of use to the reader. I have omitted those Epistles of St. Paul universally acknowledged to be genuine.

<i>Name of Book.</i>	<i>Earliest direct allusions or quotations.</i>	<i>Earliest indirect evidence and Remarks.</i>
St. Matthew	Papias, A. D. 120	Ep. Barn. (The Didache)
St. Mark	Papias, A. D. 120	
St. Luke	Muratorian Frag., A. D. 170*	
St. John †	Irenæus, A. D. 180	Marcion, A. D. 140, accepted no other Gospel
Acts of the Apostles	Muratorian Frag.	
Ephesians	Clement of Rome, A. D. 96	Ignatius, Papias, &c.
Colossians	Justin Martyr, A. D. 140	Polycarp, (d.) A. D. 156
Philippians	Polycarp, (d.) A. D. 156	
I Thessalonians	Justin Martyr, A. D. 140	
II Thessalonians	Dionysius of Corinth, A. D. 171	
Pastoral Epistles	Clement of Rome, (I Tim.)	Polycarp, (II Tim.)
Hebrews	Clement of Rome, A. D. 96	Its antiquity certain, not so its authorship
James	Clement of Rome	Possible traces of a knowledge of the Epistle in Clement of Rome
I Peter	Polycarp	
II Peter	No evidence of value	
I John	Polycarp and Papias	Muratorian Frag.
II III, John	No early evidence	
Jude	Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 190	
Apocalypse	Papias, A. D. 120	Muratorian Frag.

* The Muratorian Fragment is dated later by some scholars. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Pt. I., p. 247 n.

† Bp. Westcott, *Hist. of the Canon*, pp. 35, 76. The early heretics (Ophites, Basilides, &c.) bear testimony to the antiquity of St. John's Gospel, and the earliest Commentary is the work of the Gnostic Heracleon.

hint by an early writer of the reconciliation of the Jewish and Christian Churches is a further objection to a theory in which we are asked to believe that two bodies of Christians, divided, not by a question of dogma, but on one which affected the daily life of man, agreed to sink their differences so completely that hardly a trace of the controversy survived its extinction.

Epistle
of Barnabas.

An epistle has been preserved which has been attributed to the apostle Barnabas. The concurrence of early testimony in favour of its authenticity is exceptionally strong. Clement of Alexandria has no hesitation in ascribing the epistle to Barnabas. Origen in his treatise against Celsus calls it 'the Catholic epistle of Barnabas'. Eusebius considers it the work of the Apostle, though he does not accept it as canonical. Jerome classes it among the apocryphal writings, and yet appears to consider it the work of St. Barnabas.¹ It is found in the Codex Sinaiticus with the books of the New Testament.

This evidence, which in the opinion of many would be sufficient to establish the authenticity of any book in the New Testament, is greatly weakened by the contents of the Epistle itself. It abounds in foolish and trivial allegories, which make it hard to believe that it could have been written by St. Barnabas, the 'son of consolation'. The institution of circumcision is an example

1. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* II. 7, 35, &c.; Origen *adv. Celsum*, bk. 1. ch. lxiii.; Euseb., *H. E.* III. 25 (4); VI. 13 (6), 14; Hieronym., *de Vir. Ill.*, c. 6. Nearly all the testimony in favour of the Epistle is Alexandrian. Eusebius is speaking of Clement of Alexandria as a student of Scripture, and the Epistle of Barnabas is mentioned in connection with the Epistle to the Hebrews and those of Clement and Jude. Modern attempts to date this Epistle are based on two passages. (1) ch. 4: "Ten kings shall reign upon earth, and after them shall arise a little king who shall bring low three of the kings under one." No satisfactory enumeration of the Caesars can fix this date, which Weizsäcker places between A.D. 70—79, Hilgenfeld A.D. 96—98, and Volkmar A.D. 119—132. (2) The interpretation given to Isaiah xlix. 17 in ch. 16, that the destroyers of the Temple should rebuild it, which thing, says the Epistle, is now 'coming to pass'. This is thought to be an allusion to a supposed design of Hadrian to rebuild the Temple. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 241. Dr. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. I., p. 33) thinks that *Barn.* 16 seems to fix the date as A.D. 130. In the Epistle we have the first example of a saying of our Lord's being quoted as 'Scripture' "There be many called, but few chosen." (ch. 4.)

of this writer's painful habit of dealing with Scripture: "Understand, therefore, children, these things more fully; that Abraham, who was the first that brought in circumcision, looking forward in the spirit to Jesus, circumcised having received the mystery of Three Letters. For the Scripture says that Abraham circumcised three hundred and eighteen men of his house. But what, therefore, was the mystery that was made known unto him? Mark first the eighteen, and then the three hundred. For the numeral letters of ten and eight are I H. And these denote Jesus. And because the cross was that by which we were to find grace, therefore he adds three hundred, the note of which is T. Wherefore by two letters he signified Jesus, and by the third, His cross. He who has put the engrafted gift of His doctrine within us, knows that I never taught to anyone a more certain truth; but I trust that ye are worthy of it."¹ Again in speaking of clean and unclean beasts, he says, "But he adds, 'Neither shalt thou eat of the hare.' To what end? To signify this to us: Thou shalt not be an adulterer: nor liken thyself to such persons. For the hare every year multiplies the places of its conception; and as many years as it lives so many it has. 'Neither shalt thou eat of the hyaena.' That is, again, Be not an adulterer, nor a corrupter of others; neither be like to such. And wherefore so? Because that creature every year changes its kind, and is sometimes male and sometimes female." Again he argues, "But why might the Jews eat those that clave the hoof? Because the righteous liveth in this present world but his expectation is fixed upon the other."² But despite the feeling of dislike with which these tiresome allegories inspire a modern reader, it is well to remember that, in the first place, everything written even by an Apostle is not for that reason inspired, and the Church never allowed the Epistle to be reckoned among her canonical books. In the second place, it must not be forgotten that the recognised method of interpreting the Scriptures among Jews and Christians of the age was to

1. *Ep. Barn.*, ch. 9.

2. *Ibid.*, ch. 10.

treat it allegorically, as Philo had done a little earlier, as St. Paul was frequently in the habit of doing, and as Clement and Origen did at a later period almost as extensively as the author of this Epistle. Lastly, the Epistle was written soon after the siege of Jerusalem, to shew the Jewish Christians that the Temple which had just been destroyed and the Law of Moses were mere shadows of the dispensation of Christ; and this method of reasoning, which is so distasteful to us, has ever had a great fascination for the Jewish mind, and may have supplied many arguments, which at the time were considered convincing by those who heard or read them. The *Epistle of Barnabas* may consequently have been written to serve a temporary purpose, and this may account for its marked inferiority to any book in the New Testament, which the Spirit of God destined for all time.

Justice demands that we should not ignore the fact that the *Epistle of Barnabas* contains many passages of considerable beauty. "Do not" we read "withdraw yourselves from others as if you were already justified; but coming all together into one place, enquire what is agreeable to and profitable for the beloved of God. For the Scripture says, 'Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight.' Let us become spiritual, a perfect temple to God. As much as in us lies, let us meditate upon the fear of God; and strive to the utmost of our power to keep His commandments, that we may rejoice in His righteous judgments." Speaking of the spiritual temple the author says, "Let us enquire therefore whether there be any temple of God.....I find therefore that there is a temple. But how shall it be built in the name of the Lord? I will shew you. Before that we believed in God, the habitation of our heart was feeble and corruptible, as a temple truly built with hands....But it shall be built in the name of the Lord. Consider how that the temple of the Lord shall be very gloriously built; and by what means that shall be, learn.....Wherefore God truly dwells in our house, that is, in us. But how does He

dwell in us? The word of His faith, the calling of His promise, the wisdom of His righteous judgments, the commands of His doctrine. He Himself prophesies within us; He Himself dwelleth within us, and openeth to us, who were in bondage of death, the gate of our temple, that is, the mouth of wisdom; having given repentance unto us; and by this means He hath brought us to be an incorruptible temple."¹

The *Epistle of Barnabas* is valuable as shewing the manner in which a Christian teacher wrote shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, and also as proving the care with which the Christians sought to discriminate between inspired and uninspired writings. The great name of St. Barnabas, that most amiable of apostles, was not sufficient to make Christians acknowledge his *Epistle* as canonical; whilst even those who denied the Pauline authorship of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* acknowledged its authority. It marks however an important stage in the relations of Judaism and Christianity. The author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* hints that the time is coming when Christians must part company with the Jews, and in *Barnabas* we see that this has come to pass. The contrast between the two letters is well seen in the following weighty judgment concerning '*Barnabas*'. "*The Epistle of Barnabas*, whenever it may have been written, is a striking example of what the Apostolic teaching about the old Covenant was *not*. Ignoring the progressive method of God's dealings with mankind, it treats the Jewish practices and beliefs of old time as having always been mere errors, and thus makes the Old Testament no more than a fantastic forestatement of the New Testament."²

The *Epistle of Barnabas* concludes with a description of the two ways of light and darkness, which is also found in the recently discovered *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. This little treatise is quoted by Clement of Alexandria in 201 A.D., and by Athanasius in the fourth century. Eusebius mentions it by name

1. *Ep. Barn.*, ch. 16.

2. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 191.

among the spurious writings (*νόθα*) used by the Church, together with the so-called Epistle of Barnabas.¹ Athanasius also speaks of it, when he mentions the "books not canonical but appointed by the Fathers to be read to those just coming to us,"² *i.e.* to the catechumens. After the sixth century it is not mentioned by any writer except Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople (*died* A.D. 828), who names it among the apocryphal books of the New Testament. In 1873, Bryennius, then Metropolitan of Serres in Macedonia, and afterwards of Nicomedia in Asia Minor, discovered in the Monastery of Phanar in Constantinople, a MS. book called Synopsis of the Old and New Testaments by St. John Chrysostom. On examination it was found to contain, besides the Synopsis before mentioned, the Epistle of Barnabas, i. and ii. Clement, the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Epistle of Mary of Cassobola to Ignatius, and the twelve Epistles of Ignatius. Archbishop Bryennius published the Epistles of Clement in 1875, and in 1883 he edited the *Teaching* with prolegomena and notes. The date of the composition of the treatise is not known; but it is considered to be earlier than either *Barnabas* or *Hermas*, as the similarities of language between these writings and the *Teaching* betray a deviation from the original form of the Sayings. Hilgenfeld, however, assigns a comparatively late date to the treatise, on the ground that some expressions about the prophets have led him to suppose that its author was a Montanist. Dr. Stanton disputes this theory—and also that of Harnack that the *Teaching* emanated from some insignificant local Church about A.D. 160—because it seems to him to fail to account for the widespread influence of the book in early times.³ Nor is it decided whether it is the work of a Jewish or Gentile Christian, though a strong case has been made out for the former view. But, whatever the date of the *Teaching* may be, it is of great value to the historian as shewing the character of a very primitive Christian community.

1. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 25. *φερομένη*.

2. Athan., *Festal Epistle*, 39.

3. *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. I., p. 30.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles has been not inaptly described as a sort of Church Catechism intensely Jewish.¹ But although the writer regards things from the stand-point of a Jew he shews no hostility to the Gentiles, but, on the contrary, does his best to persuade his readers to abandon the Jewish Sabbath and also to change the weekly fast days to Wednesday and Friday. He speaks of those who follow the Jews in the observance of the Sabbath and the days of fasting as hypocrites.² None the less the scruples of a Jew are shewn in the direction to baptize in living water in preference to all other, and in the very strong command to beware of things offered to idols, "for it is the service of dead gods." The Christian community is depicted in a very primitive form. Baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is enjoined. The Lord's Prayer is directed to be said thrice a day. The influence of the Sermon on the Mount is distinctly marked.³ A form of thanksgiving at the Eucharist is ordered, of which none but baptized persons may partake.⁴ Apostles and prophets from time to time visit the church, and are to be entertained for two nights. A prophet however is allowed, if he likes, to settle among the Christians, and he is to receive the first-fruits of the believers; "for they (the prophets) are your chief priests." Bishops and deacons are ordered to be elected, and treated with respect. Strangers and wayfarers are to be entertained by the brethren, and if any desires to settle among them,

1. Dr. C. Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with illustrations from the Talmud*. Prof. Rendel Harris, in his edition of the *Teaching*, has a chapter on 'The Hebraisms of the *Teaching*,' p. 82 fol.

2. *Teaching*, ch. viii. : "But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second day of the week and on the fifth: but ye shall fast on the fourth day and the preparation."

3. Rainy, *Ancient Catholic Church*, p. 58.

4. *Teaching*, ch. ix. : "We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory for ever. As concerning the broken bread (*περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος*) we thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory for ever. Just as this broken bread was scattered over the hills and having been gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth unto Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever."—*Hitchcock and Brown's Translation*.

he may do so, provided he works for his living. The coming of Christ is very near. Three signs shall announce it: a sign of a cross spread out in heaven, the voice of a trumpet, and the resurrection of the dead.¹

Clement of
Rome.

We know but little of St. Clement, but the extreme importance of his name in the early legends of the Church shews how great an impression he must have made on the minds of his contemporaries. In the history of the first century he is second only to the greatest of the Apostles. His sole authentic writing is an epistle to the church of Corinth, written, according to Bp. Lightfoot, during the reign of Domitian. The (so-called) Second Epistle of Clement existed only in a fragment before the discovery by Archbishop Bryennius of the manuscript at Constantinople, and it now proves to be not a letter but an ancient homily of the second century. Clement seems from his authentic epistle to have been a man of a most catholic mind. He is a disciple of no particular school in the Church; he quotes the writings of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. James with equal respect, and the general tone of his epistle would have been impossible, had the Jewish and Gentile Christians been at hopeless variance in Rome during the latter years of the first century.

Origen identifies Clement with the person mentioned in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians,² and his opinion is adopted by Eusebius³ and the later ecclesiastical writers. But there are several reasons for thinking that Origen was misled by the similarity of the name, and that there was a Philippian as well as a Roman Christian called Clement. In the first place, Clement of Rome is traditionally connected with St. Peter, not with St. Paul. In the second, the date of Clement's episcopate makes it improbable, though not impossible, that he was a fellow labourer with the Apostle at Philippi. Eusebius asserts that Clement died in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100),⁴

1. *πρωτον σημειον εκπερασσεως εν ουρανῳ*. Dr. Taylor shews that ch. xii. of *Barnabas* proves conclusively that the sign of the Cross is meant. In this chapter the writer speaks of the prefigurations of the Cross, and quotes Isaiah lxx. 2, "I spread out my hands" (*ἐξενέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου*).

3. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 4 (10).

2. Phil. iv. 3.

4. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 34.

but as his name is mentioned in the *Shepherd* of Hermas,¹ which is not earlier than A.D. 140, it is quite conceivable that he may have been alive as late as A.D. 110, or nearly fifty years after St. Paul wrote to the Philippians; and in this case Clement would be an aged man even at the close of the first century.² But although the above objections are by no means fatal to the identification of Clement of Rome with his namesake of Philippi, the name is so common that it is impossible to draw any inference from the fact of two persons being so called. Bp. Lightfoot points out that no less than five Clements are mentioned by Tacitus,³ and that the name occurs frequently among the dependents of the Flavian Emperors⁴ (Vespasian, Titus and Domitian). Before therefore pronouncing the two Clements mentioned in the early days of Church history to be the same person it would be necessary to produce a very positive tradition to that effect. But Irenaeus, that great repository of Christian tradition, although he says that Clement of Rome was a disciple "who had seen the blessed Apostles and conferred with them, and had the doctrine of the Apostles yet sounding in his ears, and their traditions before his eyes,"⁵ yet gives no hint of his having been the fellow labourer of St. Paul at Philippi.

A more plausible theory makes Clement of Rome the same as the consul Flavius Clemens, whose children had been designated by Domitian as his successors, and whose wife, Flavia Domitilla, is actually claimed by Eusebius as a sufferer for Christ.⁶ Flavius Clemens was put to death on the charge of atheism and Jewish manners, in the very year (A.D. 95) in which, according to some authorities, Clement bishop of Rome died. But the silence of tradition militates against this theory,

1. Hermas, *Visions* II. 4.

2. Lightfoot, *Epistle to Philippians*, p. 168.

3. Clemens Arretinus, *Hist.* iv. 68. Clemens Julius, *Ann.* I. 23, 26, Clemens a slave of Postumius Agrippa, *Ann.* II. 39. Clemens Salienus, *Ann.* xv. 73. Clemens Suedius, *Hist.* I. 87.

4. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, App. p. 264.

5. Irenaeus, *Haer.* III. c. 3, § 2.

6. Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 18) calls her the *niece* of Flavius Clemens (ἡ ἀδελφῆς γεγονυία Φλαυίου Κλημεντος). Bp. Lightfoot however thinks that there was only one Flavia Domitilla. (*Philippians*, p. 22.)

since it is scarcely conceivable that so important a personage as the consul and cousin of the Emperor should have been bishop of Rome and that no record of the fact should have been preserved in the traditions of the Roman church. It is true that in the *Recognitions* Clement is asserted to have been a kinsman of the Emperor, but here Tiberius and not Domitian is meant.

All that we really know of Clement is that he was one of the early bishops of Rome, but it is not quite certain what place he takes among the first popes. The first list of Roman bishops is that given by Irenaeus, who places them in the following order: 'the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, Linus, Anencletus, Clement.' In A.D. 235 Hippolytus drew up a list of bishops in which Clement is placed after Linus and before Cletus and Anencletus. This order is adopted in the Liberian catalogue of Popes which ends with the episcopate of Liberius, A.D. 354, and by most of the Latin Fathers. Jerome, though he adopts the arrangement of Irenaeus, maintains that Clement was ordained by St. Peter;² and it seems to have been an almost universal belief that Clement received his appointment direct from the chief of the twelve Apostles. According to the *Apostolical Constitutions* Linus was ordained by St. Paul, and Clement, on his death, by St. Peter;³ Tertullian says that Clement was ordained by St. Peter.⁴ But a slight chronological difficulty makes us hesitate to accept this tradition. The latest date which we can assign to the death of St. Peter is A.D. 68, and this would make Clement preside over the church of Rome for more than thirty years, if Eusebius is correct in stating that he died in the third year of Trajan.⁵ It is perhaps best to assume that the tradition rests on the statement of the alleged letter of Clement to

1. The publication of the late Bp. Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. I., threw much fresh light on this subject, which will be discussed more fully in ch. x.

2. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, vol. I., Article 'Clemens Romanus'. Irenaeus, *Haer.* III. § 3.

3. *Apost. Const.*, VII. 46.

4. *De Praescrip. Haeret.*, c. 32. "Sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum."

5. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 34.

S. James preserved in the Homilies. It is however a noteworthy fact that Clement's name is always connected with that of St. Peter, notwithstanding the belief that he and the Clement in the Epistle to the Philippians are identical. When we turn to the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians we see how impossible it is to reconcile his connection with St. Peter with the Tübingen theory of the antagonism of the Petrine and Pauline Christian communities.

We are able to derive hints as to the personality of Clement from his Epistle, although he makes no allusion to himself and writes to the Corinthians in the name of the church of Rome. Bp. Lightfoot points out that the author of the letter has a very thorough acquaintance with the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, and describes him as a man "whose mind was saturated with the knowledge of the Old Testament"; his language and style shew him to have been trained from his childhood in the knowledge of the Bible—in other words, he must have been either a Jew or the son of a proselyte. Jews were not uncommon among the slaves and retainers of the Flavian dynasty, and the bishop of Rome was probably a freedman of Flavius Clemens. If this is the case it is not difficult to account for the spread of Christian principles in the family of the consul.¹

The Clement of the *Recognitions* is represented as the son of Faustinianus—a relative of Tiberius—and Mattidia; he had also twin brothers named Faustus and Faustinus. Mattidia was warned by a vision to leave Rome for ten years, so her husband sent her with her twin sons to Athens. Faustinianus, having no tidings of his absent wife, left Clement in Rome, and started himself to find her. He also disappeared, and Clement was left without a trace of his relations. Clement was converted to Christianity by Barnabas, after he had sought knowledge in all the schools of the Philosophers. He followed his master to Caesarea and made the

1. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 256. (1887.)

acquaintance of St. Peter. According to the Clementine romance, this Apostle seems to have devoted himself to pursuing Simon Magus in order to refute his errors. Clement followed St. Peter, and found first his long-lost mother, and afterwards his two brothers, who proved to be two of the Apostle's disciples. Their mother Mattidia was baptized, and the three brothers and St. Peter retired to bathe in the sea and to pray. A working man, who saw them at prayer, obtruded his opinion that such an exercise was useless because all things are governed by fate. He gives as an example that his own wife had been born under an horoscope which compelled her to commit adultery and end her days on water by foreign travel. Of course the working man turns out to be the long-lost father, Faustianus. He also is converted, and St. Peter, after refuting Simon Magus at Antioch, baptizes him.¹

Till the discovery of the Jerusalem Codex by Bryennius, it was supposed that the only MS. of the two epistles of Clement was the fragment preserved in the Codex Alexandrinus. Besides this, a Syriac MS. of the New Testament was purchased by the University of Cambridge from the collection of the late M. Jules Mohl in 1876, in which a translation of the two epistles was discovered.² Now that the second epistle is, by general consent, assigned to a date posterior to the death of Clement,³ there remains only one which can be attributed to him. This letter, in which the name of Clement does not appear, was addressed by the church of Rome to the church of Corinth, exhorting the latter to put an end to the factions which distracted the Corinthian Christians. It was sent by special delegates of the Roman church, named Claudius Ephebus, Valerius Bito, and Fortunatus, all of whom were elderly

1. *Dict. Christian Biog.*, Art. 'Clementine Literature', by Dr. Salmon. *Recognitions*, §§ VII and VIII.

2. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 303 foll.

3. "Bryennius (p. *pro*) maintains that the homily is the work of none other than the famous bishop of Rome. This view however has nothing to recommend it, and has found no favour with others." Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

men who had been Christians the greater part of their lives. It is possible that Fortunatus was himself a Corinthian, and he may be the same who is named in St. Paul's First Epistle (xvi. 17).¹ At any rate, Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito may have been Christians thirty years or so before, when the Apostles Peter and Paul were in Rome; and thus the epistle was written by a disciple of the Apostles, and brought to Corinth by two men who had been converted in apostolic times. The whole tone of the letter is characterised by its reasonable and conciliatory spirit,² which is the more remarkable, when we remember that it was possibly written by a member of the Flavian household during the dreadful months which preceded the murder of Domitian, when not only the Christians, but the relatives of the tyrant themselves, were in expectation of becoming the victims of his cruelty.³

Another interesting feature in the Epistle of Clement is the knowledge which this Father shews of the writings of the Apostles, and the complete absence of every trace of party spirit. Clement has no desire to exalt St. Peter at the expense of St. Paul or the reverse.⁴ The Roman

1. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 256. Clement says § 65 (59 before the discovery of the rest of the Epistle) τοὺς δὲ ἀπεσταλμένους ἀφ' ἡμῶν Κλαύδιον Ἐφεβὸν καὶ Οὐαλέριον Βίτονα σὺν καὶ Φορτουνάτῳ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐν τάχει ἀναπέμψατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς. In the newly discovered portion he says that they are ἄνδρας πιστοὺς καὶ σώφρονας ἀπὸ νεότητος ἀναστραφέντας ἕως γήρου ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἡμῖν.

2. *Clement of Rome*, §§ 58 and 62, μετὰ ἐκτένου ἐπιεικείας. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. II., vol. 1., p. 2.

3. "The letter was probably written while the church was still at the mercy of the tyrant's caprice, still uncertain when and where the next blow might fall.....Flavius Clemens was consul A.D. 95, and he appears to have suffered immediately after the close of the year. In September of the following year the tyrant himself was slain. The chief conspirator and assassin was one Stephanas, a freedman, the steward of Domitilla. He is even said to have struck the blow with the name of Flavius Clemens on his lips.....If this be so, the household of this earliest of Christian princes must have contained within its walls strange diversities of character. No greater contrast can be conceived to the ferocity and passion of those bloody scenes which accompanied the death of Domitian, than the singular gentleness and forbearance which distinguishes this letter throughout." Lightfoot, *Epistles of Clement*, Appendix, p. 268.

4. Bp. Westcott, *Hist. of the Canon of the New Test.*, p. 25. Clement, according to the Synopsis of historical evidence for the books of the

church could not have been distracted by any serious schism between Petrine and Pauline Christians when it could allow a letter to be written in its name containing the following passage: "Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles. There was Peter who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one nor two but many labours, and thus having borne his testimony went to the appointed place of his glory. By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patient endurance.....after having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having reached the furthest bounds of the west (*ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών*)."¹

The Epistle of Clement was very highly valued in the primitive Church, and was publicly read not only at Corinth but elsewhere.² For this reason it was attached to some MSS. of the New Testament, and in the Alexandrian MS. it occupies the same position, viz. after the Apocalypse, as the Epistle of Barnabas and the *Shepherd* of Hermas do in the older Codex Sinaiticus.

Besides the so-called second epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, Clement has been falsely credited with two epistles on Virginity, an epistle to James the Lord's brother, giving an account of his appointment by St. Peter to the See of Rome, and a second epistle to James, relating to the administration of the Eucharist and other matters. In the false Decretals (A.D. 829—847) the two latter are enlarged and three additional letters are forged.³

New Testament given by Bp. Westcott, shews himself acquainted with the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, and 1 Timothy, with the Epistle of St. James, and possibly with 11 Peter. "His acquaintance with the Epistle to the Hebrews" says Bp. Westcott "is such as to shew that the language of the Epistle was transfused into Clement's mind."

1. *Ep. ad Cor.*, v.

2. Dionysius of Corinth, writing to the Roman Christians, A.D. 165—175, says: "This day being the Lord's day, we kept as a holy-day; when we read your epistle, which we shall ever continue to read for our edification, as also the former epistle which you wrote us by Clement." Euseb., *H. E.* iv, 23 (11); cf. iii. 16. See Bp. Lightfoot, *Epistles of St. Clement of Rome*, pp. 3, 4, 9, for the early testimony in favour of the Epistle.

3. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, p. 14 foll.

Of the greater part of the life of Ignatius we know as little or even less than we do of Clement of Rome. Even legend is comparatively silent as to his early history. In the *Menaee* for Dec. 20, Ignatius is said to have been the child whom our Lord took in His arms, but this seems to be merely an attempt to explain the surname Theophorus. It has been conjectured that he was a pagan in early life, and from his language, Bp. Lightfoot infers that his life had been stained by those sins, of which, as a heathen, he had probably taken no account at the time, but for which he reproached himself bitterly when he became a Christian.¹ Tradition is unanimous in asserting that he was a hearer of the Apostles: Theodoret and Chrysostom say that he was ordained bishop of Antioch by St. Peter; whilst in the *Apostolical Constitutions* it is said that his predecessor Euodius was ordained by St. Peter, and Ignatius by St. Paul.²

The only tradition preserved of the episcopate of Ignatius at Antioch is found in Socrates, a church historian of the fifth century, who tells us that Ignatius saw a vision of Angels praising the Holy Trinity in antiphonal hymns, and he left the fashion of this vision as a custom to the church at Antioch.³

At the close of his life all the obscurity that hangs over the early career of Ignatius is dispelled, and we are allowed for a time to see him as a very prominent figure in the history of the early Church. He was condemned at Antioch and was sent to Rome to be thrown to the beasts in the arena. But we have no trustworthy account of his trial and condemnation at Antioch, nor

1. Ignat. *ad. Rom.* 9., ἐγὼ δὲ ἀσχύνομαι ἐξ αὐτῶν λέγεσθαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀξίός εἰμι ὡν ἴσχατος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἑκτρωμα· ἀλλ' ἠλέημαι τις εἶναι, ἐὰν Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω. The language is obviously suggested by 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9, and 1 Tim. i. 13. See Bp. Lightfoot's notes.

2. *Apost. Const.* vii. 46.

3. Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 8. He also says of Ignatius that he associated with the Apostles themselves: ὅς καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῖς συνδιέτριψεν. Bp. Lightfoot suggests that the legend of the introduction of antiphonal chanting by Ignatius may be due to his language in *Trallians* 5, *Rom.* 2, *Eph.* 4: *Apostolic Fathers*, part II., vol. 1., p. 30.

can we trace the first part of his journey with any certainty.¹ His figure only comes into the light when he has reached the heart of Asia Minor, where the road from the east bifurcates; the southerly route following the course of the river Meander to Ephesus, whilst the northerly goes to Smyrna by Philadelphia and Sardis.

Ignatius was conducted by the northerly road, but a message was sent to Tralles and Magnesia in the valley of the Meander on the way to Ephesus, to say that the Saint would remain at Smyrna and be able to receive deputations from the Christian churches of Asia Minor.² Ephesus sent her bishop Onesimus, Burrhus a deacon, and three others; Magnesia sent Damas the bishop, two presbyters, and a deacon; and Tralles, being further away from Smyrna than the two other cities, only despatched her bishop, Polybius.

During the sojourn at Smyrna Ignatius wrote a letter to each of the above-mentioned churches, and also one to the Roman Christians to entreat them not to seek by their ill-timed zeal to deprive him of the glory of martyrdom. He was allowed to see his friends, and was able to draw much strength and comfort from the society of Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, who was himself destined to die a martyr's death.

Although Ignatius was given considerable liberty for one in the position of a condemned criminal, he appears to have been treated with great brutality by the soldiers of his guard, whom he compares to ten leopards. It seems as though the greater fees the soldiers received from the Christians, the worse they behaved to the Saint,—no doubt in the hope of exacting larger gratuities.³

Although Ignatius was given considerable liberty for one in the position of a condemned criminal, he appears to have been treated with great brutality by the soldiers of his guard, whom he compares to ten leopards. It seems as though the greater fees the soldiers received from the Christians, the worse they behaved to the Saint,—no doubt in the hope of exacting larger gratuities.³

1. There are two Greek Acts of Ignatius given in Bp. Lightfoot's works, but neither the Roman nor Antiochene Acts (as they are termed) are considered genuine.

2. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

3. Ignat., *ad. Rom.* 5: ἐνδεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, δ' ἔστιν στρατιωτικὸν τᾶγμα, οἱ καὶ ἐνεργετούμενοι χεῖρους γίνονται. The chapter is a very remarkable instance of Ignatius' thirst for martyrdom. He concludes, "Come fire and cross and grapplings with wild beasts, wrenching of bones, hacking of limbs, crushing of my whole body, come cruel tortures of the devil to assail me. Only be it mine to attain Jesus Christ." (Lightfoot's Tr.)

From Smyrna Ignatius was led to Alexandria Troas. Here he wrote three letters, to the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, which had entertained him, and also to Polycarp. The object he had in writing these letters was to entreat the Smyrnaeans and Philadelphians to send delegates to exhort and comfort his own church at Antioch. We next hear of Ignatius at Philippi, where the Christians welcomed him, and two other martyrs, Zosimus and Rufus, who "like him" (to quote the words of Polycarp) "were entwined with saintly fetters, the diadems of the truly elect."¹ After he had departed, the Philippians, as we learn from Polycarp's reply to them, begged the bishop of Smyrna to send them a copy of the epistle of Ignatius to himself, and of any other of the martyr's letters which he might have by him. It is probably to this circumstance that we owe the preservation of the seven Letters of Ignatius.²

Of the rest of the journey to Rome and the martyrdom of Ignatius we know nothing definite—we see the Saint for a few days, at most a few weeks, of his life, and he disappears as suddenly as he appeared.

Ignatius has been the cause of one of the greatest of literary controversies. His martyrdom was, after that of St. Stephen, the one which appealed most to the Christian imagination, and his Epistle to the Romans became, as Bp. Lightfoot terms it, a sort of martyrs' manual.³ The tragic circumstances under which his letters were written made them very popular; they were embellished by additions, and five other letters were added in imitation of them. In the middle ages Ignatius was believed to have corresponded with St. John and the Blessed Virgin. The great St. Bernard was said to have countenanced this foolish fancy.⁴ At

1. *Polycarp to Philippians*, c. 9. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

2. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II., vol. I., p. 37.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

4. Bp. Lightfoot thinks that St. Bernard misled his readers by saying that a certain Mary, *Mariam quandam*, was *Christofera*, alluding to Mary of Cassobola.

the time of the Reformation Ignatius was credited with twelve letters, consisting of the seven we now have in a much expanded form, and five others, namely those to the Tarsians, Philippians, Antiochenes, Hero, and Mary of Cassobola. In addition to these there was a letter of this Mary to Ignatius. These letters are now called the *longer recension*. But it was observed by scholars that Eusebius mentions only seven Ignatian Epistles, and Vedelius, in A.D. 1623, printed the seven alluded to by that Father in one volume, and the remainder in a separate volume calling them *τὰ ψευδ-ἐπιγραφα καὶ τὰ νόθα*.

In 1641, when the famous Smectymnuus¹ controversy on the government of the Church by Bishops was raging in England, Archbishop Ussher made use of testimonies in favour of episcopacy taken from the Ignatian Letters. He was attacked on this point by the Puritan writers, the poet Milton among others declaring the Epistles to be forgeries. Ussher seriously investigated the question of the authenticity of the Letters, and in 1644 he published the results of his labours. He had noticed that, since the thirteenth century, the quotations from Ignatius made by English writers resembled the passages found in the ancient Fathers, and he divined that some copies of these Epistles existed in England in a less corrupted form than was then known. Two Latin MSS. were discovered of a shorter recension than that generally in use, and from these Ussher attempted to restore the genuine Ignatian Letters.² It needed only the discovery of a Greek MS. to make the triumph of Ussher's great critical genius complete, and two years later Isaac Voss published six letters of the shorter recension from a Greek MS. found in Florence. The Epistle to the Romans was not in the MS., which was imperfect towards the end. A Greek copy of this letter was discovered half a century later and published by Ruinart in 1689 with the Greek 'Acts of Ignatius'.

1. So called from the initials of five Puritan divines (Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen William Spurstow) who took part in the controversy.

2. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 231 foll.

The controversy was resumed by Daillé, a French Protestant, whose work appeared in 1666, and to whom we owe a debt of gratitude for having caused Bishop Pearson to publish his *Vindiciae Ignatianae* in 1672.¹ For nearly two centuries the question was allowed to slumber. In 1838, however, Archdeacon Tattam purchased some manuscripts for the British Museum from the Monastery of St. Mary Deipara in the Desert of Nitria.² One of these was a Syriac translation of the Epistles of Ignatius to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans. These letters are much shorter than the Epistles of the Vossian recension. They were published in 1845 by Dr. Cureton, Canon of Westminster, as the genuine Ignatian Letters; but in the following year Dr. Wordsworth (afterwards Bishop of Lincoln) pronounced them to be an abbreviation of the true Letters by an Eutychnian heretic. Cureton's theory was based on the fact that the Syriac Letters omitted many strong exhortations on the subject of the duty of obedience to the bishop and his presbyters and deacons, whilst they retained others couched in equally forcible language. From this he inferred that the Syriac translator could have had no object in omitting that which is not found in his recension, though it might prove a temptation to an editor of the Letters to interpolate passages in order to make the authority of the martyr support his own views.³ Dr. Cureton was supported by critics and historians like Bunsen, Weiss, Milman, and Pressensé; but the Tübingen school, represented by Baur and Hilgenfeld, denied the genuineness of the Letters in any shape, and Volkmar held the Vossian recension to be an enlargement of the Curetonian Letters, made in A.D. 170, whilst condemning the latter as spurious. Indeed the matter was one of life and death to the Tübingen view of Church history, and the theologians

1. Daillé's work was entitled: *De Scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagitae et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur, libri duo.* (Genevae, 1666.) Bp. Lightfoot (p. 319) considers his arguments against the Ignatian Letters very uncritical.

2. Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum*, Introd., p. xxvi.

3. *Ibid.*, p. xxxvii.

of that school had no alternative but to reject the Letters.¹

Bp. Lightfoot's great work appeared in 1885. In it he has given the whole controversy a most judicious investigation and has pronounced in favour of the seven letters mentioned by Eusebius.²

The Ignatian controversy is naturally interesting to Englishmen from the fact that some of the most learned of our bishops—Ussher, Pearson, and Lightfoot—have done much to restore the genuine Epistles, and that Dr. Cureton's labours have thrown a flood of light upon the subject. But it claims the attention of all students of Church History alike, because the Letters are the key to our knowledge of the state of the Church in the early part of the second century. Their bearing on the question of Church government is of great importance. They give us a clear insight into the doctrine of the Person of Christ as held by the disciples of the Apostles. Further they are of the highest value in shewing the canonical position of St. Paul's Epistles in the early days of the second century.³ Nor is this all; Ignatius shews that he has grasped the idea of a catholic and universal Church.⁴ His letters prove him to have been always eager to know more Christians and to interest them in each other.⁵ They are the bridge by which we pass from the age of the Apostles to the age in which the Christian Church stands forth in the light of history.⁶

Importance of the Ignatian Controversy.

1. "If for instance Baur had accepted the Ignatian Letters as genuine even in their shortest form, he would have put an engine into the hands of his opponents, which would have shattered at a single blow all the Tübingen theories respecting the growth of the canon and the history of the early Church." (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. I., p. 270.)

2. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 36.

3. Bp. Westcott says of the Ignatian Letters, "The image of St. Paul is stamped alike upon their language and their doctrine." *Hist. of Canon*, p. 33.

4. Ignatius is the first to use the term ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. (*Smyrn.* 8.) For Ignatius and Judaism, see Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, Lecture VIII.

5. *Dict. Christian Biog.*, Art. 'Ignatius' (vol. III., p. 216).

6. The views of Bp. Lightfoot are not even now generally accepted in England. The Rev. John Owen, in his able introduction to Dr. Harnack's *Sources of the Apostolic Canons*, summarises the arguments advanced by

The Churches
of Asia.

The Churches of Proconsular Asia are of great interest to the student of the sub-apostolic age, being unusually rich in Christian tradition. Ephesus had been the scene of the residence of St. Paul, St. Timothy, and St. John. St. Andrew, according to an early tradition, was a companion of the Evangelist, and actually assisted him in the composition of his Gospel.¹ A Philip, whom Polycrates of Ephesus says was the apostle, but whom others identify with the deacon and evangelist, resided at Hierapolis;² his two virgin daughters lived to a great age and handed down to the men of the second century the traditions of the very earliest days of the Church.³ Thus Phrygia and Proconsular Asia became a second Holy Land to the Christians and the resting place of the last of those who had seen Jesus.

Papias.

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, was perhaps born as early as A.D. 60, and had consequently come to years of discretion long before the death of St. John. No facts are known as to his life: it is not even certain whether he died a natural death or suffered martyrdom. Irenaeus calls him a hearer of St. John and a friend of Polycarp,⁴ and there is a statement found in Eusebius that he was a very learned man.⁵ He composed a treatise called *Λογιῶν κυριακῶν ἐξίγησις*, of which nothing remains except the

Canon Jenkins against the genuineness of the Letters, and remarks "For impartial English scholars, the Ignatian question may, in my opinion, be regarded as finally settled." Mr. Owen's summary (Intro. pp. cx.—cxiii.), is however very clear but hardly conclusive.

1. *Muratorian Fragment*. It was revealed to St. Andrew that St. John should write his Gospel aided by the revision of his fellow disciples and bishops. See Westcott, *Canon*, pp. 211 ff.

2. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 'The Churches of the Lycus,' p. 45. Euseb. *H. E.* III. 30, 31 (3), quoting Clement of Alexandria and Polycrates; both these speak of Philip the Apostle, but seem rather to allude to the Philip of Acts vi. 2—5, viii. 5—13, 26—40 and xxi. 8, 9.

3. Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*, p. 46. *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, Art. v., 'Papias of Hierapolis.'

4. Iren., v. 33 § 4. Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστῆς Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος γεγονώς.

5. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 36, ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα διὰ μάλιστα λογιώτατος. These words are however in only four MSS. and are omitted by Rufinus. The weight of MS. authority is in favour of the omission of the words, which the piety of a later age might well insert. The fragments of Papias are given in Lightfoot and Harmer's *Apostolic Fathers*.

extracts given in some of the Fathers. But the quotations from his writings by Eusebius are of the highest value, since they contain the first mention of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark.¹ Papias tells us that he made it his object to gather all the oral tradition of the elders of the Church. He says that he continually enquired what was said by Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John or Matthew. He was repeatedly asking, "What do Aristion or the Presbyter John say?"² He was also accustomed to collect the traditions of the aged daughters of Philip. Like some others who have done good work in preserving oral traditions, Papias seems to have had great capacity of acquiring information combined with almost unlimited credulity. Eusebius calls him a man of a very small mind; and Irenaeus quotes a passage about the abundant plenty which the elect shall enjoy in the time of the Millennium, which helps to mitigate our regret that so large a portion of his writings is lost. But the very dullness of comprehension which makes Papias record the tradition of the vine with ten thousand clusters, on which those who shall dwell in Christ's kingdom on earth shall feed, makes him a valuable witness when he records the exact words of John the Presbyter on the subject of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. His words are as follows—

"The elder John used to say: 'Mark having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he remembered; though he did not record in order that which was done or said by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him; but subsequently, as I said, [attached himself to] Peter who used to frame his teaching to meet the [immediate] wants of his hearers; and not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses.' So Mark committed no error, as he wrote down some particulars just as he recalled them to mind. For he took heed to one thing, to omit none

1. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 39 (15).

2. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 39 (4). It is to be noticed that the past (*ἔπειρα*) is used when the Apostles are spoken of, but the present (*λέγουσιν*) of the presbyter John and Aristion.

of the facts that he heard, and to state nothing falsely in his narrative of them." He says of St. Matthew, "Matthew composed the oracles in Hebrew, and each one interpreted them as he was able."¹

Although St. Paul says that his disciple Epaphras² had a keen solicitude for the welfare of the church at Hierapolis, there is no allusion to his epistles in any of the extracts from Papias which have come down to us. On this account he is considered by some to have been a Jewish believer who disliked the Pauline form of Christianity. This view is disputed by Bp. Lightfoot,³ who shews that the name Papias was the designation of the Hierapolitan Zeus and therefore an unlikely one to be borne by a Jew, and also points out that Millenarian views were by no means confined to Jewish Christians, being held by Irenaeus, Tertullian,⁴ and most of the early Fathers. Nor can his silence as to the writings of St. Paul be alleged as an argument that Papias did not receive his teaching, since Eusebius quotes only a few sentences of his works. This historian, moreover, when writing about the canon of the New Testament only cites what the Fathers say about disputed books. For instance, in speaking of Irenaeus, Eusebius says that he used 1 John and 1 Peter, and accepted the *Shepherd* of Hermas, but he says nothing of his use of the Acts or of the writings of St. Paul. Hence a modern critic might be tempted to set him down as an Ebionite anti-Pauline writer, but for the fact that in his extant writings he quotes St. Paul more than two hundred times.⁵ But even if we grant that Papias was the head of a Judaeo-Christian community, the Tübingen theory cannot be sustained in the case of a bishop who was a friend of Polycarp and against whose orthodoxy Eusebius, who disliked his Millenarian views, has not a word to say.

1. Euseb., *H. E.* III. 39. See Westcott, *Hist. of the Canon*, p. 71 ff. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, Art. v., 'Papias of Hierapolis.' Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. I., p. 52, vol. II., p. 39.

2. Colossians, iv. 12, 13.

3. *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, Art. v., 'Papias of Hierapolis.'

4. Bp. Lightfoot (*loc. cit.*) quotes Iren., *Haer.* v. 31; Tert., *Adv. Marc.* III. 24; *de Res. Carn.* 24.

5. Salmon, *Introd. to the New Test.*, p. 105.

Polycarp. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, is one of the most important of the hearers of the Apostles. His influence was by no means confined to a single church or even to a single province. To him the eyes of Christians throughout the world, about the middle of the second century, were turned. When he visited Rome he was regarded with the utmost reverence by bishop and faithful alike. In Gaul Polycarp's disciple Irenaeus related his master's sayings to his disciples, and was the more revered by his flock because he had been the disciple of the great bishop of Smyrna. The martyrdom of Polycarp crowned the immense influence exercised by him. It was regarded as a matter not of local but of universal interest. The church of Smyrna addressed their letter, describing the sufferings of the saint, specially to the church at Philomelium, but also to all 'parishes' of the Catholic Church.¹

Nor can we be surprised at this being the case, despite the fact that neither Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians nor the sayings which Irenaeus has recorded of him give us any great idea of his intellectual power. His great age made him a link between the Apostles and the men whose work continued into the third century. During the later years of his life Gnostic speculation had become very active, and many things unknown to the faith of ordinary Christians were declared to be derived from the secret traditions of the Apostles. In the face of such pretensions, it was natural that great value attached to the genuine tradition of Apostolic doctrine.²

Polycarp and St. John. St. John, we are told by Irenaeus, survived till the reign of Trajan, A.D. 100.³ According to Clement of Alexandria, the Apostle, after his return from Patmos, went to Ephesus and gathered disciples about him. He seems to have organized the churches of Asia by providing them with

1. Euseb., *H. E.* IV. 15. Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Σμύρναν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ παροικοῦσῃ ἐν Φιλομηλίῳ, καὶ πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίαις.

2. *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, Art. 'Polycarpus', by Dr. Salmon.

3. Iren., *Haer.* III. 3, 4, μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων.

bishops, one of whom is said to have been Polycarp.¹ But, according to Irenaeus, St. John was not the only eye-witness of our Lord's life from whom Polycarp had received instruction. "He had" in the words of Irenaeus "been trained by the Apostles and had conversed with many who had seen Christ,"² and it is a noteworthy fact that his letter to the Philippians recalls the language of St. Peter rather than that of St. John. If Polycarp was the son of Christian parents he must have been born as early as A.D. 69, according to Bp. Lightfoot's reckoning of the date of his martyrdom (A.D. 155—6).

In the next glimpse we have of this Polycarp and Irenaeus. Father we see him following in the steps of his master and instructing disciples in the traditions of the Apostles. Irenaeus in a letter to Florinus, a fellow disciple of his who had embraced Gnostic opinions, reminds him how Polycarp "would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord and about His miracles and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate it altogether in accordance with the Scriptures."³ This well remembered intercourse with Polycarp⁴ makes the evidence of Irenaeus on the subject of St. John's Gospel of the highest value in determining its authenticity.

At the very close of his life, about Polycarp at Rome. A.D. 154, Polycarp undertook a visit to Rome to discuss with Anicetus the day on which the Christian Passover ought to be celebrated. Polycarp considered that it should always be celebrated

1. Clem. Alex., *Quis dives Salvo*. 42, quoted by Bp. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II., vol. i., p. 424. Tertullian (*de Praeser. Haer.* 32) says that Polycarp was ordained by St. John. In the *Chronicon Paschale* it is said that St. John committed the charge of the robber, who had apostatised and been restored by the Apostle, to the bishop of Smyrna. Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*

2. Iren., *Haer.* III. 3.

3. Quoted by Euseb., *H. E.* v. 20. Transl. of letters in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. i., p. 429.

4. Irenaeus (Euseb., *loc. cit.*) says, "I distinctly remember (διαμνημονέω) that time better than events of recent occurrence."

on the 14th Nisan without respect to the day of the week, and pleaded the practice of St. John. Anicetus held that the festival should always be held on a Sunday. Neither bishop was ready to yield his opinion, nor to allow the difference between them to interrupt their Christian union, and Anicetus allowed Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist in his place.¹ While at Rome Polycarp is said to have converted many heretics by proclaiming the true Evangelical doctrine. He also encountered the heresiarch Marcion, and in reply to his question "Knowest thou me?" said "I know thee the first-born of Satan."² The Martyrdom of Polycarp marks the close of an epoch in Church history. With him the last of the Apostolic age had passed away.

1. This incident is related in Irenaeus' letter to Victor, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 24.

2. Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 14.

CHAPTER VII.

ORIGIN AND PRINCIPLES OF GnosticISM.

The Sources of GnosticisM. THE Gnostic sects were the result of the contact of Christian principles with the current ideas of the first century; and every Gnostic system was an attempt to blend Christianity with the theosophical speculations of the age. In a sense, however, Gnosticism is more ancient than the Church, being a philosophy of religion which seeks in the end to explain every cultus. Not only had Hellenism undergone a treatment similar to that to which the Gnostics subjected the Faith, but Judaism had, before the appearance of Christianity, been likewise transformed by external influences. The great test to which primitive Christianity was exposed from the outside world was not so much the danger of succumbing to persecution, as of losing itself in the popular philosophies of the heathen and Jewish world. In the critical period of the first half of the second century, the subject for investigation is how the Christian religion escaped being one of the many forgotten creeds of the Early Roman Empire, and emerged in a definite and permanent form. To pursue this it is necessary to understand the nature of the danger it encountered.

The speculative philosophy of the East has always had a fascination for the practically minded West, and it exercises periodically a dominating influence. Alexander the Great's conquests of the Eastern empires brought the victorious Greeks under the sway of Oriental ideas, and henceforward these obtained an increasing domination over European thought. The nation whose work it was to act as the intermediary between Europe and Asia was the Jewish, which had (by its captivity to Babylon

and contact with Persia) become well fitted for the task five centuries before the appearance of the Christian religion. The ancient religion of the Hebrews, a singularly practical and unspeculative cultus in itself, became transformed into a creed full of mystical doctrines of angels and spirits, of hierarchies of heavenly beings and unseen worlds, by the influence of the religion of the Persian conquerors of the polytheists of Babylonia.

The doctrine of Zoroaster, the great religious teacher of Persia, is found in the *Zendavesta*—literally the Text-and-comment—which is a work of eight books, written at different periods, the earliest of which has been assigned to B.C. 1200—1000.¹ It tells us that from Zarvana Akarana or Boundless Time two antagonistic principles emanated,—Ormuzd (Ahuramazda) the eternal Word of the Father, and his younger brother Ahriman. Between these a contest soon began by each principle putting forth emanations: first Ormuzd after creating the pure world by his Word put forth the six Amshaspands, of which he himself was the seventh. These were of both sexes, and produced in turn the twenty-eight Izeds, from whom came forth an indefinite number of Frarashis or ideas; and afterwards his brother Ahriman, who for his pride and jealousy of Ormuzd had been condemned by the Supreme Being to sojourn in darkness for twelve hundred years, put forth three series of evil spirits or Devs to oppose his rival. In the contest with Ahriman the Word of Ormuzd, who is also called the *Life* or the *Bull*, was destroyed, but out of its scattered fragments Ormuzd made man and woman, whom he placed in the world which he and the good spirits had created. Ahriman, however, seduced the woman by a bribe of fruits and milk, and filled the world with noxious things. The *Zendavesta* predicts that in the days when evil seems triumphant, three

1. It is a disputed point whether Zoroaster was a monotheist or a dualist. Beausobre in his *History of Manicheism* says, "Zoroastre n'a reconnu qu'un seul Dieu, Créateur immédiat du Monde des Esprits, mais Créateur médiat.....du Monde inférieur, qui est notre globe terrestre." Harvey, *Ignatius*, Prelim. Obs., p. xv.

prophets shall arise, one of whom, called Saoshyant, shall restore all things to their original purity.¹ It is impossible not to be struck by the resemblance of some of the teaching of the Zendavesta to that of the Hebrew Scripture, nor to avoid acknowledging the great debt which Jewish theology after the Captivity owes to Persian teaching. The influence of the Zendavesta will be most clearly seen in the Kabbalistic literature of the Hebrews, and in the greatest of all the Gnostic heresies—that of Manes.

The theosophy of the Jews is found in the Kabbala, consisting in its present form of the Book of Yetsirah (or Creation) and the Book of Zohar (Brightness). Tradition assigns the composition of the Kabbala to the angels at the time of the fall of man; more moderate admirers of the work ascribe it to Rabbi Akiba and Rabbi Simon ben Jochai (A.D. 100—200); whilst according to the sober fact it was compiled as late as A.D. 1300, by Moses da Leon. But though the Kabbala, in its present form, may be a late work, the theories it propounds are ancient, some being undoubtedly earlier than the appearance of Christianity. The Zendavesta is closely followed in the language of the Kabbalists, the doctrine of both being reproduced in the teaching of several Gnostic sects.²

The system of the Kabbala is shortly as follows:—God is Boundless Time and is called En-Soph. He can only be described as non-existent, but the ten Sephiroth emanate from him. These taken together form the Adam Kadmon or Primal Man. They are divided into three Triads; those on the right being male, in the centre copulative, and on the left female.³ United they form

1. King's *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 29. See my article 'The Jews and Persia', *Interpreter*, April, 1907. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 122.

2. Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biography*, Art. 'Cabbalah', by Dr. Ginsburg. King, *The Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 33.

	<i>Right hand.</i>	<i>Centre.</i>	<i>Left hand.</i>	
	MALE.	COPULATIVE.	FEMALE.	
THE HEAD	Wisdom	The Crown	Intelligence	Intellectual πνεῦμα
THE BODY	Mercy	Beauty	Justice	Sensuous ψυχή
THE FEET	Firmness	Foundation	Splendour	Material σάρξ

the tenth Sefhirah, which is styled Kingdom. From the Sefhiroth proceed the four worlds, each of which is a reproduction of the other. The first—Aziluth—is inhabited by immaterial beings. The second—the world of Creation—is ruled by Metatron, the highest being man may know, under whom are the angelic hosts who occupy the third world of Formation. In the lowest world are the Devils under Samael. Man is formed on the model of the Adam Kadmon and has three souls borrowed from the three worlds, the N'shamah (נשמה), the Ruach (רוח), the Nephesh (נפש) or life.¹ He was clothed in skin because of his transgression, but he must eventually be redeemed from the bondage of the flesh. The Law, like man, was originally perfect and spiritual, but it has been clothed in the garment of narrative. To extract its true meaning it is necessary to observe a number of hermeneutic rules and especially to discover the numerical value of the letters of each word.

Essenes. There seem to be two distinct views of the Essenes,² by whom Kabbalistic theories were given a practical form; as some writers hold that they were merely scrupulous observers of the Law who withdrew from the world to practise asceticism in seclusion; whilst others consider that their rigid austerity, especially as regards the prohibition of marriage, their custom of turning to the Sun at their worship, and above all their magical practices, and the oath they imposed upon their neophytes not to reveal the names of the angels, are proofs that they were not orthodox Jews, but mystics, who derived many of their tenets from Oriental sources. In confirmation of the latter view it may be added that they did not offer sacrifices in the Temple; this shrinking from taking animal life being eminently characteristic of Oriental philosophy. Their communities are described by Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the

1. In King's *Gnostics and their Remains*, four 'worlds' are mentioned and a fourfold division of the human soul. The highest of the four is Aziluth, from which man gets the Chaiah or principle of spiritual life.

2. For references to the really important contemporary sources of information respecting the Essenes, see Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 83, note 1.

Elder, but there is considerable doubt as to their tenets. There were four grades or orders among them, and the candidates had to pass through a rigid probation.¹ Strangely enough they do not seem to be mentioned in the Talmud: Bp. Lightfoot in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians rejects all passages which are said to allude to this sect.

Buddhism. The doctrines of Buddhism were promulgated in India in the sixth century before Christ, by Sakya-Muni, also called Gautama. It is a philosophy rather than a religion, distinguished by the lofty morality, the sublime self-sacrifice inculcated by its teachers, its rigid asceticism, its view that the highest end is the peace of Nirvana, or freedom from all desire to exist, and its practical denial of the existence of a personal God. Though Buddhism has never established itself in Europe, it made its influence felt in the Christian Church by means of Gnosticism, especially at Alexandria.²

Greek thought came into contact first with Egyptian and later with Indian ideas at Alexandria. It has been maintained that Egypt was the ultimate source of all Greek philosophy, and certainly the religion of that ancient land was fundamentally Gnostic in character. Here was a polytheism so gross and a religion so materialistic that the superstition of Egypt became a by-word, side by side with a philosophic creed held by the priests, so profound that it has been said "we find the best and wisest of the Greeks ever reverting to Egypt as the fountain head of religion and knowledge".³ Herein lies the very essence of Gnosticism—an aristocracy of enlightenment explaining a popular creed. Greek, Jewish, and Christian beliefs experienced at Alexandria the same treatment as the old Egyptian

1. Graetz mentions three probationary degrees. He alludes to the ceremony of initiation: "The new member was admitted with great solemnity, and presented with the white garment, the apron, and the shovel, the symbols of Essenism." *History of the Jews*, vol. II., p. 31, Eng. Trans. Our Lord has been supposed to have been an Essene. For this view see Schweitzer, *Quest. of Historic Jesus*, ch. iv.

2. For Buddhism, see *Buddhism* by T. W. Rhys Davids, London, S.P.C.K., 1882; Bp. Coplestone, *Buddhism*.

3. Harvey, *Irenaeus*, Prel. Obs., p. xxvii.

myths had received at Memphis or On. The plain sense of Homer as well as that of the Old and New Testaments was said to conceal a hidden meaning of spiritual truths veiled in allegory. This method of exposition found equal favour with all three schools, and Judaism in Philo produced in the days of the Apostles a Gnostic untinged by Christianity.¹ For unrestrained allegory is essentially gnostic in its contempt for realities. As to an Alexandrian the facts of Homer's narrative and of the history of Abraham were equally unimportant compared with the truths they were supposed to inculcate, so by the Gnostic of later times the circumstances of our Lord's life were disregarded, and their symbolic meaning alone considered of importance. The reality of the Divine Life on earth began to vanish, and in its place a phantom Teacher instructed mankind about the Aeons and heavenly powers. Thus arose those Docetic errors against which the Fathers of the Church rightly contended with such earnestness.

Underlying Principles.

If we enquire what principles underlie all Gnostic systems, we shall find a sufficient answer in a single sentence of Eusebius in which he speaks of the question much discussed among heretics, 'Whence comes evil?'² The question of the origin of evil occupied the mind of mankind, and Gnosticism sought to present the solution. The answer was not supplied by the Greek philosophers, who had not allowed themselves to perplex their minds with the problem, usually preferring to dwell on the less gloomy side of life. Far otherwise was it with Orientals, to whom the existence of evil was a question of all-absorbing interest. Indians and Persians had meditated thereon, and had decided by universal agreement that everything that was material, or that could be perceived by the natural senses of man, partook of the nature of evil. Matter being evil, the conclusions

1. Of Judaism among the Hellenistic Jews Harnack says, "The Jewish religion here appears transformed into an universal human ethic and monotheistic cosmogony." *History of Dogma*, Eng. Transl., p. 107.

2. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 27, *περὶ τοῦ πολυθρηλήτου παρὰ τοῖς αἰρεσιώταις ζητήματος, τοῦ 'πῶθεν ἡ κακία'.*

drawn from the examination of the errors condemned by the Apostolic age follow.

1. A higher knowledge than is possessed by ordinary men is necessarily required to apprehend that which is super-sensuous. This was recognised as a truth by the Christian teachers, and by none more clearly than by St. Paul, who in the First Epistle to the Corinthians speaks of the impossibility of the natural man (*ψυχικός*) understanding spiritual things (*πνευματικά*)¹. But whilst the Christian sought this spiritual perception from God, the Gnostics as a rule believed it to be the exclusive possession of those higher natures who were born capable of enjoying the benefit of more perfect instruction. The *γνώσις* in the eyes of the latter was the possession of a favoured few, who alone were capable of emancipation from the restraining influences of material existence.²

2. If the material of which this world consists is essentially evil, it is evident that it cannot be the creation of the supreme God. It is also obvious that the union between God and the world cannot possibly be a direct one, but must be through the medium of agencies the lowest of which approaches most nearly to material existence. The Gnostic therefore held that the Creator of this world was by his very nature inferior to the true God.

3. The worship of angels is a natural consequence of the foregoing. Man cannot understand one who is separated from his world by so vast a gulf as the perfect God. We can only approach Him through a multitude of beings which form part of a vast chain of emanations uniting the finite to the infinite.

4. If we acknowledge that matter is inherently evil we cannot admit the doctrine of the Incarnation. Christ, the highest emanation from the Father, cannot have soiled Himself by taking a material body. If man did behold Him on earth it was by some delusion, since He could have taken no real human form.

1. 1 Cor. ii. 14.

2. Döbschutz, *Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 254. "Gnosticism is, in the first place, intellectualism, one-sided over-valuation of knowledge at the expense of moral activity."

5. Matter being evil, the body must be evil, and consequently the duty of the true Gnostic was to shew himself hostile to it. Two courses lay open to him; either to conquer its desires by ascetic practices, or to adopt the alternative of shewing that he considered the body to be so contemptible that he saw no harm in degrading it by indulgence in every species of sin.¹

That some of these doctrines contain certain truths is undeniable, but a wrong light is thrown upon them all by the Gnostic teaching that matter is in itself inherently evil. Herein lies the inherent weakness of all Gnostic systems; they strike at the root of all morality, by denying that man in his state of material existence is responsible for his sins, which they assert are not the result of his free choice, but the inevitable consequences of the state in which he is placed. It is strange that a form of modern scepticism, starting from the opposite standpoint that matter is everything and spirit nothing, should have arrived by a different route at a perfectly similar conclusion.

In the days of the Apostles signs of incipient Gnosticism were not wanting, as is evidenced by St. Paul's epistle, written about A.D. 63, from Rome to the Colossian Church, which was threatened by a heresy, characterised by Bp. Lightfoot as "Christian Essenism, as distinguished from the Christian Pharisaism of the false teachers in Galatia". That the heresy at Colossae was Judaic in character is evident from such a passage as "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a feast day, or a new moon, or a sabbath";² and that it may contain many of the elements of Gnosticism may be seen—

(a) By the way in which St. Paul dwells on such

1. Irenaeus, *Heresies*, I, 1, 10 and 12, speaking of the Valentinians; Hippolytus, *Philosophumena* vi. 19, of Simon Magus. The 'elect' claimed the right to sin with impunity, since gold when plunged into mire loses not its beauty. Many Gnostics refused to see merit in martyrdom, and opposed the zeal, often excessive, for it sometimes found in the Church. Döbschutz, *Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 256.

2. Col. ii. 16.

words as wisdom (*σοφία*), understanding (*σύνεσις*), knowledge (*γνώσις* and *ἐπιγνώσις*), and by the implied condemnation of any intellectual exclusiveness in the words *νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ*.¹ Here the word *πᾶς* is four times repeated in order to exclude any idea of the Gospel lacking universality or completeness.

(b) By the condemnation of the worship of angels,² and the repeated assertion that Christ is above all heavenly thrones, lordships, powers, and authorities, and that the *pleroma* or fulness of divine perfection dwells in Him.³

(c) As the false teachers of Colossae laid great stress on asceticism, St. Paul warns the Colossians "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink"; and again, "Why do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, 'handle not, nor taste, nor touch'; which things have a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body?"⁴ &c. The Colossian heresy has consequently been pronounced to contain all the essential elements of a Gnostic system.⁵

The neighbouring city of Ephesus was a great stronghold of Apostolic Christianity, and it was there that the most insidious attacks on the Faith were made. The Epistle to the Ephesians, which bears a very strong resemblance to the Colossian letter, earnestly upholds the superiority of Christ to all the heavenly powers.⁶ St. Paul is

Heresies at
Ephesus.

1. Col. i. 28.

2. Col. ii. 18.

3. *θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι.* Col. i. 16, ii. 10, 15.

4. Col. ii. 16, 20—23.

5. Dr. Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 116—129) gives many reasons for rejecting the hypothesis that the so-called Colossian heresy was the result of a union of Essenism with Christianity. He compares the warnings to the Colossians with those given by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and (pp. 119, 120) argues that the words in Col. ii. 8—*τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης*—do not imply a Gnostic system, but simply ascetic Judaism. The leaders of the Jewish party at Colossae may have called their teaching *ἡ φιλοσοφία*. "This" to quote Dr. Hort "would be merely a fresh example of a widely spread tendency of that age to disarm Western prejudice against things Jewish by giving them a quasi Hellenic varnish." Cf. also Dr. Knight, *Ep. to Colossians*, pp. 27 ff., and Williams, *Colossians and Philemon*, xvii ff.

6. Ephesians i. 20—23.

evidently hinting at the prevalence of errors similar to those at Colossae; but this letter, being probably a circular epistle, does not attack the false doctrine so directly as its companion letter addressed to the church of Colossae. We see also from the Acts that St. Paul had been very apprehensive of the danger of heresy in Ephesus. The attempt made by Jewish exorcists like the sons of Sceva to form an alliance with the Christian teachers boded no good;¹ and at a later date St. Paul in his speech at Miletus says to the elders of the Ephesian church, "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things," &c.² That these forebodings were fulfilled is evident from the epistles to Timothy, who was left at Ephesus probably after St. Paul's liberation from his first Roman captivity. The errors, of which Timothy is warned to beware, are not unlike those at Colossae, but the Jewish element is even more prominent. The false teachers 'desire to be teachers of the Law';³ they share with the Essenes a dislike of marriage;⁴ like the Colossian heretics they command abstinence from meats. In the Epistle to Titus, which belongs to the same group as 1 Timothy, the myths of the heretics are expressly styled Jewish. The Gnostic element appears in the asceticism above noticed, and in the concluding words of 1 Timothy in which the Apostle speaks of "the oppositions of knowledge falsely so called".⁵ Without entering fully into the subject of the heresy condemned in the Pastoral Epistles, it may be well to call the attention of the reader to one feature which has no counterpart in the Colossian heresy. The first indications of the Docetic error, denying the reality of the incarnation of our Lord, appear to have induced St. Paul to assert plainly that Jesus Christ was manifest in the flesh.⁶ If we had nothing else to go upon but this passage, this statement might appear to be fanciful; but on turning to

1. Acts xix. 14.

2. Acts xx. 29—30.

3. 1 Tim. i. 7.

4. 1 Tim. iv. 3.

5. 1 Tim. vi. 20, ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως.

6. 1 Tim. iii. 16, ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. 11 Tim. ii. 8.

the Johannine literature, which also seems to have been produced at Ephesus, we find special stress laid on the fact that Jesus Christ came in the flesh.¹ It is possible that the assertion of Hymenaeus and Philetus, who said "that the resurrection is past already,"² was due to this belief in the inherent evil of matter, which made many shrink from the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection.³

Antinomianism. After the death of St. Paul, the false teachers appear to have pushed their doctrines to the most fatal of all conclusions adopted by the Gnostics. We have seen how an undue regard for *γνώσις*, as contrasted with the great Christian virtues, led to serious misapprehension, and how a false ideal of life had been developed owing to the asceticism enforced on aspirants to the higher knowledge. We have seen how the cardinal doctrines of the Faith were tampered with, and the reality of the Incarnation denied; but, though we may condemn the errors of the false teachers, their lives seem at first to have been free from any moral stain. But experience shewed that the vigorous condemnation of Gnostic error was justified. Immorality began to be the distinguishing feature of some false teachers at the close of the apostolic age. The following passages are sufficiently explicit to shew that the heaviest charge against the heretics at this time was one of immorality. In II Peter we find them condemned in the following terms: "Among you also shall be false teachers who shall privily bring in destructive heresies (*αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείαις*), denying even the Master that bought them;.....and many shall follow their lascivious doings (*ταῖς ἀσελγείαις*), by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of;.....but chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the

1. John i. 14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. I John iv. 2. II John, 7.

2. II Tim. ii. 17, 18.

3. Dr. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 146, after discussing the alleged evidences of Gnostic error condemned in the Pastoral Epistles, pronounces against them. He admits however "that there are indications..... of some such abstinence in the matter of foods.....as at Colossae and Rome, with a probability that marriage would before long come likewise under a religious ban." See also Dr. Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. xlv ff.

lust of defilement, and despise dominion,.....men that count it pleasure to revel in the day-time, spots and blemishes, revelling in their love-feasts while they feast with you : having eyes full of an adulteress, and that cannot cease from sin (μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας),.....they entice in the lusts of the flesh by lasciviousness those who are just escaping from them that live in error."¹ A very similar passage occurs in St. Jude, but it is noticeable that, whereas St. Peter uses the future tense as though he were speaking prophetically, St. Jude has the present as though he witnessed the corrupt doings of the false teachers.² Whether the Apocalypse belongs to this or to an earlier period is undecided. It alludes not unfrequently to heresies of this type, and the false doctrines are compared to the teaching of Balaam who caused the children of Israel "to eat things offered to idols and to commit fornication". This is the only book in the New Testament which mentions the sect of heretics called Nicolaitans.³

It has been long perceived that the sects of Christian Gnostics are capable of classification under the different opinions of their teachers. We have already seen that on certain points they are all in agreement, but there are others on which the divergencies are considerable. The chief of these are, the character of the Demiurge or Creator, and the relation of the Jewish Law to the Christian dispensation. Mosheim adopts the first of these differences as the basis of his classification. He divides the Gnostics into Syrian and Alexandrian: the former, under the influence of Persia, regarding the Demiurge as an active principle of evil like Ahriman: the latter looking on matter as a passive but unwilling opponent of God, and the Demiurge as a being emanating from Him, and striving to bring the chaos of material existence into order.⁴ Gieseler adopts Mosheim's classification, but recognises a third class in Marcion and his followers,

Classification of Gnostic Sects.

1. II Peter ii. 1, 2, 10, 13, 14, 18.
 2. Jude, 8—13. See Mayor on II Peter and Jude, pp. clxvii ff.
 3. Apoc. ii. 2, 6, 9, 13—15, 20, iii. 4, 9. Swete, *Apocalypse*, p. lxxl.
 See also Döbschutz, *Life in the Primitive Church*, pp. 224, 251 ff.
 4. Mosheim, *Commentaries*, vol. I., sec. LXIV.

considering, no doubt, that his opposition to Judaism shews that this teacher belonged to a different school.¹ Neander² distinguishes between those who accepted and those who rejected the Jewish dispensation, and divides the Gnostic systems thus :

Gnostics connected with Judaism.	In conflict with Judaism, inclining to Paganism.	Regarding Christianity as completely new.
Cerinthus	Ophites	Marcion
Basilides	Cainites	
Valentinus	Carpocrates	

Baur adopted a threefold division ; the Heathen Gnostics, then the Marcionites or anti-Jewish Gnostics, and the Judaizers, who he considered tried to reconcile the two earlier tendencies.³

Bp. Westcott in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* shews that the Gnostics represented the four different types of Christian teachers that existed in New Testament times. He regards Cerinthus and the Ebionites as representing in an extreme form the Jewish sympathies of St. Matthew and St. James. The Docetae in their preference for the Gospel of St. Mark stand for examples of the extreme followers of the school of St. Peter ; Marcion's teaching shews the tendency of the Pauline doctrine pushed beyond its legitimate logical conclusion ; and Valentinus by his language proves himself to be imbued with the style but not the spirit of the Johannine literature.⁴

If it were possible accurately to fix the date of each teacher of the Gnosis, it might prove the best means of classification. It is possible to shew that, whereas the earliest Gnostic teachers hardly took any account whatever of Christianity and seemed unacquainted even with the history of Jesus, the later heretics, on the other hand, take the greatest interest in Christianity and shew an intimate acquaintance with its literature, history, and

1. Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. I., p. 81 foll. Eng. Trans. (Philadelphia and London, 1843.)

2. Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 39—41.

3. Baur, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 32—41.

4. Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, ch. iv., p. 240.

doctrines. Christianity thus gradually invaded the realms of the Gnosis, and after a long struggle subdued it to the service of the Church. The history of the Gnosis, from the profane attempt of a Simon Magus to use the power of Christ for magical purposes to the time when St. Clement of Alexandria conceived the idea of the true Christian Gnostic, is a record of the way in which the Gospel consecrated the attempts of mankind to find out God and led them to the knowledge of the Truth through Jesus Christ.

For it is impossible to regard the Gnostics either as mere impostors, or as hateful heretics who wilfully perverted the word of God. It appears even permissible to regard the Gnosticism of the second century rather as a precursor than a willing opponent of Christianity, and it is quite possible that through the defective systems of some of the teachers of the Gnosis many became Christians; as at a later time St. Augustine was a Manichæan before his baptism, and as in the middle ages many of the greatest Jewish Kabbalists entered the Church.

The Ophites. The Ophites, whose opinions were promulgated early in the second century, were according to Hippolytus the first to call themselves Gnostics.¹ We have two separate accounts of them, one by Hippolytus, the other by Irenæus. The name Ophites, derived from ὄφις 'a serpent', implies that they were worshippers of a serpent; and that this designation was not given by opponents is proved by the fact that they styled themselves Naaseni from the Hebrew נָחָשׁ (*Nachash*) a serpent. Their most striking tenet was that the serpent in the Old Testament, who beguiled Eve, was in reality a beneficent being, who raised mankind to the knowledge of good and evil. Hippolytus gives a long exposition of their views, taken from Ophite text-books which he had collected. In this, as is his wont, he labours to shew that the wisdom of the sect was borrowed entirely from the philosophers of Greece and the heathen mystics,

1. Hippolytus, v., c. 6. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 82.

astrologers, and magicians. He says "they make use of the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel according to the Egyptians," and he represents them as explaining that the myths of antiquity, such as the mutilation of Atys and the story of Isis and Osiris, foreshadowed their doctrines. They seem to have had a wide knowledge of both the Old and the New Testament, and many of their explanations are extremely ingenious; for example, they interpreted the passage in which St. Paul, speaking of the abominations of the Heathen world, says that they work unseemliness,¹ as referring to that heavenly sublime felicity "the absence of all form which is the real source of every form."

Although Hippolytus devotes a large portion of his work to a description of this form of Gnostic error, and goes on to speak of the kindred sects of the Peratae and Sethians, he does not give us any very definite explanation on the subject of the real opinions of the Ophites, and we must turn to Irenaeus to obtain further particulars.²

Carpocrates. Carpocrates was a Platonic philosopher at Alexandria. Like Marcion he was bitterly opposed to Judaism, and held that redemption could only be found in emancipation from the powers that ruled the material world. He taught that 'works' were indifferent, and were good or bad in human opinion only. His followers pushed his theories to the greatest length, and like the Ophites and Cainites completely reversed the notions of good and evil. This sect was active in Rome during the time of Irenaeus, who refutes their theories at great length.³

Basilides. Basilides, who is considered one of the best types of Egyptian Gnosticism, according to Hippolytus borrowed his system from Aristotle. This Father however hints at the truth when

1. Rom. i. 27, τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι.

2. Irenaeus, *Haeres.*, bk. 1., cc. 29—36. Irenaeus never calls the heretics described in these chapters Ophites, but Theodoret, who copies his description, gives them that title. See Smith and Wace's *Dict. Christian Biog.*, Article 'Ophites', by Dr. Salmon. For an account of the opinions of the Ophites, Basilides and Valentinus, see Appendix A.

3. *Haer.* 1., 93 ff.

he says, after describing the heretical opinions of Basilides, "These then are the things which Basilides fables, who taught in Egypt, and having learned the wisdom of the Egyptians brought forth such fruits as these."¹ It seems from this that Hippolytus also regards the theory of Basilides as an adaptation of the esoteric doctrine of the Egyptian priesthood, and in this he is probably more correct than when he asserts that Basilides plagiarised Aristotle.

From Basilides we are led naturally to Valentinus, another Egyptian Gnostic teacher, who may justly be termed the poet of Gnosticism.

Valentinus. Nothing can suggest more forcibly the deep gulf which divides the spirit of Christianity from that of Gnosticism, than the contrast between the bewildering intricacy of the system of Valentinus and the profound simplicity of the language of the Gospel of St. John, with which it has a seeming affinity. This complexity, however, was nevertheless the cause of the great popularity the doctrine of Valentinus enjoyed. It had the additional attraction of being eclectic, combining as it did a variety of Greek, Oriental, and Christian speculations.² It greatly resembles the system of Basilides, but is more elaborate, and the abstractions in the scheme of that teacher are personified by Valentinus. The main point to be noticed is the adoption of the Platonic teaching that the perfect patterns or ideas of the things we see exist in the spiritual world above.

The chief followers of Valentinus were, Secundus, Ptolemaeus, Marcus, Heracleon, Theodotus and Alexander. Bardesanes, the Syrian mystic, was his disciple.

Marcion of Sinope. The two remaining systems of Gnostic speculation are later in date than those previously mentioned, and differ from them in many respects. The questions which interested the earlier teachers are almost entirely ignored, and the Heathen elements of Gnostic thought fall into

1. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 70.

2. Irenaeus, *Haeres.*, bk. I. Hippolytus, vi., cc. 16—32. Mansel, *Gnostic Heretics*, Lect. XII.

the background. The doctrines of Marcion and his opponents, instead of being based on Greek or Oriental views, are taken professedly from Christian tradition and the Scriptures of the Church, and their object is to bring into prominence some particular aspect of Christian thought. Marcion¹ was a Christian by birth and education, the son of a bishop of Sinope, in Pontus, circ. 120 A.D. He came to Rome to propagate his opinions, and there became acquainted with a teacher like-minded with himself, one Cerdon a Syrian, who had, according to Irenaeus, taught in the imperial city during the pontificate of Hyginus (A.D. 139—142). He tried in vain to induce the clergy of Rome to receive him into communion, and upon their refusal, founded a separate church. The earlier Gnostics had, like Basilides and Valentinus, been mystics and transcendentalists; they had busied themselves with the solution of such inscrutable mysteries as the attributes of God, and His relation to the universe. Marcion on the other hand was of an eminently practical turn of mind, and manifested rather the characteristics of modern rationalists and sceptics than those of an ancient Gnostic. He set before himself certain practical problems for solution, and troubled himself but little with the mysteries of the invisible world.

Marcion's System. Marcion's difficulties may be summed up by saying that they consisted in the fact that (a) God, as portrayed in the Old Testament, is not, to all appearance, of the same nature as He, Whom Christ describes in the Gospel; and that (b) absolute justice is incompatible with perfect mercy.

(a) The first of these difficulties is stated by Marcion in a book called *Antitheseis* or 'Oppositions', written to shew that the Old Testament is in opposition to the New. It is curiously modern in tone. If we may judge from the arguments quoted from it by Tertullian,

1. Irenaeus, *Haeres.*, bk. I., c. 28 foll. Hippolytus, vii., cc. 17—18. Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, iv. 4. Epiphanius, *Praescrip.*, 30—42. Marcion presented a large sum of money to the Church of Rome, which was restored to him when he became a heretic. For the relation of Marcion to modern ideas, see my *Christian Difficulties in the Second and Twentieth Centuries*. Burkitt, *Gospel Transmission*.

it might have been issued by a sceptic of to-day. God, says Marcion, could not have been perfectly wise or perfectly good, or He would not have made man in His own image and then have allowed him to fall. His calling in the garden 'Adam, where art thou?' shews He did not know where Adam was. The command to Israel to spoil the Egyptians, and the choice of Saul, are acts unworthy of a perfect God. In short, Marcion collects all the passages of the Old Testament in which God seems to be represented unworthily, and draws as his conclusion that He Who inspired the Old Testament was not the true God. Marcion never said that the God of the Jews was an evil being. He recognised that the ruler of this world was actuated by just motives, but he accounted for the difficulties of the ancient Scriptures by asserting that the God therein described was limited in intelligence.

(b) The principle on which this Limited Intelligence¹ governed the world was one of strict and undeviating justice, of the kind which Aristotle contrasts with equity, and consequently he only regarded with favour those men who observed the just though imperfect law given to his chosen people. Those who had not attained to the righteousness which is by the Law lay under the displeasure of the God of this world, although they were no less capable of good than the so-called just persons.

It is easy to see in the foregoing a perversion of the teaching of St. Paul,² due doubtless to a desire to break

1. Mill, *Three Essays on Religion*. 'Theism,' Part v. (General Result.) "The indication given by such evidence as there is points to the creation, not, indeed, of the universe, but of the present order of it, by an Intelligent Mind, whose power over the materials was not absolute, whose love for his creatures was not his sole actuating inducement, but who, nevertheless, desired their good. The notion of a providential government by an Omnipotent Being for the good of his creatures must be entirely dismissed." The 'Intelligent Mind' of John Stuart Mill and Marcion's 'God of the Jews' are not entirely unlike.

2. "Marcion was the only Gentile Christian (of the first century and a half) who really understood Paul, and even he misunderstood him: the rest never got beyond the appropriation of particular Pauline sayings and exhibited no comprehension especially of the Theology of the Apostle." This remark of Harnack's (*History of Dogma*, English Translation, p. 89)

entirely from the Jewish ideas which influenced Christian theology. This is the more apparent when we examine Marcion's theory of redemption. His Gnostic tendencies exhibit themselves in his view that redemption is the imparting of a higher knowledge, a redemption not from sin but from ignorance. According to Marcion, Christ appeared suddenly—the record of His birth and infancy being purely fabulous—in the synagogue at Capernaum in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and proclaimed the true God. The God of this world, being angry, stirred up the Jews to crucify Him. Marcion taught that as Christ's appearance on earth was entirely unreal, He did not actually die, though His seeming sufferings had a purpose in teaching mankind to despise death and pain. After His Resurrection Christ taught the truth to the Demiurge, and to St. Paul, the only preacher of the genuine Gospel. Marcion admitted the doctrine of the descent into hell, but offered a very strange explanation of Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison, spoken of by St. Peter.¹ He held that those who, like Cain, Esau, and Saul, were condemned in the Old Testament, received Christ with joy, whilst those whom the God of this world had rewarded remained satisfied with the happiness of Abraham's bosom. Like other Gnostics, Marcion divided humanity into *spiritual*, *psychical*, and *carnal*, but unlike some of his predecessors he insisted upon the most rigid purity of life, and regarded martyrdom with at least as much reverence as the orthodox teachers of the Church. But Marcion has other claims on our attention: he is the first rationalistic critic, a forerunner of the modern school of 'higher criticism'. Unfortunately for his reputation, he yielded to the temptation, into which other critics have fallen, of pronouncing all passages which did not square with his theory to be either spurious or corrupt. As two-thirds of the New Testament was opposed to Marcion's doctrine, he rejected all except the writings of St. Luke and St. Paul. Of these he only accepted a mutilated edition of

is one which, even though we may disagree with it, we must recognise as weighty and significant. See also Cruttwell, *Early Christian Literature*.

1. 1 Peter iii. 19.

St. Luke's Gospel, which he subjected to a very thorough revision, and ten Epistles of St. Paul. It is a remarkable fact that Marcion refused to acknowledge the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, and that he declared that the letter to the Ephesians was addressed to the Laodiceans.¹ Dean Mansel quotes a few of Marcion's critical 'improvements', of which one example will suffice. The words, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail," become "It is easier for the heaven and earth and for the law and the prophets to fail, than for one tittle of the words of the Lord."² The Christology of Marcion, as has been observed by Neander, closely resembles that which was soon afterwards taught by the Patripassians, but rejected by the Church.³ It is not at all certain that his language does not imply that the supreme God Himself appeared on earth; and if this be so, Marcion in some degree forestalled the Patripassian doctrines of Noetus and Praxeas.

Bardaisan.

As Tertullian's five books against him testify, Marcion was considered by the early Fathers one of the most dangerous of the Gnostics. But one of his opponents, like him, fell under the imputation of heresy, though it is not easy to say exactly what his errors were. Bardaisan, or Bardesanes⁴ (A.D. 179), is mentioned by Eusebius as having been originally a disciple of Valentinus, whose teaching he abandoned for more orthodox opinions, without however completely freeing himself from the taint of heresy. Bardaisan was a Syrian, a native of Edessa, and his Dialogue on Fate is one of the most original products of the Syriac-speaking Church.⁵

Judaizing Gnosticism.

The tendency which was most opposed to Marcion's teaching is found in the so-called Clementine Literature and in the Book of Elkesai. Here again, modern criticism

1. Tertullian, *adv. Marc.*, v., cc. 11 and 21.

2. Mansel, *Gnostic Heretics*, p. 207. St. Luke xvi. 17.

3. Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 143—144.

4. For Bardaisan, the Syrian opponent of Marcion, see Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, Lect. v.

5. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 30. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, Lect. v.

trenches on the domain of ancient Gnosticism, for whilst some scholars, with Marcion, consider that St. Paul was the true founder of Christian doctrine, others hold that the actual meaning of what was taught by Christ is found in such teachers as St. James and the Judaizing party of the Church alone. It must be observed that whenever ultra-Judaic tendencies appear they have the effect of diminishing the dignity of the person of the Redeemer. This may be seen by a cursory examination of Judaizing Gnosticism from the time of Cerinthus, the contemporary of St. John, to the latter portion of the second century.¹

Cerinthus² seems to have held the usual

Gnostic theories of Creation, but he also taught that Jesus was a righteous man endowed with the Spirit of God. The Ebionites, further, considered that Jesus did not become the Christ till the Holy Spirit descended on Him at His baptism. The Ebionites professed to find this distinction between the man Jesus and the Æon Christ in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which bears somewhat the same relation to St. Matthew's, as Marcion's Gospel does to that according to St. Luke.³ We may see the same tendency of Judaic Christianity perverted by

The Clementine
Literature.

Gnostic ideas in the so-called Clementine writings. The two works ascribed to St. Clement of

1. For the question whether the Minim were Gnostics who had apostatised from Judaism see Friedländer, *Die vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus*. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, pp. 365 ff.

2. Irenaeus, *Haer.* i. 26. Hippolytus, VII. 21, x. 17.

3. Bethune Baker, *Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 63. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, Lect. 11. Justin (*Dial. c. Trypho*, 47, 48) speaks of some Christians who keep the Law and would enforce it on all, and of others, who though they observe the Law do not regard it as binding on all. Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* i. 22) is the first to call them Ebionaeans. He says they hold similar views to Cerinthus and Carpocrates, and regards them as heretics. Origen (*c. Celsum*, v. 61, 65) distinguishes two classes, and says they reject St. Paul. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* III. 27) also divides them into those who hold higher and lower conceptions of the person of Christ; both insisting on the observance of the Law, but differing on the subject of the Virgin Birth. Epiphanius (*adv. Haer.* xxix, xxx) names these two classes respectively Ebionaeans and Nazaraeans, but it is more probable that he is mistaken, and that Nazaraean is the local and Ebionaeans the ecclesiastical term for the Jewish Christians of Syria. They existed right up to the time of Jerome, who speaks of them as spread over the East (*Ep.* 112, 13).

Rome, the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions*, are Christian romances belonging to the last half of the second century, probably both of them being abridgements of a lost work known by some such title as 'The Travels of Peter', current early in the third century among the Elkesaites. Their importance lies in the fact that they are the basis of the theory that the Christian Church grew out of a compromise between Jewish and Gentile Christians, who had formerly been widely separated from one another. This view is set aside by Dean Mansel, who says of the *Homilies*, "In truth it is only a protest of one Gnostic school against another,—the Ebionite against the Marcionite,"¹ and a candid examination seems to shew that it is the really erroneous teaching of Marcion, and not the supposed heresy of St. Paul, that is combated. The Clementine writings are the protest of the extreme Jewish party against Paulinism as perverted by Marcion.

The Clementine *Homilies*, twenty in number, are probably of an earlier date than the *Recognitions*. Both works are composed with considerable literary skill; the scene is cast in the Apostolic age. St. Peter is made to dispute with Simon Magus, the father of heresy, and Clement, a noble Roman, is present to hear the discussions. St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, is represented as the Head of the Church, to whom St. Peter submits his doctrine. Although St. Paul is not obscurely alluded to under the name of Simon Magus, it is Marcion's errors which are condemned, especially his doctrine of the incompatibility of justice and mercy. The Gnosticism of the Clementine Literature is seen (a) in the Christology and (b) in the doctrine of *Syzygies*. Our Lord is represented as the eighth great teacher, only greater in degree than His seven predecessors,—Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses. The creation of the world is due to the expansion of the Monad into the Duad, *i.e.* God and His Wisdom. In this way successive pairs are multiplied, the first or male element being superior down to the time of the creation of man. After

1. Mansel, *Gnostic Heretics*, p. 229.

this the order is reversed, the second principle being the stronger and more true: thus Cain precedes Abel, false prophecy true prophecy, the Baptist the Christ, Simon's false doctrine Peter's true Gospel.¹

Results of Gnosticism in the Church. (a) The Canon. Although Gnosticism was one of the worst dangers to which early Christianity had been exposed, the contest had some salutary results on the development of the Faith. It is a noteworthy fact that the first commentator on a canonical Gospel, the first harmonist of the Evangelical narrative, and the first scholar to pronounce an opinion on the Canon, were not orthodox Christians but Gnostics. Heracleon, the Valentinian, wrote a commentary on St. John, to which Origen devotes much serious attention.² Tatian the Encratite, the friend of Justin Martyr, composed the famous Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels, the full text of which has now been discovered;³ while despite his erroneous conclusions, Marcion deserves the credit of having first attempted to define the Canon of the New Testament. The impulse to explain, define, and understand the writings of the New Testament was due to Gnosticism, and to the opposition it aroused. In the face of the numerous forgeries, which were multiplied in support of the various doctrines of the Gnostic sects,⁴ the Church found it necessary to declare what writings were accepted by her as sacred. The most venerated names were pressed into the service of the heretics, and the Church was bound to pronounce what books she received as Scripture and what she rejected. A good illustration of the effects of Gnosticism in this direction is the vagueness with which Justin Martyr in the middle of the

1. Mansel, *Gnostic Heretics*.

2. Brooke, *Fragments of Heracleon*.

3. For the Diatessaron of Tatian, see *Cambridge Texts and Studies*. Bethune Baker, *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 66. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 211. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, Art. Tatianus.

4. Some of the heretical books mentioned by Eusebius are—The Gospel of Peter, *H. E.* III. 3, condemned by Serapion, Bp. of Antioch, as heretical, VI. 12; the Gospels of Thomas and Matthias, and the Acts of Andrew and John, III. 25. Those mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment are, two Epistles to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians, forged in Paul's name to suit the heresy of Marcion.

second century speaks of the 'Memoirs' of the Apostles, and the care of Irenaeus to emphasise the fact that there can be only four Gospels.¹ Midway between Justin and Irenaeus we have the distinction drawn between canonical and heretical books in the well-known Muratorian Fragment.

(b) *The Idea of a Catholic Church.* In emphasising the necessity for unity, as well as for watchfulness against Docetic error, the Letters of Ignatius draw a comparison between the bishop in each congregation and Christ in the Catholic Church.² The standpoint of Christianity as opposed to Gnosticism was historical tradition. The churches in different places, founded by Apostles or Apostolic men, had preserved their teaching, whilst no Gnostic doctrine could boast unbroken descent from the public tradition of the Apostles of Christ. At most the sects claimed to possess a secret exposition of the Faith reserved only for the elect, and the existence of such was indignantly denied by the defenders of Apostolic doctrine. Of this the bishop was regarded as the custodian in every church, a view which contributed greatly to increase the influence of the episcopal order. We are actually given an instance of a Christian of enquiring mind visiting the different churches to see whether the Faith delivered by the Apostles was the same in every place. Hegesippus, writing in the middle of the second century, says that when he was at Rome he "composed a catalogue of bishops down to Anicetus" and adds that "in every

1. Irenaeus' famous words about the impossibility of there being more than four Gospels are found *Adv. Haer.* III. 11. The four cliques of the world, the four winds of heaven, the four faces of the Cherubim, all prove that the Word of God gave us the Gospel in a fourfold form (τετραμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον).

2. Since writing this paragraph I have read Dr. Harnack's significant words: "Gnosticism was the acute secularization (Verweltlichung) of Christianity, and it began as soon as Christianity came in contact with the Greek mind. At first it was not heretical simply because there were no standards by which to try it: the Canon was not yet formed; episcopacy was not yet established; both arose as safeguards against heresy." Harnack, *History of Dogma*, I., p. 162.

3. *Ep. to the Smyrnaeans*, c. 8, *Ἰουνοῦ ἀν φανῆ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὡς περ Ἰουνοῦ ἀν ἡ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.*

succession and in every city that is held which is preached by the Law and the Prophets and the Lord."¹

Writers against Gnostics: Justin Martyr, *circa* 100–165 A.D.; Justin Martyr is the earliest Catholic writer against Gnosticism. According to Eusebius this Father wrote a work against his contemporary, the heresiarch Marcion, in which he alludes to another book written by himself "against all the heresies that have existed."²

Irenaeus, *circa* 133–203 A.D.; Irenaeus possessed an incalculable advantage over his opponents in being the direct representative of the school of St. John. Though the heretical teachers declared that they taught the secret doctrine of the Apostles, none of them were able to prove that they were teaching the ancient belief of the Church. Irenaeus, on the contrary, at the close of the second century could trace his creed through Polycarp to St. John. To this advantage was added a knowledge of the various Gnostic systems. Irenaeus, who had lectured on heresiology at Rome, published his great work in five books between A.D. 182–188, when he was bishop of Lyons. He begins with a description of the teaching of a certain Ptolemaeus, a follower of Valentinus. After this he gives a summary of the uniform teaching of the Catholic Church, contrasting it with the diversity of the Gnostic doctrines. Irenaeus naturally attaches the highest importance to tradition, and cites that of Rome and Asia against the false traditions of his opponents. He lays much stress on the unity of the Old and New dispensations.³ Irenaeus' book was translated into Latin, probably before the end of the second century, as the Latin version was in the hands of Tertullian, the famous African opponent of Gnosticism.⁴

1. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 22. So Bishop Lightfoot; but the meaning of *γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδοχὴν ἐποιήσαμην μέχρις Ἀλικήτου* is not very certain. It may be "I remained at Rome, &c." and a reading *διατριβὴν* has been suggested by Valesius and adopted by Heinischen. (See the note in the Nicene and Post-Nicene series *in loco*.)

2. See Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 11 and 18, for lists of Justin's works. Fuller account of Justin Martyr will be found on p. 158.

3. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, pp. 240–261.

4. This however is disputed by Hort, who dates the Latin version

Tertullian tries, as is his wont, to treat the matter as a lawyer; his Prescription¹ against heretics being an attempt to shew that the heretics have no case. He brings six arguments forward to prove his point: 1. Perverse disputings are forbidden by St. Paul. 2. Heretics either resist or corrupt the Scriptures. 3. The Faith was committed by the Apostles to their successors. 4. The truth of the Catholic Faith is proved (a) by its unity, (b) by its antiquity. 5. No heretics have a line of bishops going back to the Apostolic age. 6. The earliest heretics were condemned by the Apostles.

It will be seen that Tertullian's method is more suited to win a verdict in court than to convince the mind of an enquirer, and this is especially manifest in his treatment of Scripture. "Irenaeus," says Dean Mansel, "while insisting on the Church's rule of faith expresses his conviction that this rule may be obtained by the sound independent exposition of Holy Writ, as well as by tradition." According to Tertullian, Scripture is the property of the Church alone, and heretics are incapable of explaining it at all. At the same time Tertullian never asserts that the Church has an authoritative tradition differing from Scripture.²

as late as the fourth century. The most important book of Irenaeus is the third, in which he states the case for the Church. See especially c. 3 on Apostolic tradition, c. 11 on the number of the Gospels, c. 14 where the idea that the Apostles taught a *Disciplina Arcani* is scouted.

1. *Praescriptio* in its legal sense meant "a clause prefixed to the 'intentio' of a 'formula', for the purpose of limiting the scope of an enquiry (excluding points which would otherwise have been left open for discussion before the 'judex'), and at the time when Tertullian wrote it was used only of the plaintiff." Bethune Baker, *Hist. of Chris. Doctrine*, p. 57, note 3. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 251.

2. Mansel, *Ibid.*, p. 253; this author refers to Iren., II., c. 27, §§ 1, 2; c. 28, § 1. Dr. Hort in his six Lectures on the Ante-Nicene Fathers calls Tertullian's *de Praescriptione Haereticorum*, not without justice, "a most plausible and mischievous book," but its historical value is rather increased than lessened by the defective taste and argument of the author, as it appears to me to give a just idea of popular prejudice against heresy in the Church at the close of the second century. The reply to the argument of the heretics from the words "Seek and ye shall find" is so framed as to preclude all further enquiry. (cc. 8—11.) All philosophy is said to be evil: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" (c. 7.) Heretics are not to

The *Philosophumena* or Refutation of Hippolytus, *fl. circa 220 A.D.*; all the Heresies, once ascribed to Origen, is now attributed to the great Roman scholar Hippolytus, who, though a zealous defender of the doctrine of the Church, like Tertullian seems to have been unable to agree with Catholic practice.¹ This Father bases his work on Irenaeus and displays great erudition in shewing that the Gnostic systems are mere *rechauffés* of pagan philosophy without even the merit of originality. But in the age of Hippolytus (A.D. 220) the great effort of Gnosticism had been made, and the tide had begun to ebb.

Though Clement flourished a little before Hippolytus, his name is placed last on the list of Christian champions against Gnosticism, because to him and to his School we owe the phrase which gave it a death-blow. The weakness of the Catholic position lay in the neglect of philosophy, which in the ancient world was regarded much in the same way as we look upon scientific research. The Gnostic, on the other hand, tried to reconcile Christianity and philosophy, and endeavoured thereby to provide a religion for educated men. Clement and the Alexandrians boldly assumed the appellation of Gnostics, and professed to teach the true Christian Gnosis in opposition to the false. They based their knowledge on faith, and held that belief, instead of being (as the false Gnostics maintained) the virtue of the ignorant, was the means by which mankind arrived at the true knowledge. Clement in support of his position quotes the Septuagint² "Except ye believe ye

be admitted to any discussion out of the Scriptures. (c. 15.) The notes of a true Church are however "brotherhood and the bond (contesseratio) of hospitality". (c. 20.) The fact that the Faith is one in so many churches is a strong argument for its original unity. (c. 28.) The heretical sects have no order or discipline—"The majority of them have not even churches." A man who is a bishop one day may be a deacon the next. (cc. 41, 42.) The treatise is characterised by the usual impetuosity of this violent writer, relieved by some vigorous appeals to common sense and to the religious instinct of mankind.

1. Hippolytus' position in the Church is discussed at length below in Chap. XI.

2. Isa. vii. 9 (LXX), *ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσητε οὐδὲ μὴ συνήτε.*

shall in no wise understand." He bases his antagonism to the pretended Gnostics (1) on their denial of man's free will and consequent perversion of the moral relation of man to God, (2) on their condemnation of the material creation, resulting in hostility to marriage whereby man is multiplied.¹ In order to illustrate his theory, Clement, in his *Stromateis*, sketches the ideal Christian Gnostic; the wise man enriched with knowledge, yet established in the Faith. This did much to break the spell of Gnosticism, for when the Church threw open her doors to men of learning, the attractions of error gradually lost their power. That so formidable an enemy as Gnosticism should have been repulsed, is no small testimony to the latent vigour of early Catholic Christianity.²

**Manichæan
Heresy.**

The Gnosticism of the first two centuries of our era did not aim at being other than a secret creed held by the more enlightened members of the Church. The Gnostic teachers desired no more than to instruct a few privileged persons in their esoteric doctrines. Towards the close of the third century, however, a new Gnosticism, or more correctly a new religion, arose in the doctrine of Manes.³ There are two narratives of the origin of the Manichæan religion—the Christian, and the Persian. The former has come to us in an account of a disputation between Manes and Archelaus, bishop of Caschar in Mesopotamia. The date of the document is A.D. 320; it was written in Syriac, and is preserved in a very corrupt Latin version. It relates how Scythianus, a Saracen merchant in the age of the Apostles, devoted his latter days to study, and left a disciple called Terebinthus, who took the name of Buddas Terebinthus, settled at Babylon, professed to have been born of a virgin, and embodied the doctrine he had learned from

1. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, Lect. xv.

2. For Clement of Alexandria, consult Prof. Bigg's *Bampton Lectures*, 'The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.' See also Fisher, *Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, p. 94.

3. Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 31) derives the name Manes from *μαλόμενος* and speaks of him in his short notice as a "madman named from the demoniacal heresy." See note *in loco* in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.

Scythianus in four books, which came into the possession of a freed slave called Cubricus. Cubricus took the name of Manes (the vessel),¹ and taught the new religion in Persia. As he failed to heal the king's son he was imprisoned, but escaped. He then studied the Scriptures, and disseminated his views among the Christians. At last he was seized by the Persian king and flayed alive. The Persian documents of the eighth or ninth century tell a different tale, which is considered to be more probable than the Christian narrative. They relate that Manes, a member of a Persian family, had been carefully trained by his father, Fatak, in the principles of the Mandaean or Elkesaite sect of Ebionite Gnostics. He appeared at the court of Shahpoor I., in A.D. 242, but his doctrine met with no favour, so he left the Persian dominions and spent thirty years in missionary work. He returned at the end of Shahpoor's reign, about A.D. 272, and won the support of Hormuzd the king's brother and successor. Bahran (Varanes), who reigned after Hormuzd, had him flayed alive as a heretic. (A.D. 276.)

The Manichaean system is pure dualism. In its Eastern form it approximates to Parseeism, in its Western to Christianity. It teaches that there is a realm of darkness and a realm of light. Satan, the lord of the former, invaded the latter. The First Man was created to repel Satan, but was defeated by him and his angels. The Living Spirit delivered him and vanquished the daemons. But in the warfare a portion of light had been absorbed by matter. This is the *Jesus patibilis*, the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐμπαθῆς*, or Soul of the World. Out of the remnants of the light, which he had saved, the Living Spirit made the Sun and Moon, and settled the First Man, the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀπαθῆς*, in them. The work of these luminaries is to free the *Jesus patibilis* from Matter. The twelve signs of the Zodiac form a wheel with twelve buckets to collect the imprisoned light and to empty it into the new Moon, who in her turn pours the light she has received into the Sun. Satan, to prevent the escape of the light, made Adam

1. King, *Gnostic Gems*, p. 42.

and Eve, whom he tempted to sin in order to imprison the luminous particles more closely in the material world. To assist in their liberation the *Jesus impatibilis* descended to earth in human form to instruct mankind as to the means of redemption. These doctrines were naturally bound up with the practice of asceticism. The slaughter of animals was forbidden to all: the more advanced disciples were not allowed to injure either plant or animal life; and to the highest order all carnal intercourse, and indeed all sensual pleasure, was entirely interdicted. The souls of those who observed all these precepts were at death instantly liberated from the material world. In the case of the rest of mankind purification was needed by transmigration into plants, animals, or men. Manes gave himself out to be the Paraclete, and did not accept the Old Testament, or any of the New except the teaching of St. Paul. The Manichaean church was most carefully organized. There was a sort of Pope or Imaun residing at Babylon, twelve *magistri*, seventy-two bishops, priests, deacons, elect, and hearers. The hearers ministered to the elect, who were not permitted to destroy even vegetable life.¹

The heresy spread with extraordinary rapidity in spite of the fear and detestation it inspired among Pagans, Christians, and Magians. The Magians in Persia did all in their power to destroy it by persecution. Diocletian (A.D. 284—305), or his successors in 308,² ordered the proconsul of Africa to burn the leaders of the sect. Almost all of the Christian emperors passed laws against the Manichaeans. Yet the system possessed great attractions: that Augustine was at one time a hearer is well known.³ The Paulicians, so formidable in Bulgaria in the eighth and ninth centuries, the Children of the Sun in the tenth, the Euchites and Bogomili in the eleventh

1. I have taken my account of the Manichaean system from Kurtz, *Church History*, vol. 1., § 29. King's *Gnostics and their Remains* should be consulted, and a most suggestive account of the attitude of the Manichaeans towards Christianity is found in Mozley's *Lectures on the Old Testament*. See also Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. 11.; Rawlinson, *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*, ch. iv. For an account of the Oriental lives of Manes, *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, Art. 'Manes', vol. III., p. 793b.

2. Dr. Mason in his *Persecution of Diocletian* places the Manichaean edict after the abdication of Diocletian, A.D. 305.

3. For Augustine and the Manichaeans see Chap. XIX.

and twelfth centuries, attest the vitality of dualism in the Eastern empire. In Western mediaeval Europe the name of Manichee was full of nameless terror, the accusation of Manichaeism being the most serious that could be made. The fear and hatred which teaching akin to that of Manes inspired provoked the war against the Albigenses,¹ and was the means employed to bring discredit upon the Knights Templars in the early part of the fourteenth century.² Yet the very bitterest opponents of the system were in a measure tainted by its influence, and it is a matter for consideration how far the practice of monastic asceticism, and the doctrine of predestination—which divides men into two classes, the one born to salvation, the other to damnation—are due to the teaching, not of the Apostles, but of the heretic Manes.

1. Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christianity*, vol. v., p. 392 foll.
2. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 401.



CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES.

THE struggle with Gnosticism resulted in the beginning of scientific Theology within the Church. The age of witnessing Christianity was succeeded by a period of investigation. The facts of the Gospel history no longer sufficed, and it became necessary to formulate the principles which underlay them. The attempts of the Gnostics to explain Christianity in accordance with the ideas of Greek philosophy or Oriental theosophy forced the orthodox doctors of the Church to define their belief with care and precision. At first, however, we cannot fail to notice that accurate theological definitions were extremely rare. The time for drawing up formal creeds stating the exact limits of belief was still distant, and great freedom of expression was permitted to the Christian theologians. The creed of the Church was very simple, professing no more than a belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.¹ As a natural consequence there arose a certain confusion of thought as to the relation of the three Persons of the Trinity to one another. In addition to this, the close of the second and the first fifty years of the third century were characterised by great intellectual freedom. Philosophy had made men very tolerant in matters of opinion, and the Church allowed great liberty in the exercise of the mind upon the highest problems of religion. It is impossible not to admire the breadth of Christian liberality,

1. For early baptismal creeds see Hahn, *Symbolik*, p. 19, who refers his readers to Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 106.

which allowed such thinkers as Origen full scope for the most daring flights of speculation, and warmly acknowledged that the truths declared by the philosophers of antiquity were taught by the Wisdom of God.

Such being the character of the second and third centuries, we shall look in vain if we expect to find in the theologians of the period such clear exponents of dogma as the writers of the fourth century. It was not until they had learned by the repeated misinterpretations of heretics the need of extreme care in defining religious opinions, that the Fathers expressed themselves in terms of scrupulous accuracy. As yet, they were only feeling their way into the domains of theology, and their language betrays at times an ignorance of the pitfalls by which they were surrounded. At the same time the doctrine of the fourth century declared in terms of scientific accuracy no more than was generally accepted by believers between A.D. 150 and 250, and it was merely a natural development of the views which were more crudely expressed in the earlier days of the Church. Nevertheless we must bear in mind that much of the language of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and especially Origen, could not have been employed by an orthodox Father of a later age.

Among primitive peoples God is conceived as a being resembling man in almost every respect. As long as the limitations of time and space are applied to the idea of God, the mind readily conceives Him as a personal being; but once the notions of His eternity, infinity and omniscience are introduced, there is a tendency to regard Him as a mere abstraction. Thus the personal God is displaced by some philosophical conception; either as identifying Him with and manifested in the universe—the Pantheistic notion—or as completely isolating Him from the visible world. This difficulty was very acutely felt by the Jews of the Graeco-Roman age. The LXX, for example, tried to soften the anthropomorphic conception of God in the Old Testament by modifying such passages

Difficulty of
expressing the
idea of God.

as "Enoch walked with God", "They saw the God of Israel", by their renderings "Enoch pleased God", "They saw the place where the Lord stood".

The Targum, or Aramaic version of the Scripture, advanced a step farther. Instead of making God act upon the world directly, the Targum of Onkelos makes God act by means of His *Memra* or Word, which thus became almost personified. This is a development of the idea of the Divine Wisdom, which, in the Proverbs and later Jewish literature of similar character, is often described as God's assessor at the time of the Creation. The famous passage in the eighth chapter of Proverbs regards Wisdom as the principle of the world laid down by God, and not as a creature like the things of the world, Wisdom coming forth from God being on the contrary a presupposition of the world's creation.¹

The tendencies displayed in the LXX and Targums were further developed by Philo, the great Alexandrian Platonist of the first century. In his system $\delta \acute{\omega}\nu$ of the translators was altered into the Platonic $\tau\acute{o} \delta\upsilon\nu$,² and the *Memra* under the name of the *Logos* became identified with that Mind which, according to Greek ideas, was the manifestation of the Supreme God. Philo uses this word in its twofold sense of reason and speech. As the former, or (in Philo's phrase) as the *Immanent Word* ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$), it abode in God. When God manifested Himself in creation the Divine Logos went forth and became the revealed Word ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$).³ By the Logos alone God is known to man; it was by this means that He communicated with the patriarchs in the Old Testament. Philo does not attempt a closer definition.

1. Oehler, *Theology of the Old Test.*, vol. II., p. 439. (Clark's Theol. Library.) See Prov. viii. 22 foll., a most important passage, frequently quoted by the Christians as a proof of our Lord's perfect union with His Father. Davidson, *Theology of the Old Test.*, pp. 106 ff.

2. Gwatkin, *Arians*, p. 12.

3. Ueberweg, *Hist. Phil.*, vol. I., p. 230. Philo does not actually regard the Logos as a Being separated from God. As man's thought is *immanent* till it is declared in words, so it is with the 'Logos' or Mind of God.

At one time he speaks of the Logos as a Being distinct from God under the figure of a Son, and also as a *δεύτερος θεός*, at another as merely the manifestation of the Divine Mind.¹ This confusion of ideas was felt by Christian theologians, some of whom fell into the error of making the Logos an inferior God, whilst others went to the opposite extreme in declaring that God's Word had no personal existence but was merely a manifestation of His nature.

The Christian religion holds fast to the doctrine of the spirituality and perfection of God, and denies that He is comprehensible by the human understanding. It agrees with Philo in making the Logos the means of the revelation of the Father to man; but goes farther in declaring that the Word of God was revealed in man by Jesus Christ. Herein lies part of the secret of the success of Christian theology. With singular felicity, its theory of the conjunction of the Divine and human natures, each preserving separate attributes, enabled the mind to preserve inviolate the pure conception of the Deity, and yet to approximate it, as it were, to human interests and sympathies.²

All who were prepared to accept Christianity recognised that Christ had manifested God to man, and that in His Person dwelt a spirit which came direct from the inmost sphere of the Divine. Our Lord's Divinity was as fixed an axiom of Christianity as the unity of God.³ The difficulty lay in defining precisely wherein this Divinity was situated. Was it the Divine Spirit abiding in the man Jesus, or was the Incarnation a mere figure under which God was revealed to man? The Ebionites adopted the former solution of the difficulty; the Docetics the latter. But the Christian Church was unable to accept either view. She at once recognised the important truth that if she sacrificed the doctrine of the Incarnation

1. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, Lecture II. Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible* (extra volume), Art. 'Philo', p. 206. Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*.

2. Millman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. II., p. 353.

3. Gwatkin, *Arians*, p. 5.

all was lost. The Ebionite idea of a deified man was a reaction to the gods of polytheism, whilst the Docetic theory was a step back to pantheism.¹ The only reply to Gnosticism was in the words of St. John: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us."

The Apologists were in a sense the first Christian theologians, as it was their object to present Christianity to the cultured world as a philosophy, and to convince outsiders that it was the highest wisdom and absolute truth. They differed from the Gnostics by dwelling on the historical and essentially moral character, and thus they not only successfully appealed to the common sense of intelligent men of the age, but also avoided hurting the susceptibilities of the upholders of orthodox tradition. Their doctrine of the Logos, borrowed from Philo and St. John, is the beginning of scientific theology within the pale of the Church.²

The anonymous *Letter to Diognetus* has been well considered to be a suitable introduction to the study of Greek Theology in the Church.³ It consists of two loosely connected portions. Of these the first is evidently distinct from the conclusion, its tone being essentially Greek, whilst that of the second is Alexandrian. Bp. Westcott considers that the first part belongs to a very early age of the Church, not later than the reign of Trajan, A.D. 117. Even the concluding fragment he believes to be not later than the close of the first half of the second century.⁴ The Hellenic culture of the writer is obvious in his Christology, where he thus describes the advent of the Redeemer: "The Almighty, Himself the Creator of the universe,.....has established in men's hearts the Truth and the Logos, since He sent

1. Gwatkin, *Arians*, p. 8.

2. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. II., p. 170, Eng. Transl. See also Illingworth, *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 88.

3. *The Continuity of Christian Thought*, by A. V. G. Allen, D.D. Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 68.

4. Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 88. The epistle is printed in Bp. Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* (p. 488), where it is assigned to the middle of the second century.

not, as some insinuate, a servant, or angel, or prince, but the Artificer and Creator of the universe Himself..... Him hath He sent to them; but for what? to terrify, and appal,.....? By no means; but in friendliness and compassion, as a king sends his son himself a king. Him He sent to men, to deliver, not to destroy."¹ The author finds the evidence of the Incarnation not in miracles but in its power over men's hearts. Notwithstanding a certain ambiguity of such words as "Himself revealed Himself,"² the tone of the letter recognises a distinction between God and the Logos.³ But it has been well said in reference to much of the context "We probably ought, however, to recognise in such a passage as this, addressed to a heathen, a Stoic philosopher, an eloquent amplification of the majesty of the messenger and of his intimate connexion with the eternal universe, rather than the evidence that the writer was not familiar with the conception of the immanent relations of the Logos and the Father to the inner being of the Godhead."⁴

About the same time we have in Justin (b) Justin Martyr, Martyr an example of philosophy satisfying its higher cravings by the adoption of Christianity. The account of Justin's conversion presents a picture of the world of educated thought in the second century.⁵ By birth a Greek, he was a native of Flavia Neapolis, the city founded by Vespasian on the site of the ancient Sychem. He began his search for truth in the old philosophical schools. His first master was a Stoic, who affirmed that a knowledge of God was unnecessary. This made Justin leave him, and go to a Peripatetic philosopher, who was so covetous about his fees, that his would-be disciple began to doubt whether he was a philosopher at all. He next applied to a Pythagorean, but finding that a knowledge of Music, Astronomy, and Geometry was necessary before he could attend his lectures, he betook himself to a

1. Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. 1., p. 261. (Clark's Foreign Theol. Library.)

2. Allen, *op. cit.*

3. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

4. Bethune Baker, *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 123.

5. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

Platonist, with whom he fared better and considered himself in a fair way to attain to a knowledge of God. It was at this time that he met an ancient and venerable man who led him from Plato to the Prophets, from metaphysics to faith in Christ. Thus Justin, in his own words, "found Christianity to be the only philosophy that is sure, and suited to man's wants".¹ As a Christian, he retained his philosopher's cloak, and travelled about propagating his opinions. There is truth in Eusebius' description of him as "an ambassador of the Divine Word in the guise of a philosopher".² It was at Ephesus that Justin held his famous Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, in which he endeavoured to prove that, whenever God is said in the Old Testament to have appeared to the patriarchs, it was in fact the Logos.³ He also set up a kind of school at Rome, in which he laboured to satisfy the doubts of the enquiring heathen. Justin was a very voluminous writer, but his only undisputed works now extant are the two Apologies and his Dialogue with Trypho. If we may add the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, Justin must also have taught at Alexandria.⁴ He engaged in a public disputation with the Cynic, Crescens, his chief heathen opponent, and this brought about his martyrdom, A.D. 165.⁵

Justin considered the Divine Logos to have been the means by which God instructed the whole world. Not only the Jewish Patriarchs, but those Greek philosophers who lived according to reason, were taught by the Word of God. Indeed Justin is bold enough to say of the latter that they were Christians, even though reported to be atheists.⁶ This large-minded view of the Divine Logos was no doubt due to the combined influence of Justin's Greek birth and education and his Samaritan environment, which enabled him to look upon the ancient history of Israel and the philosophy of Greece

1. *Dialogue with Trypho*, cc. ii., iii. Westcott, *History of the Canon*, pp. 96, 97.

2. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 11, § 8.

3. Kaye, *Justin Martyr*, p. 39.

4. Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 97, note 3.

5. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 16.

6. Kaye (*Justin Martyr*, p. 52) quotes *Apol.* 1., p. 83, B.

with equal impartiality. He is, in fact, the first Christian writer who uses the word *Logos* in its double sense of *reason* as applied to philosophy, and of *the Word* as applied to revelation. The Logos dwelt in Christ as it never did in man. Human reason is a mere σπέρμα or μίμημα of the primal Logos, but in Christ the All of reason abode in full perfection.¹

Justin fully acknowledges the humanity of our Lord, and speaks of Him as perfect Man without sin, whose doctrine was superior to all human teaching because of the perfection of His nature.² He dwells much on the facts relating to our Saviour's life on earth, and asserts, in terms that recall the Apostolic writings, that we are purified by Christ's blood.³ But his Christology necessarily lacks the precision of dogmatic formularies. In isolating the Father from the world, and making the Logos the sole means by which He is known, Justin falls sometimes into the error of making the Word identical with God, thereby leaning towards opinions afterwards formulated by Sabellius; on the other hand, when he tries to avoid this error by giving the Word a distinct personality (ὑπόστασις), he seems almost to countenance the hypothesis that there are two Gods. Thus the two tendencies, subsequently condemned as heretical, are manifested in this Father; and they shew that the greatest care would be necessary to avoid falling into one or the other of these opposite extremes of thought in the attempt to formulate the doctrine of the Logos. Justin, in fact, contributed little to the solution of the difficult problem of maintaining the divinity and personality of the Logos without breaking the unity of the Godhead.⁴

1. Dorner, *op. cit.*, pp. 264—266. Kaye, *op. cit.*, p. 53. *Apol.* II., p. 48, B.

2. Kaye, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

3. Kaye (*op. cit.*, p. 59) quotes *Apol.* I. 74, A (41) δι' αἵματος καθάρων τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ.

4. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 272. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 32. Justin's doctrine of the Logos is briefly this: Christianity, the only true philosophy, is found piecemeal among the philosophers (λόγος σπερματικός) which is revealed in its entirety in Christ. (*Apol.* II. 8, 10.) God the Father is known to man as Creator, Lord and Master, but He is Unoriginate (ἀγέννητος), ineffable, mysterious (ἄβυσσος), one and alone, incapable of incarnation. The Logos is the visible God, the subject of the O. T. Theophanies, was

We pass from Justin to Theophilus, the author, according to Eusebius, of several works, but known to us only by an Apology in three books, addressed to Autolytus.¹ His doctrine of the Logos is similar to that of Justin, but less carefully expressed. God put forth His Word making it the real principle of the world, but at the same time the Logos remained in God.² Dorner rightly points out that the Arianizing tendency of Justin disappears, but only to make way for a denial of the hypostasis of the Logos.³ Theophilus is the first writer to use the term *Τριάς* or Trinity.⁴

But it was Alexandria, not Antioch, that became the centre of Christian theology in the second and third centuries. The mantle of Philo fell upon Christian shoulders, and his speculations were continued by the great doctors who presided over the catechetical school.⁵ Pantaenus, the first of these, was succeeded by the learned Clement, a Greek, possibly an Athenian, by birth, whose greatest literary activity was displayed between A.D. 190—202. Clement's works are valuable to the classical student for the numerous quotations from books no longer extant, and

with the Father before all things (*Dialog.* 68), but was begotten or projected (*πρόβληθεις*) like flame from fire. (*Dial.* 128.) He proceeded from the Father in order to create, Prov. viii. 22. (*Dial.* 61, 129.) Before this He was λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, now He is προφορικὸς, the Word uttered, Ps. xlv. 1. This distinction is not in Justin, but is found Theophil. *Ad Autol.* i. 10, 22. (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (Athanasius)*, p. xxiii.)

1. Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 24.

2. ἐρευζόμενος. Cf. Ps. xlv. 1 (LXX), ἐρεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἄγαθον. Theophilus *Ad Autolytum*, II. 10. Fisher, *Hist. Christian Doctrine*, p. 64: "Theophilus distinguishes the internal Logos from the Logos expressed (*προφορικὸς*). The former is said to be not distinguishable from God's mind and thought."

3. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

4. *Ad Autolytum*, II. 15. The three first days of Creation are types of the Trinity (*τριάδος*) of God, His Word, and Wisdom. *τύποι τῆς τριάδος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας.*

5. Of the school of Alexandria, Harnack remarks that it was "of inestimable importance for the transformation of the heathen empire into a Christian one, and of Greek philosophy into ecclesiastical philosophy. In the third century it overthrew polytheism by scientific means, while at the same time preserving everything of any value in Greek science and culture." *Hist. of Dogma*, II., ch. vi. (Eng. Trans.)

for the light they shed upon the manners and customs of the ancient world.¹ His doctrine of the Logos was not unaffected by the Neoplatonic teaching of the relation of the *νοῦς* to the absolute *ὄν*.² Clement maintains that God can be known only to the Son, whose nature is the most holy and supreme, the most venerable, the most princely: nay, He is King by nature, united in the closest manner with the one Supreme Ruler. He however does not distinguish the Son from the Father with sufficient plainness to make the Sabellian doctrine of one God revealed under three forms impossible. Nor does Clement altogether escape from the theory of the Logos being in a sense subordinate to the Father,³ which forms a very distinctive feature in the scheme of Origen.

Clement in fact regarded the Logos as (e) Origen, A. D. 185-254. He affected human nature without any serious attempt to solve the question of His relationship to the Father. Origen, starting from the philosophical conception of God as the Absolute, yet recognising Him as known to Christians as Love, grappled with the difficulty and made one distinct step in advance of his predecessors. The expressions *Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός* involved those who used them in the difficulty of having to try to discover when the Word ceased to be immanent and went forth to act. Origen boldly cut the knot by declaring the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son. "The Father" he says "did not beget the Son and send Him free when He was begotten, but He ever begetteth

1. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 38. The extant works of Clement are (1) *The Address to the Greeks* *λόγος προτρεπτικός*. (2) *The Pedagogue*. (3) *The Stromateis*. (4) *The Outlines* (*ὕπομνησις*). (5) *τις ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*. A list of Clement's works is given by Eusebius, *II. E. VI. 13*.

2. Neander, *Hist. of Ch.*, vol. II., p. 306. Fisher, *Hist. Christian Doctrine*, p. 95.

3. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 291. On Clement's views see *History of Christian Doctrine* by G. P. Fisher, D.D., p. 95. There is in Clement "no ambiguity in the assertion of the true divinity and the true humanity of Christ." See also Harnack, *op. cit.*, II., p. 352, note 2. On the impossibility of knowing God see Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. Clement is said to have taught that there were two *λόγοι*, but this rests on a passage said to be from the *Hypotyposesis*, quoted by Photius, the sense of which is, to say the least, obscure. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. II., p. 352, Eng. Trans. See also Bethune Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 134. who defends Clement's position.

Him" (*ἀεὶ γεννᾷ αὐτόν*). The idea that the Logos existed before Creation led Origen to infer that there was no time when the Logos was not generated from the Father, and this he illustrates by the continual generation of light from the sun.¹ But at this point he was unable to shake off the Oriental notion that what is generated is inferior to its source. Origen held the Platonic theory that God is the highest *δυν* and is exalted in essence even above His *νοῦς* or *λόγος*. Accordingly he accepted a view which by subordinating the Logos to the Father made an essential unity of God and Christ impossible. So far from teaching the Nicene doctrine of the *ὁμοούσιον* he taught that the essence of the Father and of the Son was not the same, but that there was a difference of essence (*ἐτερότης τῆς οὐσίας*), thus paving the way for Arianism. Yet it cannot be doubted that Origen is really explicitly against the chief Arian theories, and at least implicitly in harmony with the Nicene doctrine of the Person of the Son. Nevertheless the sympathies of his followers in the East in the great controversy of the fourth century were rather with the Arians than with their opponents.² Origen divides humanity into three classes in a manner which shews how strongly he felt that the Son occupied a subordinate position. The first class were men who were capable of understanding the *αὐτόθεος*, then came those who knew Him by the Logos, and lastly those who know God by recognising the divine essences which animate the planets.³ The Logos according to Origen is absolute Truth, and reveals himself as far as the mind can bear the revelation of his nature.

Monarchianism. Before proceeding to an account of those who developed Origen's opinions, it is necessary to describe the heretical tendencies which appeared in the East during the third century. Monarchianism, or the denial of the Persons (*ὑποστάσεις*) in the

1. Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 309—312. *In Jerem. Hom.* IX. 4.

2. Bethune Baker, *op. cit.*, 151.

3. Origen *In Johan.*, t. II., § 3. An excellent outline of Origen's views is given in the edition of Athanasius, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Proleg., p. xxv.

Trinity, was a heresy which shewed itself in several different forms, and greatly agitated the church of Rome at the close of the second century.¹ These three chief phases of this error present themselves: (1) 'Dynamic' Monarchianism regarded Jesus Christ as a mere man endued with divine wisdom and power. This view is represented by Theodotus, Artemon, and, in a sense, by Paul of Samosata. (2) Patripassianism, or the identification of the Son with the Father, was taught by Praxeas and Noëtus. (3) Sabellianism regards the Father, the Christ, and the Holy Spirit as mere *πρόσωπα* or characters by which God is revealed to man. The last named form of Monarchianism is in reality a development of the two first: but as it was the heresy most strongly combated in the Eastern Church, and as the subordination theories of Origen and his disciples were due to their fear of this error, it has been thought advisable to discuss it here and to reserve the heretical views of the two first classes of Monarchians till we come to the consideration of the doctrines of the Western Church.²

Sabellianism.

Sabellius, a presbyter of the Libyan Pentapolis, taught in Rome during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (A.D. 198—217). He declared God to have been first a Monad dwelling in silence (*θεός σιωπῶν*), but afterwards revealing Himself in creation as a *θεός λαλῶν*. In the course of Redemption He assumed the three characters (*πρόσωπα*) of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the Trinity being one, not of essence, but of revelation. The process by which the Monad revealed Himself was that of expansion (*πλατυσμός* or *ἐκτασις*) and the *πρόσωπα* again became the Monad by a contraction (*συστολή*.) One of the most remarkable features of the Sabellian scheme is that the Logos is placed above the Father. The Logos both came forth from the Monad and at the same time was represented as abiding therein, whilst the Father was merely one of the *πρόσωπα*, or extensions of the Monad. The failure of Sabellianism was due to the fact that it recognised in the historic

1. Tert., *Ad Prax.*, cap. iii. Origen on *John*, II. 2.

2. Prolegomena to Athanasius, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. xxi^v.

Christ a mere transitory exhibition of God's power, and did not characterise the divine Christ as an eternal determination of the essence of God. Christians felt too great a need for a personal Christ to accept a theory which deprived them of His eternal presence.¹

**Beryllus of
Bostra.**

The difficulties raised by the foregoing theories are seen in the case of Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra in Arabia, who tried to prove that the personality of Christ was purely human and that He had no personal existence (*κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν*) before His Incarnation. He taught that the divinity of Christ was a *πατρικὴ θεότης*, derived from His Father, and that He had no individual Godhead (*ἴδια θεότης*). Beryllus thus rejected the doctrine of the distinct hypostasis of the Logos, but endeavoured to avoid the position of the Patripassians by giving the Logos a hypostatical existence after the Incarnation, and by recognising an efflux of the divine essence rather than the whole deity in Christ. His doctrines were condemned at a synod assembled at Bostra A.D. 244, but Beryllus was unconvinced till Origen was invited to argue with him. He then acknowledged his error and is said to have thanked Origen for convincing him of his mistake. But Origen's arguments are not themselves above suspicion. He says that the eternal generation of the Logos proves that he has an hypostasis of his own; but in granting the personality of the Son, Origen makes him inferior to the Father, and even goes so far as to suggest that he is a creature (*κτίσμα*) in so far as he is *θεοποιούμενος*.²

**Dionysius of
Alexandria.**
A. D. 247-265.

Dionysius of Alexandria, the pupil of Origen, held the position as head of the great catechetical school after Heraclas, and succeeded him as bishop in A.D. 247-8. He occupied the episcopal chair of Alexandria

1. Kurtz, *Church History*, vol. 1., § 30, 7. Baur, *Church History*, vol. 11., pp. 96, 97. Dorner, *History of the Person of Christ*, vol. 1., p. 170. Sabellius is said to have spoken of the *νιοπάτωρ*. See the letter of the Arians to pope Alexander of Alexandria in Athanasius *de Synodis* 11. Athanasius gives the opinions of Sabellius in his third discourse against the Arians. Bethune Baker, *Hist. of Doctrine*, pp. 104 ff.

2. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 33. Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 102. Kurtz, *op. cit.*, § 30, 7. Bethune Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

till A.D. 265. From the little we know of him he appears to have been one of the most moderate and amiable of men, and to have gained the respect of all parties. We shall have frequent occasion to recur to his name, and always to record some act of Christian moderation. He was a learned scholar, his criticism of the style of the Apocalypse, to quote the words of Bp. Westcott, being perhaps "unique among early writers for clearness and scholarly precision."¹ In refuting Sabellianism Dionysius was betrayed into the use of very incautious language, and said that our Lord's essence was foreign (*ξένου κατ' οὐσίαν*) to that of the Father. His name-sake, Dionysius bishop of Rome, pointed out the erroneous character of this doctrine, and the bishop of Alexandria withdrew his unhappily chosen phrases, which however were probably due to the fact that the bishops of Rome and Alexandria differed in terms rather than in doctrine, the one being accustomed to think and speak in Latin, the other in Greek.² It is satisfactory to notice that Athanasius defended Dionysius's orthodoxy when the Anomoean Arians quoted him in support of their views.³

Paul of Samosata
condemned at
Synods,
A.D. 264-269.

In the latter days of the episcopate of Dionysius, the see of Antioch was occupied by Paul of Samosata. This extraordinary prelate is described, in the encyclical letter of the synod of bishops which condemned him, in

1. Smith and Wace, *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, Art. 'Dionysius (6)'.

2. Bethune Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

3. Kurtz, *op. cit.*, § 30, 8. Dionysius wrote to the bishops of the Pentapolis, where Sabellian doctrine was so prevalent that, as Athanasius remarks, "the Son of God was scarcely any longer preached in the churches." Some of the faithful were offended at the language used by Dionysius, and laid their complaints before his Roman name-sake. In answer to the criticisms of the Roman bishop, the 'pope' of Alexandria drew up a treatise called 'Refutation and Defence'. Eusebius mentions the letters to the Sabellianizing bishops, and the four books addressed to Dionysius (*H. E.* VII. 26): he is however silent as to any controversy between the two bishops, the knowledge of which we owe to the Athanasian tracts *De Decretis*, vi., and *De Sententia Dionysii*. See Bull, *Defensio Fid. Nic.*, § II., ch. xi. Dionysius of Rome made five charges against his name-sake of Alexandria: (1) that he separated the Father from the Son, (2) that he denied the Son's Eternity, (3) that he named the Father without the Son and the Son without the Father, (4) that he rejected the term *ὁμοούσιος*, (5) that he spoke of the Son as a creature. Feltoe, *Dionysius of Alexandria*, p. 167.

language that brings to our minds the typical popular preacher of later ages. He is reproached for his theatrical and affected style of preaching, for his popularity with the fair sex, for the way in which he allowed himself to be praised in the sermons of his partisans. He is said to have been attended by crowds of servants, and to have prided himself on the secular office of *ducenarius*. His eloquence in the pulpit was applauded by persons hired to lead the enthusiasm of his hearers. The powerful Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, who, with her husband Odenatus, ruled the East, was his admiring patroness. Unluckily Paul was not satisfied with popular plaudits or feminine flattery; he aspired to be a theologian. His attempt to explain the mystery of the Trinity was disastrous. He dissociated the Father from the Son manifested in His human nature, regarding the latter as a mere man in whom the divine Logos dwelt.¹ He asserted that Christ, when on earth, progressed towards the attainment of divinity (*ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιῆσθαι*)² No less than three synods about Paul were held at Antioch between A.D. 264—269.³ He was condemned as a heretic, but not dispossessed of his bishopric till after Aurelian's victory over Zenobia, A.D. 273.

In condemning Paul's doctrine, the Fathers of the synod of Antioch pronounced his use of the word *ὁμοούσιος* to be heretical. This word afterwards changed its sense, and became the very key-stone of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Athanasius explains that Paul argued that, if the Father and Son were *ὁμοουσιοί*, there

Condemnation of
Paul of Samosata's
use of the word
ὁμοούσιος.

1. In conformity with this view, Paul, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* VII. 30), stopped the singing of hymns to our Lord. *ψαλμοὺς τοῦς μὲν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν πάσας.*

2. Kurtz, *op. cit.*, § 30, 8; Hefele, *History of the Councils*, pp. 118—124; Baur, *Church History*, vol. II., p. 105; Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 327—330. Athanasius, *de Synodis*, c. 45.

3. There is a doubt as to whether two or three synods were held about Paul. Eusebius only mentions two, but Hefele thinks that in *H. E.* VII. 27 he really alludes to the first and second synod. Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia is said in the encyclical letter to have attended two synods, and he certainly died on the way to that of 269.

was an *oúoria* above them to the unity of which they were both subordinated.¹

The School of Origen.

The genius of Origen was felt long after his death; a great school of admiring disciples survived him and exercised much influence on Christian thought. Heraclas, his colleague in the catechetical school and bishop of Alexandria, Dionysius who filled the same see, the two great Alexandrian teachers Pierius and Theognostus, and the ascetic Hieracas, were his chief followers in Egypt. In Palestine and Syria what was known as the School of Antioch began under the influence of Lucian the martyr, Pamphilus, and his erudite admirer Eusebius of Caesarea; and Methodius of Tyre (270—300), the opponent of Origen, is not uninfluenced by his teaching.² But the most devoted admirer of the great Alexandrian was Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocaesarea in Cappadocia.

Contrast of Eastern and Western Theology.

When we turn to the West we find ourselves in a very different atmosphere. We no longer are in company with active speculative intelligences, whose chief failing is that of over-subtle refinement. Authority, not logic, decides in theological disputes. For in the Western Church the question of doctrine was subordinated to that of discipline. The Roman bishops generally failed in their attempts to mediate in doctrinal disputes, though they succeeded admirably as administrators. Even the theologians Tertullian, Hippolytus and Novatian fought their most bitter conflicts on questions of eccle-

1. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 45; but see also Hilary (*De Syn.* 81, 86), and Basil (*Ep.* 52 [30]), who take different views of Paul's opinion. See Bethune Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 111. Harnack (*History of Dogma*, vol. III., pp. 35 ff.) gives a most sympathetic account of Paul. He apparently considers his condemnation one of the "saddest and most momentous things in the history of dogma". (iv., p. 197.)

2. Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., p. 483 foll. For a good account of Lucian's doctrinal position, see *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Prolegomena to Athanasius, p. xxviii. Cf. Bethune Baker, *Hist. Christ. Doct.*, p. 40: "He seems to have recognised the personality of the Logos and his incarnation in the historical Christ, ... but did not regard the Christ as essentially one with the eternal God, clinging to the idea of development, ... and he seems to have distinguished between the Word or Son in Christ and the immanent Logos."

siastical organization, or administrative discipline. The austere party, represented in its extreme forms by the three above named, were strict Trinitarians, while Praxeas was supported by the Roman bishop who expelled the Montanists, and Pope Callixtus was decidedly inclined to Monarchianism. Indeed, the powerful church of Rome, despite its statesmanlike views of church organization, was perfectly unable to cope with the doctrinal difficulties of the second and third centuries. Almost every Gnostic teacher sought to obtain a hearing in the imperial city; no great reply to Gnosticism came from the Roman Christians till the appearance of the *Philosophumena*. It was the same with Monarchianism. The bishops of Rome shewed little ability in dealing with the doctrinal difficulties. The factions and intrigues fostered by this incapacity must be described elsewhere. At present we deal only with the history of opinion in the Western Church.

Theodotus, a leather-merchant of Byzantium, a member of the sect of the Alogi,¹ brought their opinions to Rome. The school consisted of Artemon, another Theodotus distinguished by the title of the 'Banker' (ὁ τραπεζίτης), and several others, and was taunted with its devotion to mathematical and scientific studies.² They taught that Christ was a man endowed with the Holy Ghost, and 'the Banker' went so far as to say that Christ, being only a man acted upon by the power of the Holy Ghost, was by nature inferior to Melchisedec, the chief of the angelic host.³ Artemon and his adherents maintained that they held the primitive faith of the Roman church. That such a claim, however unsubstantial, was actually made illustrates the vague character of the Christology of the time. Victor, bishop of Rome, however, sought to disprove

1. Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.* 54) calls him ἀπόσπασμα ὑπάρχων τῆ προειρημένης ἀλόγου αἰρέσεως. The term Alogi was invented by Epiphanius for the "unreasonable" men who would not accept the 'Logos' Gospel. Salmon, *Intro. to N. T.*, ch. xiii.

2. "Euclid is laboriously measured by some of them, . . . and Galen, perhaps, by some is even worshipped." Euseb., *H. E.* v. 28.

3. De Pressensé, *Early Years of Christianity* (Heresy and Christian Doctrine), p. 130, Eng. Transl.

this assertion by excommunicating Theodotus and Artemon.¹

The more plausible opinions of Praxeas and Noetus were at first favourably received. Victor's successor, Zephyrinus, is described as a weak and ignorant man, greatly influenced by Callixtus, an unscrupulous adventurer who afterwards succeeded him, and even Victor himself was not proof against the arts of Praxeas. It is due to a mere accident that even the name of this heretic has survived. Praxeas, who had 'confessed' the faith in time of persecution, was an Asiatic; and on his arrival at Rome he exposed the errors and procured the condemnation of the Montanists. He taught the absolute unity of God, and Tertullian maintains that Praxeas taught that the Father suffered in the Son. Both his acts and his doctrine provoked the wrath of Tertullian, who with his biting sarcasm reproaches Praxeas with having driven the Comforter into exile and crucified the Father.² The heresy of Praxeas was branded by the name of Patripassianism.³

Noetus, a native of Smyrna, with Cleomenes and Epigonus, tried to make the teaching of Praxeas less objectionable by retaining the unity of the Divine Essence but at the same time removing the unfortunate impression that the Father suffered. They taught that God changed His name according as He manifested Himself to the world, but although it was the Father who in the person of Jesus suffered on the cross, He could not be said to have suffered as God. The Father is invisible, unoriginated, immortal; but the Son, whose person God assumed, is the exact opposite.⁴ Noetus is the forerunner of Sabellius, whose teaching leads to pantheism pure and simple.

1. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 28. This charge occurs in an anonymous work called the *Little Labyrinth*, against Artemon, quoted by Eusebius. Mr. Bethune Baker (*History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 97) rightly points out that "In origin Monarchianism was an 'orthodox' reaction (from Gnosticism) to an earlier tradition, though it was soon turned against the orthodox themselves."

2. *Adv. Praxeam*, c. 1. "Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit, prophetiam expulit et haeresim intulit, Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit."

3. Origen, *In Ep. ad Titum*.

4. Baur, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 94, 95.

That a bishop of Rome could fall into heresy, as in the *Philosophumena* Callixtus is said to have done, naturally gave rise to much comment. Historical truth seems to compel us to own that this unlucky prelate in his attempt to please all parties drifted from one extreme to another, and ended by founding an heretical school of followers. He is accused (in spite of his having excommunicated Sabellius) of being at once a Sabellian, a Theodotian, and a Noetian.¹ His view on the Trinity is summed up as follows:—God is a Spirit giving life to all. As such He is the Logos. The Spirit which became incarnate in the Virgin is personally identical with the Father. That which became thereby manifest, the Man Jesus, is the Son. Therefore it cannot be said that the Father as such suffered, He suffered with and in the Son.²

Although Tertullian's treatise against Praxeas is the great answer of the Western Church to Monarchianism, his definition of the Trinity is not wholly satisfactory. Unlike Origen, Tertullian, not being hampered with a philosophical training, or, perhaps, under the influence of legal ideas, can conceive of one Essence shared by Three Persons. But his lack of philosophic culture leads him to speak of the essence of the Godhead being divided unequally among the *hypostaseis*. Thus he actually says that the Father is the whole Essence, the Son a derivation and a portion thereof.³ In the same way he explains the words of our Lord, "the Father is greater than I." But in spite of his defects Tertullian has a very firm grasp of many important truths. He attaches the greatest weight to the reality of the Incarnation and to the doctrine of the Atonement. In addition to this

1. Hippolytus, *Philos.*, IX., ch. 6. Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 102, note. De Pressensé, *Early Years of Christianity* (Heresy and Christian Doctrine), p. 145, Eng. Transl. Of course the whole question depends on the character of the author of the *Philosophumena*. Bethune Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 103, n.

2. Kurtz, *op. cit.*, § 30, 5.

3. Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam*. "Pater enim tota substantia est, Filius vero derivatio et portio."

he holds firmly to the essential unity of the three Persons of the Trinity.¹

Novatian,
c. A. D. 251. Novatian, the first who caused what in later days would have been called a Papal schism, was an orthodox doctor on the subject of the Trinity, and the Novatians in the fourth century were vehement partisans of the Creed of Nicaea. In him we find the doctrine of subordination carried to an even greater length than in Tertullian, but he holds to the belief in a unity of essence.² Thus the doctrine of the West differed from that of the East in one important particular. In the East undue prominence was given to the distinctions in the Trinity, the three Persons were in danger of becoming three Gods. In the West the unity of essence was often held to the exclusion of a due distinction of the Persons. Even Hippolytus, who wrote in Greek, comes perilously near to a Sabellian exposition of the Trinity in making the Trinitarian relation not original in the very being of God, but as coming into existence through successive acts of the Divine will.³ The permanent hold that Monarchianism had on the Roman church can be seen in the part it played in the condemnation of Origen, in the Dionysian controversy, in its attachment to the *ὁμοούσιον* formula, and in its reception of Marcellus and Athanasius.

Doctrine of the Incarnation. The Docetic heresy compelled the Fathers of the first three centuries to put in the clearest possible light their belief in the reality of our Lord's Incarnation, and of His sufferings. Ignatius lays great stress on the fact that Christ truly suffered, and quotes a saying of our Lord's after His resurrection, "Handle me and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit."⁴ Irenaeus maintains

1. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, vol. 1., p. 59. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. II., p. 144.

2. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

3. Bethune Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

4. Ign., *Smyrn.*, ch. iii., *λάβετε ψηλαφήσατέ με και ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον.* Bp. Lightfoot's note on the passage, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol. II., § 1, p. 294. For Ignatius' opposition to Docetism, see *op. cit.*, vol. I., pp. 359, 360.

the necessity of the Incarnation of the Logos, not only in order that he should be visible to all flesh, but that he might shew himself their king."¹ Tertullian devotes an entire treatise (*de Carne Christi*) to the necessity of the Incarnation. But it is not requisite to multiply proofs on this point: the only apparently conflicting testimony by an orthodox Father being found in Origen's suggestion, that our Lord shewed Himself to each man as he was capable of beholding Him. In this way Origen considers that the Transfiguration ought to be explained.² Both Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria assert that, in accordance with the great Messianic prophecy in Isaiah liii., our Lord's human form was mean and unsightly.³

The Holy Spirit. In the Church of the second and third centuries the belief in the Divine Personality of the Holy Spirit was acknowledged, though seldom expressed. There has been at all times a tendency to ignore the important doctrine that the Spirit has a work and place in the Blessed Trinity of equal dignity with that of the Father and the Son. The fact that Baptism was administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as well as the use of the term Trinity after the time of Theophilus of Antioch, are sufficient proofs that the office of the Spirit was recognised by the Church. But the language of the Fathers on this subject often betrays a certain confusion of thought. The recognition of the truth that the *Logos* was the Second Person of the Trinity led to an almost inevitable tendency to confound him with the Spirit of God, who was universally acknowledged to have spoken by the Prophets. Justin Martyr, for example, sometimes attributes the inspiration of the ancients to the Son and sometimes to the Spirit. Irenaeus endeavours to distinguish the work of the Spirit from that of the Logos;

1. Irenaeus, bk. iii., c. 9.

2. Neander (*Church History*, vol. II., p. 373) quotes *Contra Celsum*, iv. 16: *μη νοήσαντες τὰς ὡς ἐν ἱστορίαις λεγομένας μεταβολὰς ἢ μεταμορφώσεις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.* And *Contra Celsum*, vi., c. 77: *τὸ παραλλάττων τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς ὁρῶσι δυνατὸν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο χρήσιμον τοιοῦτο φαινόμενον, ἵπποιον εἶδει ἐκάστῳ βλέπεισθαι.*

3. Clem. Alex., *Paedagogus*, III. 1. Tert., *Adv. Marcionem*, III. 7.

the one he calls the Energy, the other the Wisdom of God. Tertullian admits the doctrine that the Spirit has His due place in the Trinity—"tertium numen divinitatis, et tertium nomen maiestatis," but, though as Montanist he believed in the dispensation of the Paraclete, he does not seem fully to have grasped the real significance of His Personal Being. He speaks, for example, of the pre-existent Christ as the Spirit of God. Hippolytus and Novatian follow Tertullian, and Lactantius as late as the beginning of the fourth century calls the Holy Spirit a *sanctificatio* proceeding from the Father or the Son. In Origen the question is raised as to whether the Holy Spirit is or is not a creature, and there was in his time a growing tendency to associate the idea of createdness with the Holy Ghost. As Neander justly remarks, "The Fathers alternated between the doctrine of the Holy Ghost being a part of the Trinity and a good gift of God through Christ,"—a state of mind not unknown among modern preachers and writers. So little however was the doctrine of the Holy Spirit a matter of controversy, that the Council of Nicaea was satisfied with the mere expression of belief in the Holy Ghost.¹

Montanism was a movement in the right direction in so far as it laboured to bring the work of the Spirit in the Christian body into more prominence in men's minds, and revolted against the hard legalising tendencies of the Roman church. The Montanists were accused of identifying their founder with the Paraclete, but the testimony of the Fathers on this point is extremely contradictory, and Tertullian in his treatise against Praxeas, written after he had become a Montanist, is orthodox on the subject of the nature of the Holy Ghost.²

1. See Kaye, *Justin Martyr*, pp. 54, 55. Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., p. 337. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (Eng. Transl.), vol. II., pp. 261 (note), 266 (note), and 357 foll. Fisher, *Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, pp. 95 and 109. Origen, *De Principiis*, I. iii. Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam*. Consult Dr. Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, cc. I.—III., and article 'Holy Ghost', *D. C. B.* Bethune Baker, *Hist. Christian Doct.*, pp. 197 foll.

2. De Soyres, *Montanism and the Primitive Church*, Book II. (The Tenets of Montanism.)

The Gnostics generally denied the personal responsibility of man, and the freedom of the will, by their division of humanity into *pneumatic*, *psychic*, and *carnal* natures. In consequence of this tendency, the doctrine of Free Will was strongly maintained by the orthodox Fathers. Justin Martyr teaches that man was created a rational being, able to choose the truth and thereby to secure his own happiness, "for" he says "it is the property of everything created that it is capable of virtue and vice" (*κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν εἶναι*), and that on the possession of this power of volition depends the responsibility of men and of angels. Clement of Alexandria teaches that man being made in God's image is consequently capable of good, and his conscience re-echoes the commandments of God. God's law is written in men's hearts, and thus Christianity is an advance upon Judaism, because Christians obey willingly, the Jews by compulsion. There is no trace in Clement's theology of the doctrines of Original Sin or of the fall of man in Adam. He looks on Christ as the true head of humanity, and on man's will as free to follow out the Divine purpose.¹ Origen's view is somewhat different, being based on his theory of the pre-existence of the soul. He thought that, as all spirits come from God, all differences of nature are the result of free will. Though the Son of God is the universal brightness of His glory, His scattered beams were diffused over all rational creation, and therefore all partook of God's enlightenment. Free will was, in a sense, the principal cause of sin, for (as Origen taught) evil exists as soon as desire for individual existence arises in any rational being.²

As usual, the Western teaching on this subject differed slightly from that of the East, and in Tertullian we discover the germs of the Augustinian doctrine, that evil is inherent in man. He is the first Christian writer who advances the doctrine of the propagation

1. Allen, *Continuity of Christian Thought*, p. 48 foll.

2. Neander, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 340—382. Harnack (*History of Dogma*, Eng. Transl., vol. II., p. 214) gives the view of human nature and its responsibility taken by the Apologists.

of the corruption of human nature, which is inseparable from his theory of the propagation of souls. Tertullian taught that all souls were descended from Adam and inherited the contagion of his sin. The corruption of our nature has, he says, become a second nature. He even went so far as to maintain the connexion of an evil spirit with every man from his birth, and actually brings forward the Daemon of Socrates in confirmation of his opinion.¹ It is here that the gloomy theology of Africa with its narrow and sour illiberality contrasts most unfavourably with the generous teaching of the Greek and Alexandrian Christians.

Redemption. Docetic Gnosticism, by denying the reality of the Passion and Death of the Saviour, excluded all belief in the efficacy of the Cross, to which the Catholic Fathers naturally attached the deepest significance. They regarded the Death of our Lord as a voluntary offering for the sin of the world, and as a ransom by which man was redeemed by God. They did not, however, hold the view popular with theologians since the days of St. Anselm, that the Death on the Cross was a satisfaction to Divine Justice, but considered that our Saviour offered His life as a ransom to Satan, the conqueror of the human race. "The Word and very Man," says Irenaeus, "in redeeming us by His own blood gave Himself a redemption for those who were taken captive: and though sin had dominion over us unlawfully, . . . the Word of God, in making us His own disciples, and not coming short of His own righteousness, shewed Himself just in dealing with Apostasy herself, redeeming from her that which was her own, not by violence, as she originally had dominion over us, . . . but by persuasion," &c. Irenaeus is however quite free from any idea that the devil has any real right over man, or that God accomplished the work of redemption by any act of deceit.²

1. Tertullian, *De Anima*; see Neander, *Planting of Christianity and Antignostikus*, vol. II., p. 463.

2. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. II., pp. 290 and 365 (for Origen's doctrine); Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 86. The passage paraphrased in the text is Irenaeus *Haer. v. 1*: "Quoniam Verbum potens, et homo verus, sanguine

Millenarianism. The prophecy that the martyrs and those who had not worshipped the Beast should rise from the dead and reign on earth with Christ for a thousand years¹ was interpreted literally, and had a very powerful hold on the Christian mind, especially in Asia. It was held by Papias, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, and the Montanists. The Alexandrian Fathers had a strong objection to these views, considering them to be gross and sensual in the extreme. Clement, for example, is of opinion that the idea is irrational because Christ is spiritually here in all His fulness.² Eusebius quotes from Caius, who endeavoured to disparage this Millennial teaching by making the heretic Cerinthus its author.³ But the great opponent of Millennial hopes was the wise and amiable Dionysius of Alexandria. Nepos, a bishop of the nome Arsinoe in Egypt, had composed a work, called 'the Refutation of the Allegorists' (*Ἐλεγχος τῶν ἀλληγοριστῶν*), against those who denied the literal interpretation of the Millennial promises in the Apocalypse. A party was formed,

suo rationabiliter redimens nos, redemptionem semetipsum dedit pro his, qui in captivitatem ducti sunt. Et quoniam injuste dominabatur nobis apostasia, et cum natura essemus Dei omnipotentis, alienavit nos contra naturam, suos proprios nos faciens discipulos, potens in omnibus Dei Verbum; et non deficiens in sua justitia, juste etiam adversus ipsam conversus est apostasiam, ea quae sunt sua redimens ab ea, non cum vi, quemadmodum illa initio dominabatur nostri, ea quae non erant sua insatiabiliter rapiens, sed secundum suadellam, quemadmodum decebat Deum suadentem, et non vim inferentem, accipere quae vellet; ut neque quod est justum confringeretur, neque antiqua plasmatio Dei deperiret."

1. Apoc. xx. 4.

2. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

3. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. II., p. 300. Dr. Harnack regards the success of the learned Eastern Fathers over Chiliasm as a significant proof that the laity were falling under the tutelage of the clergy. "The religion they understood was taken from them (the 'simplices et idiotae'), and they received in turn a faith they could not understand; in other words, the old faith and the old hopes decayed of themselves and the authority of a mysterious faith took their place. In this sense the extirpation or decay of Chiliasm is perhaps the most momentous fact in the history of the Christianity of the East." Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 28) quotes from the Disputation of Caius, who does not say plainly that Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse, but that he found support for his views in revelations, which he pretends were written by the great Apostle. For Caius see the note on Euseb., *H. E.* II, 25, § 7 in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.

after the death of Nepos, headed by Coracion a presbyter, and it appeared probable that a serious schism would distract the Church. Dionysius, with the Christian forbearance which characterised him, went in person to endeavour to convince Coracion and his adherents. He conciliated all by the respect with which he spoke of Nepos, and ended by persuading Coracion to confess his error. Dionysius argued that the Apocalypse was not the work of John the son of Zebedee, but of John the Presbyter, who is mentioned by Papias.¹

The belief in a Millennium was a survival of the old Jewish expectation of a visible kingdom of the Messiah, but it contained the germs of two important ideas. One is that the reign of Christ on earth is not a mere chimera, but an end for which all Christians are bound to strive. The other is that the Millennium as foretold in the Apocalypse is a time for preparation for the second Resurrection. This paved the way for the theory of an intermediate state after death. The Montanists held firmly to the belief of a purification of the soul after death, and even Clement of Alexandria speaks of a purifying fire for those who have lived ill. From this germ the mediaeval doctrine of Purgatory was destined to grow.²

The Resurrection. The doctrine of the Resurrection was generally stated at this time in a materialistic form, though the Fathers of Alexandria as usual take a spiritual view of this great mystery. Clement held that "the resurrection was the standing up of all things to immortal life; it was not the same body, but a re-clothing in some higher form of the purified spirit."³ Origen, in his reply to the taunt of Celsus⁴ that the Christian hope of rising out of the ground at the last day is one worthy of worms, enlarges upon St. Paul's words, "this corruptible must put on incorruption," and in another place he dwells upon the change which

1. Euseb., *H. E.* vii. 24—25. Feltoe, *Dionysius of Alexandria*, pp. xxv, 106.

2. Neander (*Planting of Christianity and Antignostikus*) quotes Tertullian, *De Anima*. See also his *Church History*, vol. II., p. 403.

3. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 67. Dr. Allen quotes *Stromateis*, IV., cc. 22, 26.

4. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iv. 57, v. 19.

the body undergoes at the time of resurrection. Tertullian however draws a distinction between the heathen doctrine of the immortality of the soul and the Christian teaching concerning the resurrection of the body.¹

The above short sketch of the doctrines held in the early days of the Church shews at least how many points remained as yet unsettled. The work of the fourth and fifth centuries was to give these a dogmatic shape. But the precise language and clear definitions of the succeeding age was purchased with intestine discord, and the loss of liberty of thought. The century in which men sat at the feet of the great Origen was followed by more timorous days in which his bold imaginings were branded as heresies.

1. Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, v., c. 9 ff.

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS AND PHILOSOPHIES.

As we approach the time when the Roman empire united itself to the Church, we may fairly enquire into the cause of the combination of two organizations hitherto, to all appearances, opposed to one another. The triumph of Christianity by its complete absorption of all mental and religious activities in the Roman world is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of mankind. Our astonishment is increased when we consider how speedily a highly civilised and educated age changed from Hellenism to Christianity. The conversion of the nations which overran the Roman empire in the fourth and fifth centuries, though no doubt more rapid, was often due either to actual force or to an appeal to the superstitious terrors of barbarians. But in the first three centuries it is undeniable that many of the most enlightened and cultivated men were led after serious consideration to embrace the new faith. Considering that mankind is always most conservative in the matter of religious prejudices, Christianity appears to have advanced with giant strides between the accession of Marcus Aurelius and the death of Julian. In A.D. 161, when Hellenic philosophy mounted to the throne of the world in the person of the former emperor, Christianity had made comparatively little progress. Two centuries later, when Julian, who in character was not altogether unlike Marcus Aurelius, tried to restore the ancient religion, the Empire was so completely Christianized, that the votaries of Hellenism, nay, the very philosophers

and the priests, shewed no great zeal to recover their lost influence. At the end of two years Julian was compelled to acknowledge that Christ had conquered. This is the more remarkable, when we contrast the slow progress of Christian ideas in the ancient civilizations of India and China. We are consequently led to consider whether Hellenism and Christianity had not much in common; whether, in short, Greek philosophy was not, like Judaism, a road which led men to the Gospel.

The object of this chapter is to give an outline of the attitude assumed by the supporters of Hellenic philosophy towards the teaching of the Christian Church. How the Roman Government tried to extirpate Christianity by force, has been already shewn; we shall now describe the attempts to crush the Faith by argument. In the former struggle the martyr confronted the magistrate; in the latter, Greek philosophers disputed with the doctors of the Church.

The Christianity of the second and third centuries expressed in many points the popular feeling of the age. In a correct picture of the Church and Roman society, neither the virtues of the one nor the vices of the other appear in glaring contrast. The Christians were not without their faults, nor the Roman world without its merits. From time to time the believers are found to exhibit signs of human frailty, nor had virtue utterly deserted the heathen population of the Empire. That many good impulses existed among the latter the very success of Christianity sufficiently attests. The progress of the Faith was largely due to the fact that it supplied a want widely felt during the last ages of Hellenic Heathenism. To discover the nature of that want it is necessary to survey the religious and moral aspirations of mankind during the first three centuries of our era. Christianity did not gain its triumphs in an irreligious age. On the contrary, the religious instincts of humanity were especially active in the second and third centuries of our era. A craving for a personal relation with God was characteristic of the period. Although the ancient gods of Greece and Rome might be neglected, or regarded as merely ancient embodiments of physical

phenomena, the tone of society was neither sceptical nor irreverent. On the contrary, a strong desire for personal religion made many of Greek or Roman birth turn to the religions of the East in order to obtain that which they sought in vain in their ancestral forms of belief. The drift of Philosophy had been to exhibit the need of Monotheism. The conquests of Alexander the Great and the extension of Roman dominion had substituted for nationalism the conception of a consolidated empire embracing all the civilised world. The troubles of the second and third centuries led mankind to feel the need of one personal God. Consequently the religious cults popular in the Roman empire displayed a general desire for a faith at once monotheistic, catholic, and personal.¹

We may first notice in this connexion the worship of Serapis and Isis. the worship of Serapis, which was extremely popular in the second and third centuries of our era. This mysterious god was introduced from Pontus into Alexandria by Ptolemy I. shortly after the foundation of the city. Tacitus gives the legend of the discovery of the god at some length, but adds that some thought that Ptolemy III. brought his image of Serapis from Selucia.² A magnificent temple was raised to his honour in a district of Alexandria called Rhacotis. The building resembled an Indian pagoda rather than a Greek or Egyptian shrine, and stood on a vast mound constructed for the purpose. Within was the colossal figure of the god, formed of plates of all the metals, artfully joined together to typify the harmonious union of different elements in the fabric of the universe. The consort of Serapis was Isis—not the Egyptian deity, but a goddess resembling the Ephesian Diana³ and worshipped as the type of Nature in subjection to the Sun, with whom Serapis has been frequently identified. When, however, the god was first introduced into Egypt he was certainly regarded by the

1. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 289 ff.

2. Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 83, 84. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 72. Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 560 ff.

3. Macrobius (i. 20) says "the body is covered with continuous rows of udders, to declare that the universe is maintained by the perpetual nourishing of the earth or nature."

Alexandrians as Aidoneus or Dis, the god of the lower world, and his attributes suggest him to have been none other than the Indian god Yama, Lord of Hell. His origin was, however, in part forgotten by his worshippers in later times, and he was adored as the one and only god.¹ At Alexandria Serapis was worshipped with the most frantic devotion, and speculations as to his nature occupied the chief attention of the philosophers. Nor was the cultus confined to Egypt, it extended to the West, and was long practised in Gaul.²

The most remarkable identification of Serapis is found in a letter of the emperor Hadrian preserved by Vopiscus in his *Life of Saturninus*. Hadrian's words are: "Those who worship Serapis are likewise Christians; even those who style themselves the bishops of Christ are devoted to Serapis. The very Patriarch (the Jewish *nâsi* of Tiberias) is forced by some to adore Serapis, by others to worship Christ. There is but one God for them all. Him do the Christians, Him do the Jews, Him do the Gentiles all alike worship."³ It has even been suggested that the face of the image of this divinity, so full of grave and pensive majesty, gave Christian artists the model for the conventional representation of our Lord, and it is not altogether impossible that some of the semi-pagan Gnostic philosophers saw in Serapis a prototype of Christ, the Lord and Maker of all, and

1. This is borne out by the talismanic gems bearing figures of Serapis with such inscriptions as *εἰς ζωὴν θεῶν*.

2. Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 84: "Deum ipsum multi Aesculapium, quod medeatur aegris corporibus; quidam Osirin, antiquissimum illis gentibus numen; plerique Iovem, ut rerum omnium potentem; plurimi Ditem patrem insignibus, quae in ipso manifesta, aut per ambages coniectant." Dill, *op. cit.*, 563 ff.: "Although it was generations before the worship won its way, in the face of fierce persecution, to an assured place in Rome, its first appearance coincides with the decay of the old religion, the religious excitement in the beginning of the second century B.C., and the immense popular craving for a more emotional form of worship." p. 568: "Already in Nero's reign Lucan could speak of Isis and Osiris as not only welcomed in the shrines of Rome, but as deities of all the world."

3. Dean Milman (*Hist. of Christianity*, vol. II.) thinks however that Hadrian is speaking satirically of the universal worship of wealth. Serapis as a god of the lower world represented Plutus. Vopiscus, *Saturninus*, c. ii.

Judge of quick and dead. Be this as it may, the devotion for Serapis, both in Alexandria, the intellectual capital of the Empire, and throughout the Roman world, is a sign of a wide-spread longing for a universal worship of one God.¹

Mithraism. According to Plutarch the worship of the Persian god Mithras was introduced into the West by the captives brought by Pompey to Italy after his victories over the Cilician pirates, B.C. 67. The new cult rapidly became popular, and has left its traces in all parts of Europe. It was in reality an adaptation of the teaching of the Zend-avesta to Western ideas. Mithras, in the Zoroastrian religion, is the first-born of Ormuzd, the chief of the seven Amshaspands, whose abode is in the Sun. The Greeks however identified the Persian Spirit with their more material deities Phoebus and Hyperion. There were many reasons for this form of Sun-worship becoming a universal religion in the Roman world. The Sun was already adored by all nations, from Britain to the far East. We find philosophers like Macrobius regarding all gods worshipped by civilised men as various forms under which they honoured the Sun. Even Christians, like Origen, dared not deny that the Sun was a rational being endowed with free will.² It is possible therefore that the attempt to install the god of Emesa in Rome and to unite him in marriage with the Palladium was something more than a mad freak of the emperor Heliogabalus. This emperor (as Priest of the Sun) may have seriously aimed at establishing a worship of his deity which should include all other forms of

1. I have taken my account of Serapis from King's *Gnostics and their Remains*, pp. 158 foll. For the worship of Isis see Apuleius, *Metam.* xi.; the Hibbert Lectures (1879) by Le Page Renouf; and Dill, *op. cit.*, p. 572. It seems to have evoked the sympathy of sufferers in a manner not unlike the Christian religion. Many a stricken spirit found comfort in the adoration of Isis. "She does not forget" says Plutarch "the sorrow which she endured, nor her painful wanderings, but ordains most holy rites in memory of her sufferings, for instruction in piety, and for the comfort of men and women oppressed by similar misfortunes." Plutarch, *de Iside et Osiri*, 27.

2. Origen *De Principiis*, bk. i., c. 7. He quotes Job xxv. 5 to shew that the stars are intelligent beings and subject to error.

religion.¹ The Mithraic religion had rites so closely resembling the two great Christian ordinances, that both Justin Martyr and Tertullian² declare them to be a diabolical imitation of the Sacraments. The votaries of Mithras, in common with the Christians, recognised the need of atonement, and held the doctrine of a future life.³ Augustine, writing when Mithraism was in its decline, informs us that a priest "of the fellow in the cap" (*illius Pileati*, viz. Mithras) used to say "our capped one is himself a Christian".⁴ But the resemblance between the two faiths is, in truth, one of very superficial character. The celebration of the Mithraic eucharist was attended at times with the performance of darker rites, nor was human sacrifice unknown in connexion with its orgies. This may perhaps account for the popular belief that the Christians met in secret for a similar purpose. As wide a gulf severs the Mithraic baptism of the Taurobolium from that of the Christian laver of regeneration. The recipient of the horrid Mithraic rite stood in a pit covered with planks pierced full of holes. A bull was then slain and the blood was allowed to fall into the pit and drench the man below. As the bull was the symbol of life, the lustration of the Taurobolium was considered to have unlimited efficacy. The desire for purification and regeneration so vividly expressed by this ceremony shews that the worshippers of Mithras were partly conscious of a truth which found its full expression in Christianity.⁵

1. "Bringing together in his temple the Fire of Vesta, the Palladium, the Ancilia, and all the other most venerated relics; and moreover the religion of the Jews and Samaritans, and the devotion of the Christians," says Lampridius. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 119.

2. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. 62, 66. Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, c. 5.

3. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, vi. 22.

4. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 119. "Usque adeo ut ego noverim aliquo tempore illius Pileati sacerdotem solere dicere 'Et ipse Pileatus Christianus est'." Aug., *Hom. in Joh.*, VII. 6. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, Lect. II.

5. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, part II., 'The Worship of Mithras and Serapis.' Cumont, *Monuments Relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra*. "It is perhaps the highest and most striking example of the last efforts of paganism to reconcile itself to the great moral and spiritual movement...towards purer conceptions of God, of man's relations to Him, and of the life to come. It is also the greatest effort of syncretism to absorb ... the gods of the classic pantheon in a cult which was almost

The deities of Rome presented little attraction to their own worshippers and none to the outside world. The hard practical nature of the Roman people was little susceptible to religious impressions. The national gods reflected the national character. They were mere frigid impersonations of civic virtues and the useful arts of life. Their worship tended to develop the sense of citizenship without in any way satisfying man's spiritual instincts. It has been truly observed that the religion of Rome was purely selfish, being simply a means of obtaining prosperity, averting calamity, and reading the future. The virtues inculcated by the old Roman religion disappeared with the growth of luxury in the latter days of the Republic, and with them the power of the gods of Rome. The worship with its ceremonial and priesthood remained, but its influence had long disappeared.¹

The religion of the Hellenic nation had even less power to satisfy the moral or spiritual cravings of the heart. Its mythology, the creation of an unbridled and irreverent fancy, attributed the basest motives and the worst actions to the gods, and is an evidence of the lack of seriousness inherent in the Greek mind. From a very early date the popular religion excited either the contempt or hostility of the philosophers. Pythagoras (born about 582 B.C.) is said to have declared that he had seen both Homer and Hesiod tortured in Hell on account of the fables they had invented about the gods. His younger contemporary Xenophanes remarked that each nation attributed to the gods its distinctive national type.² The very existence of the popular gods was questioned by many philosophers, the general opinion among them being that there was really but one supreme God, but they were not agreed as to whether he had an existence apart from the universe or was simply the

monotheistic." Dill, *op. cit.*, p. 585. Renan suggested that if Christianity had succumbed, Mithraism might have become the religion of the Western world.

1. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. I., p. 176; "The Roman religion, even in its best days, though an admirable system of moral discipline, was never an independent source of moral enthusiasm."

2. Lecky, *op. cit.*, p. 109. Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, vol. I., p. 52. (Eng. Transl.) Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, VII., p. 711 b.

anima mundi, the all-pervading spirit of nature. The traditional religion of Greece is an example of a popular faith continuing for centuries after being separated from the moral and intellectual aspirations of the educated part of those who professed to hold it.

The Mysteries. On one side only did the religion of Hellas approximate to Christianity. In the Mysteries, especially those of Eleusis, we recognise an attempt in the direction of personal religion. They were the worship not of the gods of the sky, but of those of the lower world, a Triad consisting of a god and two goddesses, Pluto, Demeter, and Koré or Persephone. The Mysteries were guarded with jealous care by secret societies, and were known only to the initiated. The ceremonies by which they were disclosed appear to have been of a most imposing and dramatic character. The initiation to the Mysteries at Eleusis began with a solemn proclamation that no one might enter whose hands were not clean and whose tongue was not prudent. The candidates were next asked to confess their sins, confession being followed by a species of baptism. A fast of nine days, during which certain kinds of food were forbidden, was prescribed, and at the end of this period a solemn sacrifice, known as the *σωτηρία*, was offered by each of the candidates. After a further interval of two days a procession of the initiates set out from Athens for Eleusis, singing paeans in honour of the god. The night of their arrival was spent in learning the nature of the Mysteries. The candidates stood outside the temple in the darkness; suddenly the doors were opened and they were in a blaze of light. The story of Demeter and Koré was represented: the loss of the daughter, the grief of the mother, the restoration of life from death. The whole scene was a parable; *mors janua vitae* the clue to it. In the Roman empire, mysteries of the character described obtained wide popularity. Most of them gave utterance to the same ideas as those expressed in the sacred rites of Eleusis—the desire for purification from sin, the hope of immortality, the joy of a brotherly union cemented by religion. The popularity of mysticism was, in fact, a part of a great religious revival which distinguished the age, a noteworthy feature of which

was the desire to worship the One true God. Even in early times the unity of God appears to have been acknowledged in the Eleusinian Mysteries. An ancient hymn sung in them by the priest said: "Go on in the right way and contemplate the sole Governor of the world. He is One and of himself alone, and to that One all things owe their being. He worketh through all, was never seen by mortal eyes, but doth himself see everyone."¹

The Philosopher exercised in the Empire a far greater influence than the Priest, and was not unfrequently summoned to act the part of a spiritual director.² His authority was respected in cases of conscience, and his presence sought in times of sickness or bereavement. In some families the philosopher occupied a position somewhat analogous to that of a domestic chaplain. The satirist Lucian describes the troubles of philosophers who lived under the patronage of the fashionable ladies of his time. His essay 'On Persons who give their Society for Pay' recalls the description of the chaplains in the novels of the eighteenth century. One philosopher has to travel in the cart with the maid-servants, another is asked to take care of the lap-dog, a third reads a sermon on temperance while his patroness is having her hair dressed, and is interrupted while she writes a note to her lover.³ The same author, in his description of the death of Peregrinus Proteus, depicts the philosophers as street preachers addressing exciting harangues to the multitudes on the subject of the proposed self-immolation of Peregrinus. The philosophers in their long cloaks were everywhere conspicuous. Like the mendicants in the middle ages, they sought to inspire reverence by their ragged attire, their filth, and (to borrow a phrase from Gibbon) 'their populous beards'. Some philosophers held well-endowed 'chairs' of philosophy in the great cities, others wandered about from

1. See Dr. Hatch's *Hibbert Lectures*, Lecture x., 'The Influence of the Mysteries upon Christian Usages.' Also *The Unknown God*, by C. Loring Brace, ch. iv.; and Bury, *History of Greece*, pp. 312 ff.

2. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 289 ff.

3. Hatch, *op. cit.*, ch. ii., 'Greek Education.'

place to place delivering lectures. The dominant philosophy of the age aimed at moral excellence, and many submitted to ascetic discipline by the advice of a philosopher. Marcus Aurelius led the life of a religious recluse under the guidance of Junius Rusticus and Claudius Severus. At the age of twelve the future emperor assumed the dress of a philosopher, and learned to practise such severe austerities as permanently to injure his health.¹ During the early days of Christianity the aim of Greek philosophy was the moral elevation of mankind, and despite the eccentricities and follies of a few, the influence of the philosophers was a power for good. The works of the best exponents of Stoicism, of Seneca, of Epictetus, and of Marcus Aurelius, remain to this day among the most popular moral treatises of antiquity.² Christians like Justin Martyr after their conversion continued to wear the philosopher's robe, which Tertullian considered to be the dress most becoming to a Christian teacher.³

Epicureans. The most popular and wide-spread philosophies during the first three centuries of our era appear to have been those of the Epicurean, Stoic, and Neo-Platonic schools. The first-named was, however, steadily decreasing in influence. The times were too hard, the tragic side of life too prominent, to allow the genial but selfish doctrines of Epicurus to flourish. When they made their appearance in Rome, they were hailed by Lucretius as a means of deliverance from superstition,⁴ but the calamities which the world had undergone in the first and second centuries had made mankind turn with longing to the supernatural, and the religious feeling of the age was entirely opposed to the atheism of the Epicurean philosophy. Origen

1. Renan, *Marcus Aurelius*, ch. i.

2. Tertullian, *de Anim.* 20, "Seneca saepe noster."

3. Tertullian, *de Pallio*.

4. "Humana ante oculos foede quum vita jaceret
In terris oppressa gravi sub religione,
Quae caput a coeli regionibus ostendebat,
Horribili super aspectu mortalibus iastans:
Primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra
Est oculos ausus, primusque obsistere contra."

Lucretius, l. 62-67.

taunts Celsus with not daring to avow himself to be an Epicurean.¹ Lucian, in his romance of the pseudo-prophet Alexander of Abonitichos, makes the hero institute a celebration of Mysteries, on the first day of which a proclamation was made, "If any Atheist or Christian or Epicurean has come to spy upon the festival, let him flee!"² The unpopularity of the Epicureans is in itself a sign of the religious temper of the age.

Lucian.

The satirist Lucian (born about 120 A.D.), who made it the object of his life to expose impostures, is the most brilliant product of the Epicurean philosophy. He describes himself as a hater of jugglery, lies, and ostentation. He attacks superstition with unsparing severity, shewing himself relentless towards those who imposed on the credulity of mankind. His detestation of hypocrisy is apparent even when his laugh is loudest. Lucian introduces the Christians in his humorous description of Peregrinus Proteus, a Cynic philosopher who burned himself at the Olympic Games. The satirist treats the admiration excited by this ostentatious self-immolation with the ridicule it deserves, and gives a short biography of Peregrinus. Among the victims of the impostor were the Christians, whom Lucian describes as very simple persons liable to be deceived by worthless pretenders to sanctity. Peregrinus completely succeeded in making the Christians his dupes, and when he was imprisoned for the Faith,³ their admiration for him was unbounded. They regarded him, in Lucian's words, "as their legislator and high priest, nay they almost worshipped him as a god."

1. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, i. 68.

2. Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, x. Lucian, *Alex.*, c. 38.

3. Lucian in his amusing sketch *de Morte Peregrini* shews a very slight acquaintance with Christianity. Peregrinus' connexion with the Church was probably due to Lucian's imagination. He is called by a strange mixture of Jewish and heathen terms *προφήτης και θιασάρχης και συναγωγεύς*, and is said to have composed some of the sacred books of the Christians. A deputation from the churches of Asia waited upon Peregrinus during his imprisonment. It seems highly probable that Lucian based the story of his here's adventures as a Christian upon an account of the martyrdom of Ignatius. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol. 1., pp. 344 sq.

During the imprisonment of Peregrinus the widows and orphans of the Church visited him assiduously, and bribes were offered to his gaolers for permission to share in his imprisonment. He was attended by the clergy, who delivered religious addresses in his presence. At last, however, the Christians seem to have discovered that Peregrinus was an impostor. Lucian says that they expelled him from their society for eating something forbidden among them. Although Lucian's account of the Christian religion shews that he had only a superficial acquaintance with its doctrines, his description of their behaviour to Peregrinus is probably taken from observation. It is noteworthy that he shews no animosity in his description: in his eyes the Christians are ignorant and credulous persons, liable to be deluded by any clever charlatan.¹

Stoicism.

The teaching of Zeno of Citium (*circa* B.C. 350—258) was popular in Rome during the latter days of the Republic,² and continued to be the chief moral force in the Empire till the death of Marcus Aurelius. The proud self-sufficiency, the heroic devotion to duty inculcated by the Stoics, together with the importance attached by them to the performance of the practical obligations of life, made their doctrine very attractive to the Roman mind, and Stoicism contributed largely to the maintenance of a lofty ideal of virtue during the wildest excesses of the early days of the Empire.³ The influence for good exercised by the most eminent professors of Stoicism during the first centuries of our era, and the excellence of many of their maxims, has prompted several Christian writers to discover a connexion between the first preachers of the Gospel and the Stoics.

1. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 337 ff.

2. In B.C. 155, the Athenians sent an embassy to Rome consisting of Diogenes a Stoic philosopher, Carneades the Academic, and the Peripatetic Critolaus. Cato the Elder was so apprehensive of the influence of Greek philosophy that he insisted on the Athenian ambassadors being dismissed as soon as possible. Panaetius of Rhodes (about 180—111 B.C.) was the first Stoic philosopher to make disciples among the Roman aristocracy. Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*.

3. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. I., ch. ii., 'The Pagan Empire.' Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 289 ff.

Supposed resemblance between Stoicism and Christianity. Many Stoic precepts bear a strong if superficial resemblance to the utterances of Christians. St. Paul and Seneca present such striking analogies, that it has been conjectured that they had become acquainted during the Apostle's imprisonment in Rome.¹ The language of Seneca might be that of a Christian divine when he says: "No man is good without God." "God made the world because He is good; as the good never grudges anything good, He therefore made everything the best possible." "God has a fatherly mind towards good men and loves them stoutly; and, saith He, Let them be harassed with toils, with pains, with losses, that they may gain true strength." "A holy spirit resides in us, the guardian and observer of our good and evil deeds."² Still more devotional are the sayings of Epictetus: "The first thing to learn is that there is a God, that His knowledge pervades the whole universe, and that it extends not only to our acts, but thoughts and feelings." "To have God for our maker and father and guardian, should not that emancipate us from all sadness and from all fear?" "When you have shut your door and darkened your room say not to yourself that you are alone. God is in your room, and your attendant genius likewise. Think not that they need the light to see what you do." "What can I, an old man and a cripple, do but praise God?"³ The same religious character is exhibited, if possible in a still greater degree, in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius.

Stoic and Christian ideas irreconcilable. Similarity of phraseology, however, does not necessarily involve identity of thought. The Stoic idea of God is radically opposed to the Christian. The latter conceives of God as a Being with personal attributes dis-

1. The pretended correspondence between the Apostle and the Philosopher was current in the days of St. Jerome.

2. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, Dissertation 'St. Paul and Seneca', p. 279.

3. Quoted by Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. I., p. 260, from Arrian, *Epictetus*. Notice, however, the harsh contempt with which Epictetus speaks of women and children: Bigg, *Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, p. xii.

tinct from the universe of which He is the Creator and Ruler. When the Stoic spoke of God, he meant the soul of the universe, the animating spirit of the world. Thus the philosophers of the Porch regarded God in a totally different light from that in which Christians contemplate Him. The Hebrew idea, adopted by Christians, that God is infinitely superior to man, is quite alien to the Stoic conception of His nature. To Jew and Christian alike the idea of comparing man with God seems blasphemous. The Stoic saw nothing profane in asserting that the wise man is the equal of Zeus. To him Lucan's famous line "*Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni*"¹ contains nothing irreverent. The just man defying adverse fate appeared a nobler object than the gods themselves. Equally unintelligible to the Stoics was the warm sympathy displayed by Christians to one another. Absence of feeling was the ideal of the one; to rejoice with them that rejoice and to weep with them that weep, the duty of the other. The most famous examples of Stoicism prided themselves on their complete freedom from all natural emotions. The philosopher who, on being told that his son was dead, replied "I never thought that I had begotten an immortal," was commended as an example of manly fortitude. The sentiment of pity was considered to be a sign of weakness. The wise man, it was said, ought to imitate the gods in relieving distress without experiencing any sentiments of compassion. Compassion in the eyes of the Stoic was an abuse of clemency, as superstition is of religion. This arrogance, however, towards God and harshness towards man, which in the Stoic system of ethics occupied a place among the noblest virtues, were not more alien to the precepts of Christianity than its view of death. Nothing proves more clearly how wide a gulf separates the ideas of antiquity from those prevalent among the Christianized nations of Europe, than the view taken of suicide. In modern jurisprudence suicide is considered a crime, public opinion brands it as an act of cowardice, and the merciful verdict of a jury often attributes self-destruction to insanity. In the opinion of

1. *Pharsalia*, i. 128.

antiquity, suicide was frequently an act of sublime virtue. The death of Cato was a common subject for panegyric. Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, died by his own hand. Seneca expatiates on the power of terminating life at will as a most inestimable privilege. This frame of mind, almost incomprehensible to us, was common in antiquity. Very few remonstrances were made by ancient moralists against the practice of self-murder. The Roman law recognised the right of a man to end his life when he pleased, and imposed no posthumous disgrace on suicides. This circumstance is attributable to the view the ancients took of death. They had no idea that it could be regarded as the wages of sin. The Platonists looked upon it as the liberation of the soul from the bondage of the body; many said that it was an eternal sleep. The philosophers agreed in condemning the popular superstition that men were tormented in Tartarus.¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that the only allusions Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius² make to Christianity should express their contempt for the desire for martyrdom shewn by the believers. The rapturous hopes of a future life, as well as the joy felt by the martyrs at dying for Christ, seemed to them the height of folly and ostentation. The wise man, if he desired to retire from life, had the remedy in his own hands, and could do so quietly and without display.

Stoic virtue.

It is undeniable that the Stoic philosophy did a great work in stimulating a love of virtue in one of the darkest periods of history. It is no small glory to a philosophical School that, during the political immorality which characterised the last days of the Republic and the hideous outbreak of unbridled sensuality which marked the age of the Twelve Caesars, it should have taught men to prize

1. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. 1., p. 217: "To destroy them (these superstitions) was represented as the highest function of philosophy. Plutarch denounced them as the worst calumny against the Deity, as more pernicious than atheism....."

2. Epictetus, speaking of the fearless attitude which a wise man ought to assume towards the threats of a tyrant, says *ετρα ὑπὸ μανίας μὲν δύναται τις οὕτω διατεθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα, καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθους ὡς οἱ Παλιλαῖοι*. Arrian, *Diss.*, IV. 7, 6. Marcus Aurelius condemns the *ψιλή παράταξις* with which the Christians meet death.

integrity, self-discipline, and virtue as the highest good. At the time when the profession of virtue was regarded as a crime, Stoicism furnished its martyrs. Its principles triumphed with the accession of Nerva, and close upon a century of good government marked its victory. To the Stoics the world owes the enunciation of principles, which Christianity has at last made realities. The noble declaration that 'all men are born free' was first made by a Stoic; that slaves were capable of virtue was strongly affirmed by Seneca, and proved by Epictetus. Marcus Aurelius under the teaching of Stoicism affords one of the very few examples of despotic power exercised entirely for the benefit of mankind. In this great emperor, moreover, many of the more repulsive aspects of Stoicism were conspicuously absent. He was sincerely religious, his disposition seems to have been singularly affectionate, his self-examination in his *Meditations* shews a touching humility. This softening of the asperities of Stoicism, though partly due to the personal character of the Emperor, is to some extent attributable to the tendencies of his age. In philosophy, as in religion, eclecticism had become popular, and Marcus Aurelius was, in this respect, no exception to the rule. His Stoicism was very dissimilar to the harsh philosophy which formed the earlier ideals of Cato or of Brutus.¹

Neo-Platonism. The heartlessness of Epicureanism and the hard self-righteousness of Stoicism were being supplanted throughout the second century by more humane and religious philosophies. It must be added that the period succeeding the death of Aurelius was hardly propitious to the practical and eminently political virtues inculcated by Stoicism. From the time of Commodus to that of Diocletian political life was crushed by the licence of military despotism. The New Platonism, which maintained supremacy in the philosophical Schools from the death of Marcus Aurelius to the suppression of philosophical teaching by the bigotry of Justinian (A.D. 527), was a fusion of various philosophies and religions. It laboured to keep the influence of philosophy alive by allying it with religion, and to

1. Bigg, *Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, p. xii.

revive religion under the sanction of philosophy. In consequence of this the Neo-Platonists came into open collision with the Christians. The attitude of the philosophers of the new School towards the Church was neither that of the Epicureans, who regarded Christianity as a delusion to be ridiculed, nor that of the Stoics, to whom it was a political duty to crush a religion alike unreasonable and illegal. The Neo-Platonists saw in Christianity a rival religion, and employed the arts of the priest as well as those of the statesman to subdue it.

This is the true explanation of the persecution under Diocletian, accounting for the phenomena by which it was characterised. The refusal of the oracles to reply to the Emperor because the Christians were *tolerated*, the burning of the Christian Scriptures, the outrages on the chastity of the Christian virgins, and the other distinguishing features of this persecution, may be traced to the influence of Neo-Platonic philosophers like Hierocles and Theotecnus. The earlier persecutions had been political; the last great persecution was essentially religious. The same fanatical spirit, though restrained by the caution and, we may add, the natural humanity of the Emperor, animated Julian's attempt to suppress Christianity more than half a century later.

In Neo-Platonism the system of the later Pythagoreans was combined with the teaching of the Platonists. The Pythagorean philosophy, revived at Alexandria about B.C. 60 by P. Nigidius Figulus, was further developed by the Plato-Pythagoreans, among the most celebrated of whom were Plutarch, Galen the physician (A.D. 131—200), Celsus the opponent of Christianity, and Numenius of Apamea.¹

Between this School and the Jewish and Christian philosophers, especially those of Alexandria, there were many remarkable affinities. Philo was almost more a Platonist than a Jew; Justin Martyr in his search for truth, before he became a Christian, found partial satisfaction in the Platonic doctrines; nor does his teaching

1. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 398.

on the subject of the Logos differ materially from that of the Plato-Pythagoreans of the second century.¹ Evidence that Christianity was not entirely without influence upon some of the exponents of this philosophy is found in the 'Life of Apollonius of Tyana' composed by Philostratus at the request of Julia Domna, wife of Septimius Severus. It is obviously based on the Gospel narrative, and it seems to have been written with a desire to conciliate the Christians, and to shew under what conditions Hellenism was prepared to acknowledge our Lord. Apollonius of Tyana was a Neo-Pythagorean philosopher in the age of Nero. His biography, written by Philostratus, is a pure romance, representing the sage as a combination of the Christian Messiah and a Greek philosopher. His birth was announced by Proteus, the spirit of nature. To his mother's request to know whom she was to bear, the god replied, "Myself." At the age of sixteen the divine child's mission began; he gave away his property, and took a vow of perpetual chastity. He constantly practised all the severe asceticism of a Pythagorean recluse—dwelling in temples, especially those of Aesculapius. His desire for wisdom led him to the land of the Brahmins, from which he returned as the saviour of the Hellenic world, wandering from city to city attended by his disciples. From the heathen priests he met with continual opposition, but the common people heard him gladly. His mysterious powers were felt by the political world in the downfall both of Nero and of Domitian, and in the elevation of Vespasian and of Nerva. Hearing of the persecution of the philosophers, Apollonius visited Rome. When he was insulted and imprisoned and told by his judge to save himself by a miracle, he vanished from the tribunal and appeared to two disciples at Puteoli as they sat in the grotto of the nymphs talking of their lost master. Apollonius

1. Numenius of Apamea, for example, speaks of the first God who is pure thought (*νοῦς*) and the principle of being (*οὐσία ἀρχή*). The second God is the Creator (*ὁ δημιουργὸς θεός*). The third God is the World. He terms these three Gods respectively 'Father, Son, and Grandson.' Euseb., *Præp. Evang.*, XI. 22.

continued his work of reformation, preaching earnestly against the shedding of blood in sacrifices, the worship of images, and the cruelty of the amphitheatre. At last he was imprisoned in Crete, but the prison doors were opened, his chains were loosed, and he ascended to heaven in the company of hosts of celestial beings. The object of Philostratus appears to have been to present in his hero a life of Christ alike acceptable to Hellenic and Christian ideas.¹

If the Life of Apollonius may be considered as an *eirenicon* offered by the Plato-Pythagoreans to the Christians, the work of Celsus is a statement of their objections to the doctrine of the Church.

Celsus wrote his treatise probably in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, but it does not seem to have attracted much attention till half a century later, when a copy fell into the hands of Ambrosius of Alexandria, who asked Origen to answer its arguments. In his great work against Celsus the Christian Apologist has quoted so much of his opponent's book that we are able to obtain a good idea of its contents. The *Λόγος ἀληθής*, as Celsus' work was entitled, is of inestimable historical value, because it enables us to see in what light Christianity was regarded by the most cultivated heathens of the third century. Celsus evidently devoted much time and attention to the study of Christianity. He was familiar with the Scriptures, knew something of the internal divisions among believers, and he had made himself acquainted with the opinions of several Gnostic sects. Although his incapacity to appreciate the beauties of the religion he desires to overthrow often impels Celsus to advance palpably absurd arguments, he is sometimes a very dangerous and skilful antagonist. According to Celsus, the world is the work of the One God, who committed it to the care of the inferior gods or Daemons. The Creator has no need, like a bad workman, to correct His work, but can leave it to continue in the same perfect condition as it was when He called it into being.

1. Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 244-252. Dill-
op. cit., p. 399 ff.

The world was not made for the sake of mankind, whom he regards as only a part of the universal whole, not in many respects superior to the beasts. The soul of man is immortal, but his body is of vile and perishable material. Worship is due to the Daemons, for by honouring them we honour the Creator of all. Everything is in subjection to God; and it is derogatory to His dignity to suppose that there can be evil beings opposed to Him. Celsus regards Christianity as not only irrational but as taking an unworthy view of God, since its doctrine of Redemption presupposes an imperfection in God's creation, and the hope of resurrection implies an unworthy desire for the retention of the mortal body. The supposition that God specially desires the salvation of the human race is an undue exaltation of one small part of creation. Celsus considers that the refusal of the Christians to worship the Daemons betrays inconsistency, for it is impossible to avoid receiving benefits from them, since the very food which we eat and the air which we breathe are the gifts of the particular Daemons to whose province they are assigned. Equally incomprehensible to Celsus is the Christian doctrine of the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. He dwells on the supposed meanness of our Lord's appearance, and on the failure of His earthly career, and considers it folly to imagine that God would thus reveal Himself. Celsus is not slow to take advantage of what appear to him as weak points in the Christian scheme:—the inconsistency between the moral code of the Old Testament and that of the New; the discrepancies in the Gospels; the notion that an obscure race like the Jews were God's chosen people. His tone throughout is bitter and supercilious; he can see no merit in the Christian Faith, and treats it as a pure delusion.¹ But the care bestowed upon the refutation of Christianity by Celsus shews that he was far from underrating its power. He feels that it is destined at no long period of time to prevail. Celsus was the first of the governing classes to discern that Christianity

1. Baur, *Church History*, vol. 11., pp. 140—167. An admirable epitome of the arguments of Celsus.

was dividing Roman society, and he viewed with alarm the prospect of a large, intelligent, and ill-used class, alienated by persecution from public affairs, when the Empire needed its support. His diatribe against the Christians concludes with an earnest appeal to them to rally round the Emperor against his foes and no longer to refuse to serve the State in public offices.¹

The founder of the Neo-Platonic School² was an apostate from Christianity named Ammonius Saccas (A.D. 175—250), whose lectures Origen is said to have attended. Plotinus (A.D. 204—269), the disciple of Ammonius, was the first to develop the principles of Neo-Platonism into a system, which was subsequently revised and arranged by his pupil Porphyry (A.D. 232—304).³ Jamblichus (*died* A.D. 330) opposed Porphyry's attempt to discountenance the growing tendency to combine magical practices with philosophy, by laying great stress on the religious aspect of Neo-Platonism, which he regarded simply as a means of strengthening polytheism.⁴ Hierocles, the governor of Bithynia in the time of the persecution of Diocletian, and the Emperor Julian (A.D. 361—363), were also members of the Neo-Platonic School.

Neo-Platonism differed from the earlier systems of philosophy in its preference of the contemplative to the practical side of life. Stoicism had made active virtue its chief object; and the ancient philosophers of Greece had clearly recognised the inculcation of principles of political virtue as their most important duty. The Neo-Platonists, on the other hand, sought rather to

1. Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 254—267.

2. Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, vol. 1., pp. 126—130 (Eng. Transl., Sonnenschein). Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy* (Theol. and Philosophical Library). Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. 1., pp. 348 foll. Baur, *Church History*, vol. II., pp. 178—189. Gibbon, ch. xiii. (end).

3. Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, p. 251. Porphyry's writings against the Christians are only known from quotations in the works of Eusebius, Augustine, &c.

4. Jamblichus distinguishes between the *θεοὶ νοεροί*, *ὑπερκόσμοι*, and *ἐγκόσμοι* and the Absolute One, the *ἐνὰς ἀμέθεκτος*. Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, vol. 1., p. 248 (Eng. Transl.).

withdraw their disciples from the world than to encourage participation in the active duties of life.¹ This tendency is in part attributable to the cessation of political life in the Empire, but chiefly to the transcendental character of the Neo-Platonic conception of God. Plotinus and his followers agreed with the Christians in exalting God above the universe, and in placing Him beyond the reach of human understanding. They believed, however, that the soul, if purified from all earthly thoughts, was capable of ecstatic contemplation of the Divinity.² This condition of mind was considered attainable by self-isolation and ascetic observances, and, notwithstanding the protests of Porphyry, it was frequently sought by the practice of magic or in ceremonies of a mysterious and awe-inspiring character.³ The popular myths, which the earlier philosophers had either held up to ridicule or endeavoured to explain as due to ignorant misconceptions of natural phenomena, were regarded by the Neo-Platonists as foreshadowing the most important truths. The doctrine of Daemons, or intermediaries between God and man, was carefully maintained by this School, which in its opposition to the bolder scepticism of antiquity exalted credulity into a virtue, and degraded manly self-discipline into a means of weakening the physical power of the body in order to quicken the spiritual perceptions. The Neo-Platonists attempted to provide, by a revival of the ancient religion, a counter-attraction to Christianity. The Roman world in its desire for a faith was already almost prepared to embrace the Gospel, when this last effort to restore the influence of Hellenism was made. The Neo-Platonists borrowed without acknowledgement that which seemed most attractive in Christianity, and

1. Plotinus teaches that retirement from the whole external world is necessary for the attainment of this standpoint. Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, vol. 1., p. 244 (Eng. Trans.). Lecky, *History of European Morals*, p. 350.

2. According to Plotinus, we must believe in this illumination in which the contemplating and the contemplated become one, so that ecstasy, devotion, actual union, take the place of contemplation of another. Erdmann, *loc. cit.*

3. Porphyry's *Epistle to Anebon* is a protest against this. Rendall, *Julian*, ch. iii. Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 430 ff.

used it to galvanize the dead forms of older creeds into a semblance of life.

The philosophers of this School, especially Porphyry,¹ shewed much zeal in combating the Christian doctrines.

The line of argument adopted was more plausible than that followed by Celsus and the earlier writers against Christianity. The Neo-Platonists did not, like their predecessors, asperse the character of our Lord, but, whilst professing a great admiration for the life of Jesus, they endeavoured to shew that the teaching of the Founder of Christianity was perverted by His disciples, especially when they represent Him as an opponent of the gods of polytheism.² Porphyry, the writer most hostile to the Church and most dreaded by the Christian Fathers, applied himself to a searching examination of the Old and New Testaments. He declared the book of Daniel to be not a prophecy but an historical work composed in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes; he used the dispute between St. Peter and St. Paul, related in Galatians, ch. ii., as an argument against the credibility of the testimony of the Church, whose leaders were proved to have been guilty, the one of inconsistency, and the other of contentiousness; and he censures our Lord's visit to Jerusalem (St. John vii. 14) after His refusal to go up to the feast of tabernacles (St. John vii. 8).³ Porphyry, Jamblichus, and Hierocles agreed in blaming the exclusive reverence of the Christians for their Founder, and in claiming that in Pythagoras and Apollonius of Tyana the Deity had been manifested to the world at least as wonderfully as the Christians supposed had been the case in the life of Jesus. Jamblichus depicts Pythagoras as not only the highest ideal of wisdom but as an incarnate god. The chief hope of the Neo-Platonic revival lay in this

1. Baur, *Church History*, vol. II., p. 179. Theodoret, a Christian bishop of the fifth century, calls Porphyry ὁ ἀσπουδος ἡμῶν πολέμιος ὁ πάντων ἔχθιστος διατεθῆναι.

2. Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 182. Augustine calls them "vani Christi laudatores, et Christianæ religionis obliqui obtretratores".

3. Smith and Wace, *Dict. Christian Biog.*, Art. 'Porphyry'. Porphyry wrote fifteen books against the Christians. Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, vol. I., p. 253. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 19.

attempt.^a In a credulous and indiscriminating age, when Porphyry's criticism of Christian records had little weight, the partisans of Hellenism saw that if Christianity was to be supplanted it could only be by a system which was a counterfeit of its own. Hellenism could only succeed if a divine Pythagoras could supplant Christ, and Oriental magic take the place of the Sacraments of the Church. Neo-Platonism was a last despairing attempt to counterfeit Christianity under the name of Hellenism.

Influence of Neo-Platonism on Christianity. If in the Neo-Platonic School we see philosophy powerfully influenced by Christian ideas, the history of the Church in the fourth century shews the reflex action of Neo-Platonism upon Christianity. The same tendencies, which had caused the ancient philosophies to give way to systems in which emotional ecstasy was preferred to virtue, and the practice of bodily mortification to duty, were at work among the Christians. A growing belief in the value of the mere externals of religion, an ever-increasing credulity, and undue reverence for relics, holy places, and the like, conjoined with a preference of orthodoxy to purity of life, and of asceticism to domestic virtue, are characteristics of the age which followed the conversion of Constantine. The degeneracy of philosophy was accompanied by a corresponding decay of the nobler elements of primitive Christianity. The high ideals of St. Paul, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian in the Church have their counterparts in those of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. The great Fathers of the fourth century completely overshadowed all the representatives of the philosophy of their age, but were powerless to check its prevailing influences. Monasticism, the multiplication of religious rites, pilgrimages, and relic worship, were signs of the rapid degeneration of the lofty morality and fearless faith of the first age of Christianity.

The Christian Apologists. The difference between Christian thought in the Eastern and Western world is further illustrated by the attitude of the Fathers towards philosophy. The Orientals—Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen—were

1. Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

irresistibly attracted by the teaching of Plato, which was regarded with distrust by the teachers of the Western Church. On the other hand, the practical morality of the Stoics touched a responsive chord in the hearts of the Occidentals. Tertullian, Lactantius, and Jerome agree in praising Seneca; and the spurious correspondence between that philosopher and St. Paul attained a wide popularity in the Latin Church.¹ Herein lies the reason for the distinction between the Greek and Latin Apologists. The former made it their first object to demonstrate that Christianity is the perfect development of truths imperfectly apprehended by the sages of antiquity;² the latter, that the Faith is worthy of encouragement because of its salutary influence on mankind.

The newly discovered Apology of

Aristides. Aristides is the earliest example of a Greek Apology for Christianity. Eusebius says that when Hadrian succeeded Trajan, Quadratus presented him with a discourse about the Christians, because at this time some evil-disposed persons were trying to arouse a persecution against them. From this Apology Eusebius proceeds to quote the oft-cited passage about some of those who had been healed and even raised from the dead by our Saviour surviving to his own days. After this the historian speaks of Aristides, "a faithful man attached to our religion, who also addressed an Apology to Hadrian." "The work" he adds "is extant to this day with very many."³ The Armenian version of the Chronicle of the same writer, under the year A.D. 124 says that Aristides was a philosopher of Athens, and that his Apology and that of Quadratus "the hearer of the Apostles" were the cause of the rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus. As however the Syriac version of the Apology is addressed to Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, it has been suggested that Eusebius is in error, and that the Apology of Aristides

1. Bp. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, Dissertation 'St. Paul and Seneca'.

2. Justin Martyr, *Ap.* II. 13. ὅσα οὐκ ἐκ παλαιῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐστὶν.

3. Eusebius, *H. E.* IV. 3. Καὶ Ἀριστείδης δὲ πιστὸς ἀνὴρ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ὁρμώμενος εὐσεβείας, τῷ Κοδράτῳ παρακλησίῳ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ἀπολογία, ἐπιφωνήσας Ἀδριανῷ καταλέλοιπε. Σώζεται δὲ γε εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ πλείστοις καὶ ἡ τούτου γραφή.

belongs to neither of the visits of Hadrian to Athens in the winters of A.D. 125-26 and 129-30, but to the early days of his successor. The discovery of this Apology, or rather of what it really consisted, is due partly to the Armenian fathers of the Lazarist Monastery at Venice, who published an Armenian version with a Latin translation of the earlier chapters, which M. Renan at once pronounced to be a production of the fourth century; and partly to two Cambridge scholars, Prof. Rendel Harris and Dean Armitage Robinson. The former discovered the Syriac version of the Apology in the convent of St. Catharine on Mt. Sinai in 1889, and the latter's critical skill was by a happy accident enabled to recognise that the Greek of Aristides had been for centuries before the world in the speech put into the mouth of one of the characters in the popular Oriental Christian romance of *Barlaam and Josaphat*, frequently attributed to St. John of Damascus (eighth century), but belonging probably to an even earlier date. So widely was it known in mediaeval Europe that it had been translated into Icelandic as early as the year 1200 A.D.

The Apologist begins his address to the Emperor by stating that from natural religion he was led to believe in one God, whose attributes he describes. Mankind, he adds, is divided into four races—Barbarians, Greeks, Jews, and Christians. (In the speech in *Barlaam and Josaphat* this division is replaced by one more in accordance with Eastern ideas—worshippers of false gods, Jews, and Christians.) The errors of the Barbarians are first exposed, afterwards those of the Greeks, but a digression is made at the conclusion of the exposure of Hellenism to shew how degraded the Egyptians are in their gross forms of superstition and idolatry. The writer next remarks, "It is a matter of wonder, O King, concerning the Greeks, whereas they excel all the rest of the peoples in their manners and in their reason, how thus they have gone astray after dead idols and senseless images." The Jews are treated by Aristides with such marked tenderness as to make us think that he wrote before the breach between the Church and Synagogue was complete. They worship one God, have compassion on the poor, bury the dead, and do other things accept-

able to God and well-pleasing to men. Their chief error is that they do not really serve God, but rather the Angels. Aristides states first the belief the Christians have in one God, and secondly the purity of their lives. Their brotherly love is next described. When a Christian is poor the others fast for a day or two to get the means to relieve his necessities. The Emperor is invited to study the Christian writings and judge whether their apologist has spoken truly of them or not.¹

Tertullian's
Apology.

We are as it were transported to a different atmosphere when we peruse Tertullian's masterly defence of the Christian position. This is not an academic treatise addressed by a philosopher to an emperor of literary tastes, but a fierce polemic, written in time of persecution, to magistrates who refused to listen to a word in defence of Christianity and condemned the accused solely on their admission that they practised and refused to abandon a *religio illicita*. Without professing to give even an outline of the arguments of Tertullian's treatise, it may be well to state a few leading points in his defence of the Christian position. Tertullian is a writer with whom it is impossible always to agree, and who sometimes jars upon us: but no one, however repelled by his style, can deny his vigour, any more than he can refuse to admire the striking originality of his arguments because he is disinclined to accept them. With all his faults Tertullian is undoubtedly a writer of great genius, and his character is one of the most interesting studies in the history of the Church.

His Apology commences by shewing the absurdity of condemning the Christians on the mere assumption that they were criminals worthy of death, and the illogicality of treating them differently from all other offenders against the law. The felon is tortured to confess his crime; the Christian, to deny it. Tertullian lays great

1. Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, vol. 1., No. 1. The most interesting topics discussed in the Introduction are: The style and thought of the Apologist (p. 3); The traces of a Christian Symbol (p. 14 and p. 23); The connexion of thought between Aristides and Celsus (p. 19); as well as the discussion as to the date of the treatise.

stress on the moral value of the Christian training: the very heathen admit this. 'A good man' they say 'is Caius Seius, only that he is a Christian.' 'I am astonished' says another 'that a wise man like Lucius should become a Christian.' In many cases the hated name is given when a man's character is reformed. A more striking argument is supplied by Tertullian's statement that "no one, not even a human being, will desire to be worshipped by any man against his will". This strikes at the very root of the Pagan idea of religion being an affair of state. To the Christian the essence of religion is liberty of conscience, and this Tertullian concedes to all men. Tertullian is frequently held up as a typical bigot, but few remember to quote his noble words in favour of toleration: "Let one worship God; another Jupiter: let one raise his suppliant hands to the altar of Fides. . . . See to it whether this does not deserve the name of irreligion, to wish to take away the freedom of religion, and to forbid a choice of Gods, so that I may not worship whom I will, but be compelled to worship whom I do not will."

Like St. Paul, Tertullian believes that mankind received from God a natural enlightenment, and in the seventeenth chapter shews how men in phrases used in their common talk admit the existence of God. 'God grant,' 'I commend myself to God,' and similar expressions, are, he says, on every lip; and he adds the famous words, "*O testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae.*"¹ One of the finest examples of Tertullian's style is when he contrasts the hypocritical religious honours paid to the Emperor by the heathen with the honest prayers of the Christians for his welfare; and one of the most curious indications of the change in feeling since the Apostolic age is his assertion that the Christians pray for the Emperor because they believe that when the Roman empire comes to an end the course of this world will be ended.²

1. Tertullian, *Apol.* 17.

2. Neander in his *Antignostikus* gives an excellent summary of the *Apology*.

The Christian Apologies have an historical interest rather than a practical value for us, inasmuch as the arguments are advanced to meet objections in many respects different from those used by the opponents of Christianity at the present day. The most cogent reasons for rejecting the Gospel, in the eyes of the vast majority of the heathen public, were—not the improbability of a supernatural revelation, nor the defective character of the early records of the Church, but—the novelty of the religion, the calamities assumed to be occasioned by the abandonment of the worship of the gods of Rome, and the inferiority of our Lord to the sages and wonder-workers of antiquity. These objections are met with great power and eloquence by Tertullian, with conspicuous moderation and fairness by Minucius Felix,¹ and with much ingenuity by Arnobius and Lactantius; great stress being laid, especially by Tertullian, on the evidential value of contemporary Christian miracles.² The prophetic writings of the Old Testament were considered to demonstrate the truth of Christianity; many, Theophilus of Antioch among others, being converted by the perusal of them. But the works of the Apologists contributed but little to the propagation of Christianity in comparison with the visible effects of its influence. The purity of the lives of the early Christians, their unshaken constancy in persecution, and their active benevolence, were most effectual proofs that the new religion was destined both to supplant and to destroy all the cults of the ancient world. The stately fabric of the old heathenism, which in the first three centuries seemed impregnable, was fated to collapse before the end of the fourth, much in the same manner as the walls of the Canaanitish city fell down at the shout of conquering Israel.

1. It is a most remarkable fact that Minucius Felix makes no mention of Christ save in chapter 29, where he says “*Nam quod religioni nostrae hominem noxium et crucem eius adscribitis, longe de uicinia ueritatis erratis, qui putatis deum credi aut meruisse noxium aut potuisse terrenum. Ne ille miserabilis, cuius in homine mortali speo omnis innititur; totum enim auxilium cum extincto homine finitur.*” From this, Baehrens, his latest editor, infers that Minucius did not accept the divinity of Christ. *Praefatio*, p. xi.

2. Woodham, *Tertulliani Liber Apologeticus*, c. iii.

CHAPTER X.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

**The Church
or
The Churches.** THE question of the organization of the Christian Church in the earliest stages of its development is of great importance in view of the controversies of the present day; but before entering upon it, it is necessary to premise that it is subsidiary to one of much more permanent interest. The original conception of the nature of the Christian Church is naturally of far greater moment than the original position of its rulers; the real point at issue being not whether a fixed order of government was from the first designed for the Christian community, but whether the unity of the Church was or was not an essential part of the scheme of its Founder.¹ Either our Saviour left His followers certain precepts, for the furtherance of which societies arose throughout the Roman empire, and in process of time became fused together into what was termed the Catholic Church;² or He formed His disciples into an essentially united body, branches of which soon sprang into life on all sides. In the former case the Church is a means devised by man to hand down a revelation from God; in the latter, a Divine Institution necessary to carry on the work begun by Jesus Christ. Now the unfolding of the Messianic ideal in the New Testament entirely supports the latter view. St. Peter's confession that Jesus was the Christ implied that He was the Head of God's divine Kingdom on earth, of which the disciples were subjects. To emphasise the sanctity of this Kingdom our Lord called it His *Ecclesia*—a name applied to the congregation of ancient Israel. Of this *Ecclesia* the Twelve were not so

1. Illingworth, *Doctrine of the Trinity*, pp. 32 ff.

2. The expression ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία occurs first in Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* VIII. 2.

much rulers as spiritual ancestors, representatives not of the priestly caste in the Levitical tribe, but of the twelve patriarchs of ancient Israel. From the Apostles sprang the Christian *Ecclesia*, destined to take the place of the old chosen people as the one holy nation on earth, composed of men "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God". Thus it was that the believers called one another 'Brethren' and were styled the 'People' (*λαός*) of God and 'Holy' (*ἅγιοι*).¹ This fundamental unity of the Church as the representative of the new Israel may therefore be assumed as an historic fact. But before giving any account of the organization of the early Church, it is necessary to define three stages in its development, in order that the student may recognise in what manner different offices or rites were either called into being or modified by circumstances.

Stages in the
development of
the Church.

(1) In the days of the Apostles a Christian society naturally consisted of a very limited number of members, and in Rome and other great cities two churches may have existed in independence of one another. It has been conjectured that the Jewish and Gentile Christians frequently formed separate communities in the same town, and that these did not unite in some cases for many years.² It is hardly reasonable to expect

1. Even Harnack, who frequently speaks of 'the churches', admits that the Christians realised from the first that they belonged to the Kingdom of God, but he places this in heaven rather than on earth. "There is" he says "a holy Church on earth in so far as heaven is her destination." *Hist. of Dogma* (Engl. Transl.), vol. II., p. 73. On the word *Ecclesia* and the use of the titles 'Disciple' and 'Apostle' in the Gospel, see Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*. It is noticeable that Aristides in his *Apology* speaks of the Christians as a *γένος* of mankind, and Tertullian in the last chapter of his *Apology* says "The blood of Christians is their seed." A few of the most important illustrative passages from the New Testament are St. Matth. xvi. 16—18, St. John i. 12, 13, Gal. iv. 19, 1 Cor. iv. 15, 1 Peter ii. 9, 10, etc.

2. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 337: "This fact probably underlies the tradition that St. Peter and St. Paul were joint founders; and it may explain the discrepancies in the lists of the early bishops, which perhaps point to a double succession." Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. I., p. 463, note: "I am likewise confident that in Rome, as in Corinth, there were two communities, a Petrine and a Pauline, a Judaizing and a Hellenizing Church." See, however, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxvi.

that in these small and widely scattered churches there should have been any rigid uniformity either of organization or discipline; nor must we look for a permanent and unchangeable form of government in any particular society. The subject of outward organization naturally did not appear of paramount importance to the earliest believers, who lived in constant expectation of the second coming of our Lord. Before the Christians could feel justified in giving serious attention to the question of administration, they had to realise that the return of our Lord to this earth was to be less speedy than they had anticipated. Nevertheless a certain uniformity was inevitable, from the fact that each Christian community existed for the threefold purpose of worship, brotherly association, and care for the poor and needy.

(2) In the second stage of the development of the Church we perceive a great strengthening of the union between the different Christian communities. Two common enemies—heresy and persecution—made unity indispensable. Communication between different churches became more frequent, and with it a tendency to increased uniformity in practice as well as in faith. We have now entered upon the age of the Church's struggle with the Roman government, which is characterised by the military severity of the discipline maintained among Christians.

(3) The third stage is reached at the conversion of Constantine. The Church thenceforward became a body recognised by the State, which exacted in return a certain uniform standard of faith, government, and practice.

In the Apostolic age distinction between clergy and laity very slight.

The position of the rulers of the Church naturally varied at each of the periods above mentioned. In the first age the laity seem to have exercised almost the same powers as the clergy. The Spirit manifested Himself in almost every member of the Christian body.¹ Naturally but little emphasis was attached to official status. In a society in which all lived in constant expectation of the end of the world,

1. 1 Cor. xii. 7. Acts xix. 6.

and all might claim the primitive *charismata*, no sharp line of demarcation could exist between administrators of churches and other believers.

But we must not overlook the fact that there are from the first indications of a defined hegemony. It may be that it was our Lord's intention to found in the Apostolic order a peculiar grade. The position of the Twelve in regard to the rest of the faithful is certainly at first one of recognised superiority. They are acknowledged as leaders by their converts.¹

St. Paul perhaps claims for himself absolute independence of this primitive oligarchy, but St. Paul's was an exceptional case. This hegemony, however, loses itself in very early times in forms of government more strictly representative and of more familiar structure. As a rule the synagogue seems to have been taken as a model of a Christian community.² Even in the Acts the Church of Jerusalem has presbyters who share with the Apostles in the adjudication of momentous questions;³ it may be sitting merely as assessors, but of this there is no proof. Outside Jerusalem these Elders certainly rank highest in the official system of this early period. The conversion of Asia Minor is followed by the institution of local ecclesiastical senates, "elders in every city," appointed by Paul and Barnabas themselves. It is not difficult to recognise in these "elders" the *synagoga* of a Jewish synagogue.⁴

In Gentile churches the officers corresponding to the Elders were called Bishops (*ἐπίσκοποι*).⁵ We must be careful not to be misled by the use of this term. In later times it was restricted to the presiding Elder of a church and was considered to denote a separate order. In the apostolic age it was synonymous with presbyter,

The Church modelled on the Synagogue.

Identity of Bishops and Presbyters.

1. St. John xx. 22, 23. St. Mark iii. 14. Acts v. 12, 13; vi. 2; viii. 14.
2. St. James (ii. 2) calls the Christian meeting *συναγωγή*. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 116.

3. Acts xv. 2, 4, 22.

4. Acts xiv. 23. Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, art. 'Bishop'.

5. Acts xx. 28. Tit. i. 5—7. *I. Ep. Clement*, § 44. The view that these officers were distinct from the beginning is upheld by Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles* (Camb. Gk. Test.) pp. lvi. ff., not however with much success.

and there is no mention of a single *ἐπίσκοπος* in any church in the New Testament.¹

The Deacons. Closely connected with the Bishops were the Deacons.² This order is supposed to be derived from the seven appointed by the Apostles to assist them in the administration of the church funds. The name deacons is not employed on the occasion of the choice of the seven (though the phrase *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις* is used), and Philip, the only one of them mentioned in the later chapters of the Acts, is not called 'the deacon' but *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά*.³ From the Pastoral Epistles we gather that the deacons were subordinate to the bishops and assisted in administering the property of the churches.

Spiritual gifts. It would seem as though the presbyters or bishops and the deacons possessed administrative rather than what may be termed spiritual functions. The prophets and teachers are placed by St. Paul next to the Apostles, as men commissioned by the Holy Ghost to do the work of the ministry. It is a remarkable fact that the Apostle does not name the presbyters, bishops, or deacons when he enumerates those who have received the gifts of the Spirit, and that on both occasions⁴ he places the work of converting unbelievers and founding congregations first, and keeps the permanent government and instruction of the church in the back-ground.⁵

If we put together the details as to church administration in different parts of the world furnished by the

1. Eusebius, however, (*H. E.* III. 4,) speaks of Timothy as first bishop of Ephesus (*πρῶτος τῆν ἐπίσκοπὴν εἰληχέναι*), and Titus of the churches of Crete. See *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. 'Bishop'. Of the titles Presbyter and Bishop in the New Testament Bp. Wordsworth remarks, "But this may be fairly said, that wherever the two are differentiated the title of 'Bishop' tends to be higher, and to be limited to a single person." (*Ministry of Grace*, p. 119.)

2. Phil. i. 1. But in 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8, the *ἐπίσκοπος* is mentioned in the singular, the *διάκονοι* in the plural.

3. Acts xxi. 8. See the note on Eusebius *H. E.* II. 1, in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.

4. 1 Cor. xii. 28. Eph. iv. 11. Consistently the Acts represents Paul himself as selected with Barnabas for missionary work by the action of the Holy Spirit on certain "prophets and teachers". Acts xiii. 1, 2.

5. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, Dissertation on 'The Christian Ministry'.

New Testament and other early Christian writings, we shall probably be inclined to conclude that rigid uniformity of government was not observed; but the scantiness of the material at our command must make us cautious of drawing hastily any elaborate inferences in this matter, especially those of a negative character.

Jerusalem; In the Church of Jerusalem we find apostles, elder brethren,¹ the seven,² and St. James the Lord's brother as president in a position almost corresponding to that of the bishop in a later age. Here the episcopal system might seem to be in force.³

Corinth; At Corinth, on the other hand, a government of quite different type is suggested. In the two Epistles to the Corinthians no local church officer is mentioned. The whole church is ordered by St. Paul to assemble to excommunicate an offending member.⁴ At their meetings to eat the Lord's Supper there is no allusion to any officials or clergy. The spiritual gifts have been bestowed on all. The gifts of 'prophesying', 'tongues', 'interpretation of tongues', etc., mentioned as distributed in the Church are plainly unconnected with any official system.⁵

Philippi; At Philippi the "saints" are saluted with "the bishops and deacons".⁶ At Ephesus, as we understand from the Pastoral Epistles, there was a somewhat elaborate organization — bishops, deacons, church-widows, and 'aged men' (*πρεσβύτεροι*), some of whom laboured in the word and teaching.⁷ The encyclical Epistle, however, which in after times was associated closely with the name of Ephesus, makes no allusion to these functionaries. On the other hand we have here, besides the familiar 'apostles', 'prophets', 'teachers', the unusual nomenclature 'pastors', 'evangelists'.⁸

1. Acts xv. 22, 23.

2. Acts vi. 3; xxi. 8.

3. The list of the early bishops of Jerusalem is not reliable. *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July, 1901. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that the early Christians of Syria, like the first Mahomedans, desired to place a representative of the Founder's family at their head.

4. I Cor. v. 4.

5. I Cor. xiv. 26 foll.

6. Phil. i. 1.

7. I Tim. iii., v.

8. Eph. ii. 20; iv. 11.

Roma. In the Epistle to the Romans nothing is said of the organization of their church, although in speaking of the *charismata* of the Spirit, St. Paul enumerates 'prophecy', 'ministration', 'he that teacheth', 'he that imparteth', and 'he that presideth'.¹ We have in this epistle an allusion to Phoebe the deaconess of Cenchreae,² shewing that the administration of females was fully recognised.

In the treatise known as the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles', the prophets are the most important persons in the Church. They alone may 'give thanks' at the Eucharist 'as they will',³ *i.e.* unfettered by the formularies, also cited. Itinerant preachers are here termed by the honourable name of apostles. An apostle is only allowed to remain one day, or if need be two; and if he remains three, he is to be deemed a false prophet.⁴ He is on no account to ask for money. Prophets and teachers are however to be supported by the church, if they wish to settle in any particular spot.⁵ The Christians are also to elect as bishops and deacons "men meek and not loving money, and truthful and approved: for unto you do they minister the ministry of the prophets and teachers, ... they are they which are set in honour among you with the prophets and teachers."⁶ This remarkable work bears no address, but there is some ground for supposing that its first readers belonged to an Egyptian community, who had passed through Judaism to Christianity.

St. Clement of Rome. In the one authentic letter of St. Clement of Rome, written about A.D. 96, we find a more pronounced distinction between

1. Rom. xii. 6-8.

2. Rom. xvi. 1.

3. *Didaché*, c. x.: τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπίτρεπε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.

4. *Ib.*, c. xi.: πᾶς δὲ ἀπόστολος ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς δεχθήτω ὡς Κόριος· οὐ μείνει δὲ εἰ μὴ ἡμέραν μίαν· ἐὰν δὲ ᾖ χρεία, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· τρεῖς δὲ ἐὰν μείνῃ, ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστίν.

5. *Ib.*, c. xiii.: πᾶς δὲ προφήτης ἀληθινὸς θέλων καθῆσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀξίος ἐστίν τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ. ὡσαύτως διδάσκαλος . . .

6. *Ib.*, c. xv. Br. Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace*, p. 16) says of the 'Teaching': "The most noticeable feature...is the continuance of a charismatic and itinerant ministry of 'Prophets' and 'Apostles' side by side with a settled ministry of 'Bishops' and 'Deacons'."

clergy and laity. The spiritual *charismata* are no longer prominent. It is, however, worthy of notice that though St. Clement writes in the name of the church of Rome he nowhere speaks of himself as its bishop. Clement's account of the Apostolic origin of church government is as follows: "The Apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both therefore came of the will of God in the appointed order. Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the Word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town they appointed their first-fruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe. And this they did in no new fashion; for indeed it had been written concerning bishops and deacons from very ancient times; for thus saith the Scripture in a certain place, 'I will appoint their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith'."¹ (Isa. lx. 17, LXX.) He further warns the Corinthians, "It will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblameably and holily. Blessed are those presbyters who have gone before, seeing that their departure was fruitful and ripe; for they have no fear lest anyone should remove them from their appointed place."² The above passages make it impossible to question the existence of a clerical order in the Church at a very early date.³ We have not, however, reached the period of church-government by a single bishop, although the office already existed in name. In the New Testament the word *ἐπίσκοπος*

1. Bp. Lightfoot's translation of *Clement Ep. I.*, c. 42.

2. *Ib.*, c. 44.

3. Dr. Wordsworth (Bp. of Salisbury), *Ministry of Grace*, p. 119. For two very different views of this passage of St. Clement see Dr. Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood*, and Canon Henson's vigorous attack on this work in a book of sermons entitled *Godly Union and Concord*.

is never used in the singular except in the Pastoral Epistles, where the context forbids us to assume that there was only one bishop in a church. We may now try to trace the steps by which government by a single bishop attained universal prevalence.

In the early days of Christianity the churches were institutions existing for the purposes of charity, instruction, discipline, and worship. In many respects they resembled the numerous societies existing at this time throughout the Empire. When the government of Rome became a world-wide despotism, the ancient distinctions of rank and nationality gradually made way for the broader division of mankind into rich and poor. As local patriotism disappeared there arose an universal tendency in men towards combining together in various clubs and societies, in which the common worship of some deity together with meeting at certain regular intervals formed the bond of union.¹ It is a remarkable fact that in some cases the president of an ἔρανος was called the ἐπίσκοπος and its assembly the ἐκκλησία. Although between the Christian bishop and the chief officers of the heathen guilds there were many essential points of difference, the administrative duties of both included the management of the funds of their respective societies.²

1. The Abbé Pilet (*Histoire de Sainte Perpétue*) refers to de Rossi (*Roma Sotteranea*) to shew how "the infant Church profited by the Roman laws about clubs (ἐταίρια) or associations of the poor (tenuiores) formed especially to secure an honourable burial for their members".

2. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*. Bp. Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol I. Renan, *Les Apôtres*. Dr. A. Robinson says in his article 'Bishop' in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, "The theory that the Christian ἐπίσκοπος derived his title and functions from those of the officers of the Greek guilds or municipalities has not been established." Bp. Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace*, p. 120) thinks that "probably Dr. Hatch is right". He remarks however that this need not lessen the spiritual conception of the Bishop's office. "His treasury was in fact God. . . This thought is well put in the *Didascalia* (ed. Lagarde, II. 27, p. 260): 'It is right that you should make your oblation to the Bishop either in person or through the Deacons: for he knows who are afflicted and gives to each according to what is suitable, so that it will not happen that one should receive several times the same day. . . and others not at all.'" For clubs and societies in the Empire see Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 254. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.*, cap. xxxviii.

The property of a Christian church was in many cases considerable. In the church of Rome by the middle of the second century no less than forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, and more than fifteen hundred widows and poor persons, were supported by the faithful.¹ The duty of managing the funds necessary for so complex an organization fell to the bishop, who naturally required the assistance of others. This was supplied by deacons, often, as at Rome, numbering seven, in memory of the seven appointed by the Apostles.² The senior in age, standing, or ability, among the deacons was called the archdeacon, who was styled somewhat later 'the eye of the bishop', and who often succeeded him in office.

The Christian Church had however higher functions than the distribution of charitable funds. The instruction both of those who desired to become Christians and also of the faithful, was necessarily an important duty. As in early days a high value was set upon the traditions of the Church,³ age was a great qualification for a teacher. Hence the older Christians in each community were its recognised instructors. The Pastoral Epistles direct that double honour is to be paid to the presbyters who labour in the word and doctrine. The presbyter or bishop (for the offices are as yet identical) is to be διδακτικός, 'apt to teach'.⁴

Even in the days of the Apostles it was necessary that offenders should be punished by exclusion from the Church. It appears that in some instances the whole body of believers assembled for this purpose,⁵ but the duty of judging and punishing offenders soon devolved upon a few of

1. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 43.

2. Duchesne, *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution*, p. 344.

3. On the value attached to tradition see *Iren.*, *Haer.* III., c. 3.

4. 1 Tim. v. 17, iii. 2.

5. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5.

the senior and more influential of the brethren. The Church, like the Synagogue, had her own tribunal.

Worship. In the earliest days of the Church it is probable that the prophets took a prominent position in directing the worship of the Christians, but their place was soon occupied by the chief officials in each community. As the brethren brought their weekly contributions for the maintenance of the church, it was natural that the bishop and his deacons, who received them, should take an important part in the services of the day.¹

From the foregoing remarks it may be seen that all things were tending to raise some one individual to fill the highest place in each church. The man to whom the control of the property of the community had been entrusted would doubtless be one of the presbyters, and would soon be recognised as the representative and head of his church. That this was the case can be proved by instituting a comparison between Justin Martyr's account of a Christian service (A.D. 138 or 139), and the so-called Clementine Liturgy of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. This liturgy belongs to the age of persecution, since it contains a special prayer for the persecuting emperors, and is probably not later than the middle of the third century. Justin speaks of a president at the celebration of the Eucharist, but does not say definitely whether he means the bishop or not. But the Clementine Liturgy assigns the duty of presiding to the bishop, though it distinguishes him by the title of the elected bishop. He is also called chief priest (*ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*), a title applied in the earlier *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* to the 'prophets'. With the presidency at the Eucharist the bishop also took upon himself the right of public teaching, and in some churches he alone was allowed to preach. The peculiar circumstances of the second century combined to increase the importance of the bishop in the churches throughout the world. And it is possible that the law by which every corporate body was required to have an 'actor' or representative may

1. Hammond, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, p. 41.

have helped to make episcopacy universal in the Empire.¹

Second Period:
Closer union of
different churches
in the face of
persecution and
heresy;

The Christians began at an early date to realise that their very existence depended greatly on the completeness of their organization. Persecution convinced them of the necessity of presenting an undivided front to the world without, and the prevalence of heresy shewed the need of checking all unauthorised teaching within. It is possible that St. John had sought to strengthen the churches of Asia Minor against this two-fold danger by making the bishop the chief ruler of every Christian society. Ignatius' ardent exhortations to obey the bishops and their presbyters were no doubt due to his conviction that the great hope of the Church lay in the readiness of her members to act in concert with their leaders. Seen in this light, his very forcible language on the subject of obedience to the rulers of the Church finds justification in the seriousness of the crisis.² It should, however, be borne in mind that in Ignatius the bishop is head of what now would be termed a parish rather than of a diocese.

**Causes of the
universality of
episcopacy by end
of second century;
Intercommunion;**

When Ignatius wrote³ his epistles to the churches of Asia the institution of episcopal government was unquestionably firmly established among the Christians of that province. But it is not so easy to *prove* that this was already the case in all parts of the world. As, however, by the year 180 A.D. every church had its bishop, it may be useful to examine the causes of this uniformity. When persecution was raging in any particular church the believers needed the support and sympathy of others in their trials.

1. Wordsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 120. Duchesne (*Origines du Culte Chr.*, p. 8) quotes Gaius in the *Digest*, III. 4. 1.

2. See especially *Eph.* iv., *Magn.* vii. προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τύπον θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τύπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Magn.* vi.

3. We assume on the authority of Bp. Lightfoot the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles; but see *supra*, p. 115, note 6.

The Christians of Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, for example, sent an account of their sufferings to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia. (A.D. 177.) Again, when the immediate disciples of the Apostles had passed away and false teachers were claiming Apostolic authority in support of their doctrines, the churches communicated with one another to enquire whether their traditions were in correspondence, or to convey warnings of the coming of some corrupter of the Truth. Thus, when the Montanists obtained a footing at Rome, Praxeas, an Asiatic, warned the bishop that they had been excommunicated in his country, and procured their condemnation.¹ In like manner, the question as to the correct date for the observance of Easter brought Polycarp to Rome to discuss the matter with Anicetus.² (A.D. 154.) This constant inter-communication between the most distant members of the Christian body would tend to the adoption of a uniform system of government, even if other circumstances had not contributed to make the episcopate almost a necessity in every church.

Hospitality. The practice of hospitality, in our days regarded as a pleasurable luxury, was an indispensable duty among the early Christians. When a believer entered a strange city he enquired for the Christian bishop, and the welcome accorded by him was the new-comer's passport in the local fraternity.³ But as the Church increased in numbers, impostors were frequently in the habit of presuming upon the credulity of the Christians. To prevent this, it was customary for genuine Christians to travel with a certificate signed by the bishop as the representative of their church. In this way great influence was acquired by the bishop, who, by simply

1. Praxeas himself fell into heresy. Tertullian's scathing criticism of the part Praxeas took in expelling the Montanists is not wholly undeserved: "Itaque duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit, prophetiam expulit et haeresim intulit, Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit."—*Adv. Praxeam*, i.

2. Irenaeus' letter to Victor, quoted in Euseb., *H. E.* v. 24.

3. Even in the Pastoral Epistles it is said that a bishop must be φιλόξενος. 1 Tim. iii. 2. Titus i. 8.

refusing to grant 'letters of commendation',¹ as they were called, could exclude a man from Christian fellowship in every part of the world.

Councils. When it became the custom to hold councils to which the churches sent representatives, a further impetus was given to the growth of the episcopal form of government. The Christians soon came to regard their representatives at the Councils of the universal Church as their natural leaders.

It will be observed that the growth of a uniform system of church government by bishops, priests and deacons, was the work alike of time and of circumstances. In the Apostolic age the terms bishop and presbyter meant practically the same, and there was much variety in the way in which different churches were organized. In the next generation the Christians in Asia were certainly governed by bishops, assisted in spiritual matters by presbyters and in temporal by deacons; a system which was rapidly adopted elsewhere. By the end of the second century the episcopate was everywhere established. Called into being chiefly in order to provide for organization and discipline, the presbyters or bishops soon found spiritual functions devolving upon them as well. As the manifestations of the *charismata* disappear, they become exclusively responsible for the leadership of the spiritual exercises of their people. The firm establishment of a defined clerical order both attested and assisted the aim of the Christian Church to attain a permanent footing in the Empire.

St. Cyprian and church organization. Although we are in this chapter dealing properly with the origins of ecclesiastical institutions, it may not be out of place to sketch briefly the organization of the African Church in the middle of the third century and the views of Cyprian on the subject. The great bishop must have built his theories on what was generally acknowledged to be the ancient constitution of the Christian Church, and his talent for organization must have been exercised on existing materials. That Cyprian increased the dignity of the clerical office in the eyes of all Christians

1. *Litterae communicatoriae, ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαί.*

is undeniable, but neither the episcopal rights and powers nor the conception of a Catholic Church were invented by him. He merely demonstrated the necessity of the former, and the practical reality of the latter.

According to Cyprian every congregation under a bishop is an 'Israel' in itself, and the parallelism is worked out with the most minute exactitude. The title '*sacerdos*' is applied not to the presbyters but to the bishop, who is the representative of the 'priests' of the Old Covenant. The presbyters as the successors of the Levites live on the offerings of the people, exempt from worldly cares. The doctrine of the Apostolic succession is expressly declared. When Matthias was ordained he was made a 'bishop', and every bishop, by the source from which he derives his office, is 'the apostle of his flock'. The bishop is also judge of his people, and in this he is Christ's vicegerent. Those who disobey him are guilty of the sin of Korah, since all the laws upholding the authority of Aaron were intended ultimately to apply to the Christian episcopate.¹ This theory of the Christian Hierarchy, so far from being developed by Cyprian in the course of his struggle to maintain the discipline of the church of Carthage, is propounded in the earliest of his epistles written as bishop of Carthage. The African theory of church government in the third century as unfolded by him has been described by the late Archbishop Benson as "a legitimate development of the principles of the Apostolic Church, parallel with and analogous to the growing light on cardinal doctrines, which similarly nothing but use could illustrate".

Cyprian enumerates three requisites of a regular episcopate, and he adds that in Africa these were regarded as essentials: (i) the choice of the bishops of the province assembled at the vacant see, (ii) the presence and support of the Plebs, and (iii) the judgment of God. What is meant by the last-named is uncertain; it may be that the very fact of a man being thus made a bishop is regarded as a judgment of God that he was worthy.

1. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxi. 8. See also *Apost. Const.* viii., sec. ii. In the prayer for the bishop about to be consecrated, the high priests of the Old Covenant, Melchizedek, Aaron, &c., are especially mentioned.

Although at this very time the Roman presbyters during the sixteen months vacancy of the see, after the martyrdom of Fabian, seem to have naturally undertaken the administrative work which would otherwise have fallen to the bishop, in Cyprian's writings the presbyters have no powers nor rights comparable to those of the episcopate. It is the bishops who meet for the government of the church, and the presbyters in common with the laity have merely the right of signifying their approval when the bishop is elected by his comprovincials. The deacons at this time, at Rome, where in accordance with Apostolic practice there were but seven, were, alike from their limited number and responsible financial duties, very prominent officials. To their care the bishop, Fabian, the contemporary of Cyprian, assigned the fourteen regions of the city. At Carthage the importance of this order is attested by the influence exercised by Felicissimus, and by the fact that they were styled 'the third priesthood'.¹

Controversies
about the power
of the clergy:
Montanism;
Novatianism;
Origen.

The inherent dignity of the clerical status was not established without several contests. The first, Montanism, turned on the nature of the spiritual gifts. The second, Novatianism, on the admission of penitents. The third, associated with the great name of Origen, affected the right of persons not ordained to teach in the Church.

Montanism arose in Phrygia among the followers of a certain Montanus, who claimed a transcendent inspiration as a prophet.² (A.D. 130.) Montanus is alleged to have taught that the age of the Spirit had come, and

1. See the late Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian: his Life, his Times, his Work*. For Cyprian's view of the episcopate, p. 31 foll.; for the constitutional position of the presbyterate, p. 323 foll.; for the deacons at Rome, p. 67; for Felicissimus, p. 114 foll. Cyprian's 67th epistle (ed. Hartel) is particularly referred to on p. 35 foll. The points of difference between the Cyprianic view of a bishop and the modern idea are brought into contrast.

2. Eusebius (*H. E.* IV. 27, V. 14) dates the rise of Montanism about A.D. 182; Epiphanius, A.D. 135 and 157; the *Chronicon Paschale*, A.D. 182. M. de Soyres, in his *Essay on Montanism*, thinks Montanus began to preach A.D. 130. I am greatly indebted to this *Essay* for many valuable hints on the subject of Montanism.

that Christ's promises about the Paraclete were fulfilled in himself. Two prophetesses, Prisca and Maximilla, left their husbands to follow him, and prophesied to the great edification of the Phrygians. The Catholic bishops of Asia considered them to be possessed by evil spirits, and tried to exorcise them, but this was not permitted by the Montanists. The fanaticism spread, and many of the more ardent Christians embraced the doctrine of the new dispensation of the Spirit. The Lyonnese martyrs wrote from their prison to beseech the bishop of Rome not to quench the Spirit by undue severity to the Montanists. (A.D. 177.) In Africa, Tertullian embraced the new opinions; and it has been asserted that the famous martyrs, Perpetua, Felicitas and their companions, were among those who held Montanist views.

Montanism appears to have been embraced in Rome and Carthage by a party which was opposed to the growing power of the clergy. In recognising the right of their so-called prophets to take a position in the Church above the bishops, the followers of Montanus endeavoured to restore what they imagined to be a feature of the Apostolic age, by making authority yield to spiritual illumination. They resembled the Quakers in their refusal to recognise that any spiritual gifts are conferred by ordination, and in seeking the guidance of direct inspiration on all occasions. Their doctrine, that those who had committed deadly sin could not be restored to the visible Church by any human authority, was in conflict with the claim made by the Catholic clergy to re-admit to Christian communion those who had fallen.¹ Their condemnation of all pleasure and amusement, as well as of second marriages, proves that they aimed at the ideal of a Puritan Church, and a more exclusive

1. For the views of a Montanist on the subject of Church discipline see Tertullian's *De Pudicitia*. The best side of this primitive Puritanism is seen in the visions of Perpetua and Felicitas recorded in the *Acts* of their Martyrdom, recently edited by Prof. Rendel Harris. The Abbé Pillet (*Hist. de Ste. Perpétue*, p. 54) vigorously defends Perpetua and Felicitas against the charge of Montanism. Mgr. Freppel in his *Tertullian* suggests that the author of the *Acta* was a Montanist. The question is decided by the Abbé on purely *à priori* grounds: "l'Eglise est infallible dans ses jugements, qui ont pour objet la canonisation des saints."

Christianity. The subsequent triumph of the bishops and clergy was in this case the triumph of a wider conception of the nature of the Church.

Novatianism. Novatianism was the result of a series of struggles in Rome and Carthage, which are related in another chapter.¹ It culminated in the election of Novatianus to the Roman see in opposition to Cornelius. (A.D. 251.) The Novatians denied the power of the Church to re-admit grievous sinners, but in other respects they were scrupulously orthodox.

The case of Origen and Demetrius. At Alexandria the question assumed a very different form. It is characteristic of the two churches that at Rome the right to rule and at Alexandria the right to teach was the source of the dispute. Origen was the greatest scholar in the Church of the third century. His lectures were attended by multitudes, and his Scriptural studies were the marvel of his age. But he was a layman, and by an act of youthful fanaticism had rendered himself ineligible for holy orders. Demetrius, the Alexandrian bishop, no doubt jealous of Origen's fame and possibly also suspicious of his orthodoxy, acted with so great animosity that Origen was forced to leave the city. He allowed his friends, the Palestinian bishops, to ordain him a presbyter, and returned to Alexandria. (A.D. 231.) Demetrius drove him from the city, and he was not allowed to return, even after the accession of his friend and pupil Heraclas to the episcopate; nor did his successor Dionysius, though he greatly admired Origen, reverse the act of Demetrius.

Election and Ordination. As a rule the whole fraternity of every church elected the bishop, the presbyters, and other inferior ministers.² In some instances, however, the clergy are found nominating the candidates for offices in the Church, and the people

1. Chap. XI.

2. The subject of election in the early Church is beset with difficulties. In the election of the seven deacons the people chose them and the Apostles gave them their office. (Acts vi. 3—6.) See the late Dr. Hatch's article on 'Ordination' in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

confirming their choice.¹ It seems unquestionable that the bishop presided at all ordinations and usually at baptisms.² But it has been debated whether in the earliest days the bishop entered office by virtue of a consecration, or whether he exercised his function *ex officio* as president of the presbyteral college. It must not be forgotten that many, even Roman Catholic writers, consider that there is still no inherent superiority of a bishop over a presbyter, but that both are members of the same order. To this day in the Roman Catholic Church the three chief orders in the ministry are not Bishops, Priests and Deacons, but Priests, Deacons and Subdeacons.³ Yet where we have record of any consecration in the early period the newly-elected bishop receives it from the bishops of the province. With one doubtful exception we find no single case of a bishop being consecrated by presbyters.⁴ There was no necessity for a man to pass through all the lower offices before attaining the priesthood or even the episcopate.⁵ Nevertheless it was considered highly desirable that ministers

1. Sometimes the reverse was the case, and the right of approval of the popular choice rested with the bishop or with the clergy. From Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians*, c. 44, it seems that after the first appointment of ministers by the Apostles, the people assented to the choice made by men of repute (ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης).

2. Ignatius *ad Smyrn.*, c. 8: οὐκ ἔξω ἐστὶν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, οὐτε βαπτίζειν, οὐτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν.

3. The Rev. J. J. Lias, in an article in the *Theological Monthly*, Feb. 1890, quotes Morinus *de Sacris Ordinationibus*. The majority of the Schoolmen were of opinion that "Episcopatum per se nihil aliud dicere quam officium, dignitatem, potestatem, auctoritatem sacerdoti datam multo ampliore et augustiore per consecrationem."

4. Bingham (*Antiq.*, bk. II., ch. iii., § 5) says that some quote Jerome (Ep. 85, *Ad Evagr.*) to prove that the presbyters of Alexandria ordained their own bishop to the time of Heraclas and Dionysius, but he thinks (perhaps rightly) that Jerome only refers to the election and not to the consecration of the bishop. But see also Bp. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, pp. 135 ff., who considers that both at Rome and Alexandria "there were at first only two orders, the governing order acting normally as a corporate body or college". (p. 142.)

5. The case of Cyprian is an example of promotion from a layman to the priesthood without passing through the diaconate. Ambrose was elected bishop of Milan before he was even baptized. Wordsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

in the Church should work their way upwards to higher positions, and promotions *per saltum* were looked upon with disfavour. Such ordinations were forbidden in the Eastern Church at the Council of Sardica (A.D. 343); but the practice continued in the Latin Church till the ninth century.¹

Converts and Tests. In the earliest days of the Faith a convert was sometimes admitted to the full privileges of a Christian without any previous probation. All that was required before baptism was a belief in Christ;² nor is there any mention in the New Testament of a period of instruction preceding the administration of the rite of Baptism.³ When, however, the Church became a more organized society, it was considered advisable that those who desired to become Christians should submit to a course of preparation before being finally enrolled as members of the Church. This period of instruction and probation naturally varied in different churches, and sometimes extended over three years.⁴

Catechumens. A person who desired to become a Christian was asked in the assembly of the church from what motives he made the request. He was further examined as to his calling in life. If he practised an unlawful profession, he was told that he

1. See the evidence quoted in the *Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliæ*, c. XIII., note 2. In Rome it was customary to ordain subdeacons intended for the priesthood, deacons, and priests, at the same service. (Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 355, Engl. Trans.)

2. Acts viii. 37. The confession of the eunuch of Candace to Philip is not found in the best MSS. It is, however, a very ancient Western addition. Rom. x. 10, *στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν* may imply a public baptismal confession.

3. In the Acts the following are said to have been baptized: The converts on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 41. The Samaritans who believed Philip's preaching, Acts viii. 12. Simon Magus, Acts viii. 13. The eunuch of Candace, Acts viii. 38. St. Paul, Acts ix. 18. Cornelius and his companions, Acts x. 47, 48. Lydia and her household, Acts xvi. 15. The jailor at Philippi and his household, Acts xvi. 33. Crispus with all his house, and many of the Corinthians, Acts xviii. 8. The disciples of the Baptist at Ephesus, Acts xix. 5.

4. The *Council of Elvira*, canon 42, fixes two years as the period for a person to remain a Catechumen. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (VIII., c. 47) make it three years.

must either abandon it,¹ or give up all idea of being accepted. If all seemed satisfactory he was admitted by the imposition of hands to the rank of a Catechumen. It has been inferred that there were no less than four orders of Catechumens: those who were instructed privately outside the church; the 'Hearers', who were permitted to listen to sermons and the reading of the Scriptures; the 'Kneelers', who were allowed to remain till the prayer for the Catechumens; and lastly the 'Competentes', or the immediate candidates for Baptism.² This somewhat complicated system of classification does not seem to have been generally received, and the Catechumens were usually divided into two great classes, the 'Audientes' and the 'Competentes'.

Those who had been received as Catechumens were committed to the charge of the Catechist, an officer of the church, not necessarily in holy orders. The unity of God and His relation to the world was the first doctrine on which the Catechist insisted, then followed instruction as to the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. Morality, the duty towards God and man, and the importance of purity of life, were next inculcated. The reading of Scripture by the Catechumens was encouraged, and in some churches a course of Scriptural study was prescribed. Athanasius says that the books read by the Catechumens were the *Teaching of the Apostles* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*.³ From Bede we gather that the Catechumens of more ancient times were expected to be able to repeat portions of the four Gospels from memory.⁴

The 'Disciplina Aroani'. During the period of instruction, the Catechumens learned that there were secrets which were only committed to the baptized.

1. All callings which encouraged immorality, idolatry, or theatrical or gladiatorial exhibitions, were considered unlawful. *Const. Eccl. Egypt.*, in Bunsen's *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*.

2. Bingham, *Antiq.*, bk. x., ch. ii. Duchesne, *Christian Origins*, p. 292, Engl. Trans.

3. Bingham, *op. cit.*, bk. x., ch. i., § 7.

4. "Pulcher in ipsa ecclesia mos antiquitus inolevit, ut his, qui catechizandi, et Christianis sunt sacramentis initiandi, quatuor evangeliorum principia recitentur." Beda, *De Tab.*, lib. 2. Quoted by Bingham, *loc. cit.*

Every time they were present at a service they were reminded, by their dismissal before the most solemn rites were celebrated, that there were mysteries known to none but Christians. During the last weeks of preparation they received instruction in some of the secrets of the Faith. The doctrine of the Trinity, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, were taught during the forty days before baptism, the last-named, according to St. Augustine, being only communicated a week before the administration of that Sacrament.¹

Baptism. It is an unquestionable fact that, from the very first, baptism was considered absolutely necessary for every person who entered the Christian community. Even St. Paul's miraculous conversion did not dispense with the obligation to be baptized. The only instance of unbaptized persons being regarded as Christians was that of Catechumens who had suffered martyrdom. In the language of the Church, these were 'baptized in their own blood'. The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* gives the following directions as to the administration of this Sacrament: "But concerning Baptism, baptize thus: having said beforehand all these things, baptize ye in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in living water. But if thou hast not living water, baptize in the other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou have not either, pour water thrice upon the head in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."²

Administration of Baptism. The ceremony of Baptism was far more solemn in the primitive Church than it is at the present day, and abounded in beautiful symbolism. Justin Martyr in his first *Apology* gives a description of a very simple rite;³ but Tertullian,

1. *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, art. 'Disciplina Arcani', vol. i., p. 565a. Only baptized persons were allowed to use the Lord's Prayer, which St. Chrysostom calls the εὐχὴ πιστῶν, because only believers could properly call God their Father. St. Augustine (*De Symbolo*, I. 16) asks "Quomodo dicunt 'Pater noster' qui nondum nati sunt?"

2. *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, c. vii. Notice that the practice of aspersion is allowed as an alternative to immersion.

3. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. 61, 65, 67.

fifty years later, supplies a more detailed account. The seasons for Baptism were Easter and Pentecost, but he adds "Every day is the Lord's, every hour, every time is suitable for Baptism: if (the day) adds to its solemnity, it makes no difference to its validity."¹ The candidates for Baptism prepared for their admission to full Christian privileges by prayer and fasting, and made open confession of their sins. Then followed a solemn renunciation of the devil, his pomp and his angels. After this the Catechumens were conducted to the water and were questioned as to their faith as they stood ready for baptism; they were thrice immersed. After the ceremony it was customary for the bishop to anoint the newly-baptized with oil and to lay his hands on them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. The Eucharist was celebrated, and in some instances those who had been baptized partook of a mixture of milk and honey as a sign that they had now entered the Promised Land.² Although infant baptism existed from the first,³ the majority of Christians in the second century doubtless entered the Church as adults; and consequently everything was done to make the baptismal ceremony as impressive as possible.

The Eucharist. The Eucharist, for by this name the primitive Christians usually designated the sacred act⁴ which our Saviour commanded His

1. *De Baptismo*, c. 20. "Caeterum omnis dies Domini est, omnis hora, omne tempus habile baptismo est: si de solemnitate interest, de gratia nihil refert."

2. Tertullian, *De Corona Militis*, c. 3; "Dehinc ter mergitatur amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam praegustamus."

3. Although the baptism of infants is nowhere mentioned in the New Testament, it may be inferred that the practice was not unknown from the fact that the Jews baptized infant proselytes. The custom is nowhere condemned by our Lord or His Apostles. St. Paul regarded the children of believers as ἄγιοι and therefore presumably eligible for baptism. (1 Cor. vii. 14.) The testimony of Irenaeus is the earliest direct evidence in favour of infant baptism. (*Haer.*, bk. 11., c. 39.) Tertullian was opposed to infant baptism, but this was due no doubt to his Montanistic view of the impossibility of post-baptismal sin being pardoned. "If men understand the grave responsibility of Baptism," he says, "they will fear its acceptance more than its postponement." (*De Baptismo*, c. 20.)

4. So the *Didache* says *περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε*, and Justin Martyr in his second *Apology* calls the Bread and Wine *εὐχαριστία*.

disciples to repeat in memory of Him, has always been regarded with the deepest reverence. This Sacrament, instituted on the most solemn night of our Lord's earthly ministry, was from the first regularly repeated by His grateful disciples. The 'Breaking of Bread' is mentioned amongst the most important religious duties of the Church at Jerusalem.¹ When St. Paul preached to the believers at Troas, they had assembled by night to break bread on the first day of the week.² The Corinthians were taught by the Apostle that the loaf which they broke was the Communion of the Body of Christ, and the cup which they blessed was the Communion of His Blood.³ This Sacrament seems to have been so natural a part of a Christian's life that the writers of the New Testament seldom allude to it. In the Gospel according to St. John its institution is not so much as mentioned, though the existence of the Sacrament is considered by some to be assumed by the Evangelist to have been known by his readers. This circumstance, added to a natural reticence on so sacred a mystery, accounts also for the comparatively meagre statements on this subject in the writings of the ante-Nicene Fathers.⁴

The Agape. The difficulty of defining exactly the character of the Eucharistic Service in the age of the Apostles is enhanced by the fact that it was either preceded or followed by a meal called the Agape; which, however, in the second century was not considered to be an integral part of the Sacrament.⁵ As Waterland very properly points out, it is doubtful if St. Paul means the Eucharist or the Agape by the term 'Lord's Supper',⁶ and whether the Sacrament is not always spoken of in the New Testament as the 'Breaking of Bread'. If it appears repugnant to our modern ideas as to the reverence with which this Sacrament should be regarded, that it should have

1. Acts ii. 42, 46. 2. Acts xx. 7, 11. 3. 1 Cor. x. 16.

4. For Patristic testimony on the Eucharist, see Hebert's *The Lord's Supper: Uninspired Teaching*.

5. Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 39. Clement Alex., *Paedag.* ii. 1, 4.

6. Waterland, *On the Eucharist*.

formed part of a meal, we must not forget that it was instituted as such by our Lord, and that by the believers in the days of the Apostles the spiritual presence of Christ at all times was fully realised. But this high ideal could not be maintained, and the abuses of the Agape in the church of Corinth shewed that the time had come to separate the Eucharist from it.

It has been suggested by Bp. Lightfoot, **Separation of the Eucharist from the Agape.** that when Pliny's action in Bithynia forced the Christians to abandon the

Agape, they began to make a distinction between the common meal and the Eucharistic service.¹ In Justin Martyr's description of a Christian assembly there is no mention of the Agape, and in process of time it ceased to exist in the Church, though traces of it are found in the fifth century. Tertullian testifies that even in his time it was attended with abuses, and though some allowance must be made for his Montanist opinions when he wrote the treatise *de Jejuniiis*, he probably expresses the opinion of many members of the Church in his day on the subject of the Agape.²

Once the Eucharist stands alone, it is easier to trace its subsequent development till we arrive at the period of fixed liturgies. The successive testimonies of St. Paul, the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, are the best introduction to a study of the subject.

History of the Eucharistic Service :
(a) **St. Paul ;** In the First Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul portrays a Christian assembly met for the purpose of eating the Lord's Supper. Every man brought his own food, and the celebration of the Eucharist was part of the supper. Already, however, there were signs that the reverence due to so solemn a ceremony as partaking of the Bread and Wine in memory of the Saviour's action "the same night that He was betrayed" was likely to be lost in the excesses of a common meal. The Corinthians were not able to realise the high ideal

1. *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol. 1., pp. 52 and 386.

2. Kurtz, *Church History*, § 36. Tertullian, *De Jejun.*, c. 1.

of the presence of our Lord at every Christian gathering, and their celebration of the Lord's Supper was disgraced by ostentation on the part of the wealthy, and often by scenes of drunkenness.¹ The awful reproofs and warnings of St. Paul against the abuse of the Sacrament must be read by the light of these circumstances.²

(b) *The Didache*; In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* we have the form of thanksgiving over the Cup and the Loaf, which are interesting as shewing a primitive conception of the doctrine of the Eucharist. The thanksgiving concerning the Cup is given first: "We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory for ever." The formulary over the Bread broken (*κλάσμα*) immediately follows: "We thank Thee, O Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory for ever. Just as this broken bread was scattered over the hills and having been gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom. For Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever."³

(c) *Clement of Rome*; Although Clement does not directly allude to this Sacrament, his genuine letter to the Corinthians has an important bearing on the subject from the frequent use of Jewish sacrificial terms.⁴ The liturgical form of a newly recovered portion of the letter led Bishop Lightfoot to infer that it formed part of a prayer used by Clement in the Roman church.⁵

1. I Cor. xi. 17—22.

2. I Cor. xi. 27—30.

3. Ch. ix., Hitchcock and Brown's Transl. It should however be noted that the rite is here incomplete; the prophets may give thanks 'as they please': it is called 'a sacrifice', but there is no mention of consecrated elements. *Encyclopaedia Bibl.*, art. 'Eucharist'.

4. Hebert, *The Lord's Supper: Uninspired Teaching*, vol. I, p. 17. *προσφορά...ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*, *Ep. to Cor.*, cc. 40, 41.

5. Bp. Lightfoot (*St. Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 269) remarks on the use of the word *ἐκτενής*. *ἡ ἐκτενής* is a part of the Greek ritual.

(d) **Justin Martyr;** Justin Martyr in his *Apology* gives a full description of the celebration of a Christian Eucharist.¹ He says that after a baptism it was the custom to offer prayers for the newly enlightened convert (τοῦ φωτισθέντος), and for the brethren to salute one another with a kiss of peace. Bread, water and wine (ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος) were then brought to the presiding minister (ὁ προεστώς), who gave praise and glory to God through the name of the Son and the Spirit, and a thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) for men having been thought worthy to receive these things from Him. During the thanksgiving the people kept silence, saying only the Amen. The deacons distributed the Elements and carried them to the houses of those who were absent. This Service also took place every Sunday, because on that day our Lord rose from the dead. Offerings were made for the benefit of the fatherless, the widows, the sick, strangers, and prisoners.²

(e) **Tertullian;** In the treatise *De Corona Militis* Tertullian informs us that celebrations took place at night, and also just before dawn, and that great reverence was shewn to the consecrated Elements. The Christians in his days were very careful to let no fragment of the bread or drop of the wine fall to the ground. He also speaks of oblations for the dead and in commemoration of the martyrs.³

1. Justin Martyr, *Apology*, I., cc. 65—67.

2. Mr. Hammond (*Liturgies, Eastern and Western*) enumerates nine points in this account, with all of which *in their order* the Clementine Liturgy exactly corresponds: (1) Lectures from the Old and New Testaments, (2) Sermons, (3) Prayers for estates of men (said by all), (4) The Kiss of Peace, (5) Oblation of the Elements, (6) Very long (ἐπὶ πολὺ) Thanksgiving, (7) Consecration with words of Institution, (8) Intercession said by the celebrant and all the people, (9) Communion.

3. *De Corona Militis*, c. iii.: "Eucharistiae sacramentum in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a domino, etiam antelucanis coetibus, nec de aliorum manibus quam de presidentium sumimus. Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus.....Calicis aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur." In addition to this, Tertullian gives the following particulars regarding the Eucharist: (1) It was frequent, (2) Received into the hands, (3) Reserved and carried home, (4) Received daily at home.

(f) The
Apostolical
Constitutions.

Shortly after the middle of the third century the *Apostolical Constitutions* describes the order of a Christian service, and also gives the text of a liturgy generally known as the Clementine. The latter is of great length, but well worthy of attention as illustrating the worship of the Church in days of persecution. The laity are ordered to take their seats in silence, the men on one side and the women on the other. The reader standing in the midst is to read from the Old Testament, and from Epistles or Acts, and afterwards a deacon or priest is to read the Gospel. When this is finished the door-keepers (*πυλῶροι*) are directed to keep the entrance of the men, and the deaconesses that of the women. Thus far the *Missa Catechumenorum* has been celebrated; now begins the Mass of the Faithful. The Catechumens and penitents are to go out. The remaining worshippers are to arise and pray, turning to the east. Some of the deacons are now to bring the consecrated Elements, and the others to attend to the people and maintain silence. The next act is the kiss of peace, after which the deacon is directed to pray for the whole Church and the whole world, for the presbyters, the Bishop, and the Emperor. After this the Bishop (who is here called the High Priest) blesses the people in the words used by the Priests in blessing Israel. He then prays, saying: "O Lord, save Thy people, and bless Thine inheritance whom Thou hast purchased with the precious blood of Thy Christ, and hast called them a royal priesthood and an holy nation." This is followed by the consecration of the Elements and by all present making their communion in both kinds.¹

Discipline. From the earliest times the Church exercised the right of excluding from her assemblies and from all intercourse with believers those who transgressed her laws. The principle of all ecclesiastical punishment was degradation. Thus the offending cleric lost his privileges and was ranked among the

1. *Const. Apost.*, lib. II., c. 57, and lib. VIII. *pass.* For the Clementine Liturgy, see Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Eastern), pp. 3—30. The children received the Communion before the rest of the laity, *Const. Apost.*, VIII. 13.

laity, the layman became a catechumen, the catechumen was punished by his baptism being deferred. For very serious offences the Church inflicted the terrible punishment of total excommunication. Idolatry and the grosser sins of impurity in the case of baptized persons were often considered as unpardonable in this world. We have noticed the harsh views of Tertullian on these points. The stern Spanish council of Elvira punishes such offences with perpetual excommunication: "*Nec in finem dandam esse communionem.*" Catechumens were far more leniently treated than baptized Christians, postponement of baptism being the heaviest sentence inflicted upon them. It will be noticed that the punishments of the early Church were purely spiritual. The offender was excluded from the Christian Society—that was all. Yet so terrible did it appear to a Christian, that we read of men submitting to a penance of ten or twenty years in order to obtain re-admittance to the Church. Tertullian eloquently describes this penance to consist of confession of sin, abstinence from all pleasure, and constant prayer and fasting; he says that the penitent ought to fall to the earth and implore the presbyters, to spend hours on his knees before God's altars, and to implore the brethren to pray for him.¹ No greater testimony can be given to shew the power of Christian influence over the minds of the men who entered the Church in the days of persecution, than the merciful severity of ecclesiastical discipline and the sorrow of those who were deprived of Christian privileges.

The age in which the Church won her place in the world was infamous for its profligacy. The virtues of ancient Greece and Rome had been born of patriotism and nourished by simplicity of life. The domination of Rome made patriotism illegal, and luxury had displaced simplicity. The most significant sign of the degeneracy of the age was the contempt which had fallen upon the institution of marriage. Family life became almost impossible in a corrupt society in which divorce was

Purity of
Christian life.

facilitated by the law and employed on the most frivolous pretexts. It was the Church's mission to restore the home to the world. Our Lord's precepts on the subject of the indissoluble character of the marriage tie were loyally followed by the Church of the second and third centuries, and an extreme party in the Church considered second marriage unworthy of a Christian, the Montanists going so far as to regard it as an actual sin. In thus insisting upon the sanctity of marriage, Christianity gave to woman a new dignity; the union of Christians was regarded as existing for the purpose of mutual help and encouragement in spiritual as well as temporal matters, and mixed marriages between Christians and heathens were strongly deprecated.¹ With this lofty ideal of Christian marriage there was a corresponding care of purity of life. The theatre was sternly interdicted, both on account of the cruelty of the gladiatorial games and also of the appalling indecency of the heathen spectacles. Simplicity and modesty of attire were very strongly inculcated, and everything was done to draw a sharp line dividing the purity of the Church from the laxity of heathen life and custom.

**Christianity and
Slavery.**

Slavery was an integral part of ancient society, and though incompatible with the doctrines of the Gospel it could not be destroyed till the majority of civilised mankind under Christian influence condemned it as an insult to humanity. The early believers condemned idolatry, impurity, and the cruelty of the arena, with unflinching courage; but they shewed prudence in not attacking an institution which seemed a necessary part of the constitution of society. To the primitive Christian, whose hopes were centred in Christ, the loss of liberty did not appear so terrible as it does to ourselves; indeed St. Paul's exhortation to slaves has ever been

1. Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem*, II. 5. In another place he interprets St. Paul's words, "cui vult nubat tantum in Domino," 1 Cor. vii. 39, as a prohibition of marriage with a heathen. (*Contra Marcionem*, v. 97.) See Pillet, *Perpétue*, p. 91. St. Cyprian in his treatise *De Lapsis* says, "Jungere cum infideibus vinculum matrimonii, prostituere gentilibus membra Christi."

interpreted to mean that a slave would do well to refuse liberty even if the chance of freedom should present itself.¹ But, even though the early Church did nothing to emancipate the slave, she performed an incalculable service to liberty by raising his condition. St. Paul's short letter to Philemon, containing the words "No more a slave, but a brother",² sounded the death knell of the worst evils of slavery. In the Primitive Church the baptized slave was the equal of the freeman; he might even be called upon to rule, and none would think it shame to obey. If he confessed Christ through suffering, the free-born Christian considered it a privilege to minister to his wants: if he obtained the martyr's crown, the members of the Church vied with one another in doing him honour.³

The Catacombs. The Catacombs are to early Christianity what Herculaneum and Pompeii are to Pagan antiquity. They reveal the inner life of the Christian community at Rome during the first three centuries of our era. Throughout the middle ages the Catacombs, with one exception, were entirely unknown, and remained undiscovered till 1578. It is impossible to doubt that they contain genuine records of the first days of the Church. These cemeteries give a striking picture of the effects of the influence of the Faith on the first believers. Social distinctions are completely effaced in the tombs of the early Christians, only two of the inscriptions making any allusion to the condition of a slave or free man. Labour is honoured (an important fact in an age when manual work was the duty of a slave), craftsmen at their work being represented in the frescoes which adorn the tombs. Family affection is a very notable feature in many of the inscriptions. The favourite Christian symbols are—Christ depicted as the Good Shepherd, the Anchor,

1. I Cor. vii. 21, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ δύνασται ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι μᾶλλον χρῆσαι.

2. Philemon, 16.

3. For the opinions of Lactantius, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, respecting slavery, see Pressensé, *Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church*, p. 436, Eng. Trans.

and the Fish, the Greek word *ἰχθύς* forming the initials of *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ*.¹

Honour paid to
Martyrs.

Martyrdom was the means by which the Church won her most conspicuous triumphs, and was honoured accordingly. The more ardent spirits among the brethren longed earnestly to obtain the martyr's crown. To have confessed Christ in persecution was to have won a glory second only to that attained by those who died for the Faith. The prison doors were besieged by crowds of believers, anxious to pay their respects to those who were suffering for conscience sake. The graves of the martyrs were frequented by pious Christians, and the day on which they suffered was celebrated as the birth-day of their glory. Imprisoned confessors issued commands to the churches, which were regarded almost as inspired utterances. Martyrology was the most popular literature in the early Church. Although the great honour paid to martyrdom was not unattended by serious evils,² it unquestionably proved a great support to those who were called upon to act as the champions of the Faith in the days of persecution.

Superstitions of
early Christians.

It must not be supposed that the early Christians were absolutely free from the superstitions of their age. The belief in daemons was almost universally accepted, and much of the hatred of idolatry is attributable to the fact that Christians considered a false god to be not an unreality, but a malignant spirit. The exorcists were a recognised order in the Church, and the *energumens*, or possessed persons, had a place among the penitents. Many Christians were believed to have the power of working

1. De Pressensé, *Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church*. A convenient work on the subject of the Catacombs is *Subterranean Rome*, an epitome of De Rossi's discoveries, by J. Spencer Northcote and W. R. Brownton.

2. I allude to the belief that martyrdom would atone for sin, the rash way in which fanatics sought death by insulting the magistrates or breaking idols, the disorders caused to the Church in St. Cyprian's time by pardons being granted in such rash profusion by the confessors to ex-communicated offenders, and the impostures described by Lucian in his *Peregrinus Proteus*.

miracles; visions were by no means unfrequent.¹ The Eucharist was regarded with ever-increasing awe, and as the primitive simplicity of the original rite disappeared, its power to injure the unworthy was considered fully as great as the benefit it conferred upon the worthy recipient.² It was the same with Baptism—

1. Neander (*Church History*, vol. 1., p. 103) gives many instances of the universal belief of the early Christians that they were able to exercise supernatural powers. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.) says that the name of Christ expels demons, and indeed this is one of the favourite arguments with the Apologists, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, etc. It is worth observing how Tertullian in his treatise *On Baptism* shews that waters are naturally the abode of evil spirits: "sine ullo sacramento immundi spiritus aquis incumbunt." (c. 5.) Irenaeus, in his second book, *Against Heresies*, speaks of gifts of healing, and the dead being raised by Christians. Tertullian relates that many came to the true God by means of visions, *De Anima*, 24. Origen, *Hom. in Joann.*, xx., c. 28: οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοίξει ἢ ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν, ἀ καὶ ἀναγγεγραπται, ὡν καὶ ἔχη καὶ λείμματα ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ὄνματι Ἰησοῦ μέχρι νῦν γίνεται. The question as to when miracles ceased in the Church is a very difficult one. We are compelled to accept one of two alternatives: either that miraculous powers have never been withdrawn, or that they lasted only so long as the *charismata* of the Apostolic age. See Dr. Edwin Abbott's *Philomythus*. From what I have read and heard I believe that the most striking analogies with the Early Church are to be found in the record of mission work in China. The following passage from *The Life of Pastor Hsi* (11.) might be a description of a similar event in the 2nd century:—"Without hesitation he went to his distressed wife, and laying his hands upon her, in the name of Jesus, commanded the evil spirits to depart and torment her no more. Then and there the change was wrought. To the astonishment of all except her husband, Mrs. Hsi was immediately delivered. Weak as she was, she realised that the trouble was conquered. And very soon the neighbourhood realised it too. For the completeness of the cure was proved by after events. Mrs. Hsi never again suffered in this way. And so profoundly was she impressed, that she forthwith declared herself a Christian and one with her husband in his life-work. The effect upon the villagers was startling. Familiar as they were with cases of alleged demon-possession more or less terrible in character, the people had never seen or heard of a cure, and never expected to. What could one do against malicious spirits? Yet here, before their eyes, was proof of a power mightier than the strong man armed. It seemed little less than a miracle. 'Who can this Jesus be?' was the question of many hearts. 'No wonder they would have us, too, believe and worship.' Some did follow Mrs. Hsi's example, and turn to the Lord. Regular Sunday services were established, and idolatry in many homes began to relax its hitherto unquestioned sway."

2. A good example of the terror with which this Sacrament was regarded is found in the case of a man who had been baptized by heretics, mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria, Euseb., *H. E.* vii. 9. For miracles in connexion with the Eucharist see Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 44, and Cyprian *De Lapsis* 25 sq. The doctrine of a material and corporeal change of the Elements belongs to a far later period.

the fear of losing the gifts conferred by this Sacrament led men to postpone being baptized till they were *in extremis*, in order to enter Heaven pure from sin.¹ Miracles were not of unfrequent occurrence, and are gravely related as natural events by ecclesiastical writers. The long-cherished belief that Nero would return as Antichrist was a sign of the credulity of those who first professed the Faith.² By the end of the fourth century it was held that those who persecuted the Church were sure to die miserably—a belief which events tended to confirm.³

The presence of a certain amount of credulity was not unnatural. Persecuted enthusiasts cannot be expected to exercise the calm judgment of cold-hearted philosophers, and their very zeal tends to stimulate credulity. In the first days of the Church the superstitions of the Christians were comparatively few and harmless, and they are only worthy of notice because they contain the germs of later and more pernicious corruptions of the purity of the Gospel.

1. Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. III., p. 316. Constantine is of course the most famous example of the postponement of baptism.

2. Milman, *ibid.*, vol. II., pp. 123—4, note. Kurtz, *Church History*, vol. I., p. 76.

3. This is the whole point of Lactantius' work, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, in which the worst spirit of the Early Church appears.



CHAPTER XI.

THE CHURCHES OF ROME, CARTHAGE, AND ALEXANDRIA.

THE object of the present chapter is to give in a concise form an account of the three important churches of Rome, Carthage and Alexandria, down to the time of the publication of the edict of Milan. Each of these cities represents different effects of the Faith among people of various temperaments and dispositions, and we may trace many features of modern belief and doctrine to the influence of ideas fostered in these great centres of primitive Christianity. The outward grandeur of the Roman Church has remained. On the other hand Alexandria has ceased to be a power in Christendom; and the great African Church, of which Carthage was the head, has entirely disappeared. Yet every time we repeat the so-called creed of Nicaea, we acknowledge a debt to the great theological school of Alexandria; and no question in divinity can be approached without taking into account the theology of Augustine, the product and flower of the Christianity of Africa. It is chiefly to Rome that we owe the ideal of the catholicity of the Faith. The Roman bishops, at any rate after the first half of the second century, must have been men of wide and comprehensive views shewing strong sympathy with the most distant churches. Although it is true that the bishops of Rome occasionally displayed a desire to exert undue authority over foreign Christian communities, it must be admitted that the high position accorded to the Roman Church was due to something more than to self assertion or to the

importance of the city. The virtues of the Roman Christians must be taken into account in every attempt to explain their wide-spread influence in the first centuries of our era.

The Epistle to the Romans contains the most elaborate statement of doctrine put forth by St. Paul, and is a proof that the Apostle of the Gentiles was fully aware of the paramount importance of Rome as a Christian centre. It has been already remarked that St. Paul in his missionary journeys invariably selected (as the scenes of his most arduous labours) such cities as Corinth and Ephesus, through which a vast concourse of strangers was continually passing. One of the great objects of his life was to preach the Gospel in Rome, and he may possibly have had this in view when he appealed to Caesar. In his Epistle to the Philippians, written not long after his arrival, St. Paul describes the success of his preaching in Rome with evident satisfaction.¹ Though his labours must have been somewhat restricted by the circumstances of his imprisonment, he appears to have won converts among the praetorian guard and the slaves attached to Nero's *familia*. Having once obtained a footing in the imperial palace, the new religion advanced so rapidly that by the close of the first century it began to number among its adherents even the near relatives of the emperors.

It is characteristic of the Roman church, that although it boasted of the Apostles Peter and Paul as its founders,² the name of the latter is now but rarely connected with

1. For St. Paul's desire to visit Rome, see Acts xix. 21, xxiii. 11, Rom. i. 15. For his preaching at Rome, Phil. i. 12 foll. For the date of the Philippian Epistle, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 41.

2. Allusion to the work of the two Apostles is made by Clement of Rome, *Ep.*, c. 5, and implied in Ignatius *ad Rom.* iv. The Muratorian Fragment connects the "passio Petri" with St. Paul's journey to Spain. Hippolytus speaks of the contest between Simon Magus and the Apostles. In the catacomb of St. Priscilla (also the burial place of Pudens and his daughter) there is a fresco figure inscribed "Paulus Pastor Apostolus". Peter and Paul are constantly represented together in medallions, &c. (generally with Christ in the centre) in the catacombs. Eusebius (*H. E.* VII. 18) had probably seen some of these portraits.

it. It will appear in the course of our history that the Roman Christians aimed at a policy of moderation, especially in matters of doctrine. In St. Paul we have an enthusiastic missionary, a pronounced theologian, the founder of a school; in St. Peter, a typical Christian ruler, the shepherd of God's people,¹ a man desirous of reconciling conflicting tendencies.

Was St. Peter
at Rome?

It was related at a comparatively early date that St. Peter had been bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. The belief has been traced by some to the age of Hippolytus (A.D. 200),² and it certainly existed in the fourth century. The Apostle's visit to the imperial city has been precariously connected with his disappearance from the foreground of St. Luke's narrative. (Acts xii. 17.) St. Peter, released from the prison at Jerusalem, sends a message to "James and the brethren", and "departing to another place" passes from his prominent position on the page of the historian to reappear on the single occasion of the council. (Acts xv.) But both his presence at Jerusalem on this occasion and his absence from the account of St. Paul's own visit to Rome (Acts xxviii.) argue against this bold inference. Indeed it is scarcely possible that St. Peter could have visited Rome before A.D. 58. St. Paul, who made it his aim not to build on the foundations of other Apostles, addresses in that year the Christian community at Rome. Not only is there no mention of Peter in the crowded page of salutations (Rom. xvi.), but the attitude of the writer is plainly that of the recognised spiritual overseer, who, though he has yet to visit Rome in person, is the fountain head of those missionary channels which had brought the Gospel to the Imperial centre. Nor does St. Paul speak of St. Peter in the epistles written during his Roman captivity; and from this it seems improbable

1. St. John xxi. 16. *ποιμαίνε τὰ πρόβατά μου*. It is noteworthy that St. Peter repeats his Master's words in his advice to the elders, 1. St. Pet. v. 2: *ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

2. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I., vol. 1., p. 283. The *Chronicon* of Eusebius, according to Jerome, gives St. Peter a twenty-five years episcopate, but the Armenian version makes it only twenty years. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

that the latter Apostle had visited Rome before the year A.D. 63.¹ Patristic testimony is however unanimous in saying that St. Peter did at some time visit Rome,² and it is very possible that he wrote his First Epistle from that city. This beautiful letter to the churches of Asia breathes the purest spirit of the Christian Faith. Written to console the persecuted believers in the East, it is full of the tenderest sympathy and the most practical counsels. Though, as in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, the relationship of writer and readers is not accounted for by history, the tone throughout this Epistle is that of a father addressing his children. The pathos of the letter is enhanced by the fact that the Apostle speaks to the afflicted faithful in the character of an eye-witness of the sufferings of Christ (*μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων*). In accordance with Hebraistic usage we may explain *ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή* as the congregation chosen by God from the midst of the centre of persecution, the corrupt and sinful Babylon of Rome in the days of Nero. The letter may thus be regarded as written by St. Peter from the Imperial city, probably not long before his own well-attested martyrdom there, viz. A.D. 68.

Irenaeus says that St. Peter and St. Paul founded the church of Rome and made Linus bishop, but it can neither be proved from this Father nor from any of his predecessors that the first-named Apostle was actually bishop of the city.³ Linus was followed by Anencletus; after him came Clement, the third from the Apostles. Reference has already been made to the Neronian persecution. Much additional information about the

1. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, vol. II., p. 490, 'The Roman Visit of St. Peter.'
 2. For patristic testimonies see Bp. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, who considers that *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* (1. Pet. v. 13) refers unquestionably to Rome. The mention of Mark in this passage is a strong argument in favour of this view; for Papias, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, all connect the writing of St. Mark's Gospel with the preaching of St. Peter at Rome. Dean Alford, in his Prolegomena to 1. St. Peter, chs. iii. and iv., thinks that the Assyrian Babylon is meant. See also Bp. Chase in his article on 1. Peter, in Hastings' *Dict. Bib.*; Bigg, *Peter and Jude*, p. 86; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxviii. f.

3. Iren., *Haeres.*, III. iii. 3. Bishop Lightfoot unfortunately left an Appendix to his *Apostolic Fathers*, 'St. Peter at Rome,' uncompleted.

condition of the Roman church in the time of the second Imperial persecutor Domitian has been supplied by De Rossi's important discoveries in the catacombs of Rome.¹

The Flavian
Family and the
Christians.

It had long been surmised that the Christians had gained a footing not only in the household but in the family of the Flavian emperors; De Rossi's explorations have placed this conjecture on a substantial historical basis, the connexion of Flavia Domitilla with the Church being attested by several inscriptions. Vespasian, the first of the Flavian emperors, belonged not to the ancient Roman nobility, but to the Italian *bourgeoisie*, and both he and his family were conspicuously devoid of aristocratic prejudices. They all seem to have been singularly attracted by the beliefs of the East, and to have surrounded themselves with Orientals, and even Jews. Herod Agrippa II. was on good terms with the Flavii, and his sister Berenice's mature charms produced a great impression on Titus.² The Jewish historian Josephus also took the name of Flavius in honour of his imperial patrons, and enjoyed their favour at Rome.

In the course of this work allusion has been made to the supposition that both Flavius Clemens and his wife Flavia Domitilla became Christians. "Any shadow of doubt" (to quote Bishop Lightfoot's words) "which might have rested on the Christianity of Clemens and Domitilla, after the perusal of the historical notices, has been altogether removed (at least as regards the wife) by the antiquarian discoveries of recent years." One of the earliest burial places of the Roman Christians was the *Cocmeterium Domitillae*. It has now been identified by De Rossi with the catacombs of the Tor Marancia on the Ardeatine Way; and the inscriptions discovered in it shew that it belonged to that Flavia Domitilla³ who was banished by Domitian on the charge

1. Our authority here is Bishop Lightfoot's posthumous edition of the first part of his *Apostolic Fathers*.

2. Suetonius, *Titus* 7.

3. It is uncertain whether there were two ladies of this name who professed Christianity or only one. From the genealogical table

of 'atheism' so often made against Christians. One monument in this catacomb was erected (according to its legend) *ex indulgentia Flaviae Domitillae*, and another by Tatia, the nurse of the seven children of Vespasian and of his grand-daughter Flavia Domitilla.¹


The publicity of the buildings in connexion with this cemetery shews also that they were erected by some person of influence, and as De Rossi assigns to them as early a date as the first century, they may well have been erected just after Domitian's death.

But the Christians had made a convert of high rank, even before the accession of the Flavian dynasty, in Pomponia Graecina, who, by a strange coincidence, was the wife of Aulus Plautius, Vespasian's old commander in Britain. This noble lady's friend, Julia the daughter of Drusus, was executed A.D. 43, owing to the plots of the infamous Messalina. The loss of one so intimate cast a gloom over the life of Pomponia, who sought consolation in religion. In A.D. 57 she was accused of practising foreign superstition, and tried by her husband, according to the ancient custom

Conversion of
Pomponia
Graecina.

below it will be seen that there were several Flavia Domitillas. This catacomb in the fourth century was known by the names of Petronilla, and Nereus and Achilleus.

1. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I., vol. I., pp. 35—39. The relationship of Cleinens and Domitilla to the emperors Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian may be seen in the following table:—



* Euseb., *H. E.* III. 18.

of the Romans, in a family court;¹ she was pronounced innocent, and passed the rest of her life in profound melancholy. She survived her friend Julia by forty years, and consequently died about the year A.D. 83. Such is the account of Tacitus, and it has been conjectured that what seemed the grief of Pomponia and her mournful attire was in reality due to her profession of the Christian Faith.² These surmises have been greatly strengthened by the discovery of the inscriptions in the so-called Crypt of Lucina, in memory of persons belonging to the Pomponian *Gens*. We even find the name Pomponius Graecinus, but only in a third-century inscription, and De Rossi has conjectured that Pomponia at her baptism took the name of Lucina, and that the cemetery of the Christians was called after her.

Clement's
Epistle to the
Corinthians.
A. D. 96.

It would appear then that Christianity since the death of Nero had made extraordinary progress at Rome. The patronage of the wealthy enabled the Church to obtain a tolerably firm footing in the city; and the Christians, by availing themselves of the laws affecting funeral guilds, were enabled to give a seemly burial to their dead. Suddenly, almost without warning, towards the close of the reign of Domitian all was changed. Flavius Clemens was executed, and Flavia Domitilla banished. It was shortly after these troubles that Clement wrote anonymously in the name of the Roman church to the Corinthian Christians to allay their dissensions. He describes the persecutions, which the church of Rome had just been enduring, as being sudden and repeated (*αἰφνιδίους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους γενομένας*). The tone of the letter reminds us of St. Peter; its language, of St. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Clement is evidently a Jew thoroughly acquainted with the Septuagint. He is mindful of the glories and privileges of Israel, and impressed no doubt by the terrible ruin which had so recently fallen upon his

1. Tacitus, *Ann.* XIII. 32. "Superstitionis externae rea."

2. See Alford, *Greek Test.*, Prolegomena to II. Tim. 'Excursus on Pudens and Claudia.'

nation.¹ He regards the Church as a continuation of ancient Israel, the Bishops and Deacons as taking a place analogous to that of the Priests and Levites of the Old Covenant. But he is no Judaizing controversialist. Peter and Paul are held in equal honour by him, both being held up as ensamples to posterity. Nor has he any sympathy with those Jews or Christians who regarded the Roman empire as the embodiment of evil. He agrees with the two great Apostles that the powers which be are ordained of God, and that submission to human authority is a duty.² Clement desires concord and uniformity above all things. His ideal is order in the Church, as it is seen both in nature and in the Roman empire. The watchword of the whole epistle is the necessity of obedience. The document is a remarkable monument of the practical wisdom of the church of Rome, of its profound policy, and of its spirit of government.³

The Letter of
Ignatius to the
Romans.
A. D. 110.

About fourteen years after the despatch of the Epistle of Clement to Corinth, the church of Rome received a letter from Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, when he was on his way to suffer martyrdom in the Imperial city. The letter is interesting as shewing the position of the church of Rome in the eyes of the Christians of the East. Ignatius in his salutation exhausts every epithet of honour in describing the Roman church. It is "beloved and enlightened through the will of Him who willed all things that are, by faith and love through Jesus Christ our God; even she that hath the presidency in the country of the region of the Romans, being worthy of God, worthy of honour, worthy of felicitation, worthy of praise, worthy of success, worthy in purity, and having the presidency of love, walking in the law of Christ and

1. Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, Part I., vol. I., p. 351: "Jealousy and strife overthrew great cities and rooted out great nations." In this last sentence some have seen special reference to the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem A. D. 70. Bearing in mind the language in which Josephus on the one hand and Hegesippus on the other describe the causes of the Jewish war, we cannot consider this allusion altogether fanciful."

2. Rom. xiii. 1. 1. St. Peter ii. 13. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

3. Renan, *Les Evangiles*, ch. xv. Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 16) speaks in highest praise of Clement's letter, calling it *μεγάλη τε και θαυμαστα*.

bearing the Father's name."¹ The Martyr evidently regards the Roman church as a very powerful and influential body, able, if it makes an effort, to purchase or procure his pardon from the authorities, and he entreats the Christians at Rome not to rob him of the prize of martyrdom. We have noticed how recent discoveries confirm the opinion that the patronage of persons of high station was now accorded to the Church in Rome. Ignatius doubtless was not over-estimating the influence of the Christian community.

Polycarp visited Rome shortly before his martyrdom, during the pontificate of Anicetus. He came to settle a dispute between the Roman and Asiatic churches as to whether the festival of Easter should be held invariably on a Sunday, or whether the Christian Passover, like the Jewish, should be always celebrated on the fourteenth day irrespective of the day of the week. The latter custom prevailed in Asia Minor, on (it was alleged) the authority of St. John. Anicetus allowed the venerable disciple of the Apostle to preside at the Eucharist—a most remarkable honour, as the bishop of each church invariably celebrated the sacred mysteries himself.²

The conciliatory action of Anicetus allayed the first symptoms of this controversy. More characteristic of the later spirit of the church of Rome is its attempt to intimidate the other churches in relation to the same matter of discipline. Not many years later, the Roman bishop, Victor (A.D. 190—202), deemed it intolerable that the churches of Asia should thus differ from the practice of Rome in observing Easter. Victor actually threatened to excommunicate the Asiatics for refusing to abandon a custom which they alleged had been derived from St. John himself. But this high-handed conduct shocked the more generous Christian feeling of the age. Irenaeus,

1. Ignatius, *Ad Rom.*, c. i., Bp. Lightfoot's trans. Hefele's text ignores the comma after *ἔστω*, in which case the sentence would run "Who willed all things that are in accordance with the love of Jesus Christ."

2. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 24; for so the words *παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τῆν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ* have been interpreted.

bishop of Lyons in Gaul, an Asiatic by birth and education, wrote to point out the unreasonableness of Victor's conduct, and the Roman bishop had the wisdom to withdraw his threat of excommunication.¹

Gnosticism at Rome. Allusion has already been made to the presence of numerous Gnostic teachers at Rome. We may see in this another illustration of the early importance of the Roman church. It seems as though every new teacher desired to obtain a hearing in the Imperial city. The legend of St. Peter's contest with Simon Magus in Rome is a typical embodiment of the struggle between orthodoxy and Gnosticism. The doctrines of Marcion and of the Valentinians had much influence among the inhabitants of Rome, and we are told that a lady Gnostic, Marcellina by name, attracted a number of pupils by her lectures on the system of Carpocrates.

The Shepherd of Hermas. A.D. 130? No student of Church history can ignore the fact that the religious productions which have attained widest popularity have a footing independent of learning, orthodoxy, and canons of literary taste. How well even in the early ages the Roman church understood the need of providing a popular devotional literature, we may judge by the fact that the first Christian romance was produced by Hermas the brother of Pope Pius. The work, the celebrated *Shepherd*, consists of a series of Visions represented as having been seen by the author. Hermas is introduced as a slave sold in youth to a lady named Rhoda, but afterwards appears as a prosperous tradesman, married to a Gentile wife, whose bitter tongue was the cause of great trouble to him, as was also his family of extravagant sons. In his youth Hermas had admired Rhoda, but had not seen her for many years. One day he saw her bathing in the Tiber,² and reflected how happy he would have been had he been blessed with such a wife. Neverthe-

1. It is not certain that Victor actually excommunicated the Asiatics. Jerome speaks of his desire to have them condemned. Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 23) is not definite. Socrates (*H. E.* v. 22) says that an excommunication was pronounced.

2. This incident is less startling when one has read Cyprian *De Habitu Virginum*, c. 19.

less, Hermas is careful to add that he never betrayed his thoughts to her either by word or action. In the first vision seen by Hermas, the girl, who had evidently died, appeared to him and rebuked him because his love had not been altogether devoid of concupiscence. Soon, however, an aged matron took her place, and told Hermas that all was not well with him because he had allowed his family to lead godless and irregular lives. This venerable lady, who represents the Church, revealed many things to Hermas, and was followed by an angel in the character of the Shepherd or Angel of Repentance, who henceforth acts as guide. Such is the epitome of the *Shepherd* of Hermas. The fantastic Visions and Similitudes of which the book is composed enjoyed a wide popularity. Irenaeus quotes the book as Scripture, and Origen is of opinion that it is divinely inspired; and it is included along with *Barnabas* in the New Testament of the celebrated Codex Sinaiticus in the fourth century. The late Dean Stanley has not exaggerated its influence when he speaks of it as the "popular book of devotion, the *Pilgrim's Progress* of the second century, which was spread far and wide from Italy even to Greece, Egypt, and Abyssinia."¹

The *Shepherd* of Hermas is thought to have been the production of a member of the more austere party in the Roman church. Even at this early date we are able to see that two views of church government had been adopted in Rome. There was a Catholic party, desirous of extending the limits of the Church and of deterring nobody from membership who would acknowledge official authority. We find the upholders of this view inclined to toleration in matters of opinion, and to lenity in respect of discipline. On the other hand, a Puritan party aimed at a smaller but more perfect church of unimpeachable orthodoxy, exercising unrelenting severity towards offenders. The contest was not unlike that between the Jesuits and the Jansenists in

1. For a good description of the contents of the *Shepherd* of Hermas, see Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, vol. 1., pp. 182—214. The work is divided into Visions, Commandments, and Similitudes. See also Döbschutz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, ch. xviii.

the seventeenth century. On the one side there was a certain breadth of view and liberality of mind joined with some worldliness and a tendency to a laxer morality. On the other, deep spiritual insight and strong religious convictions existed side by side with those shortcomings which make all forms of Puritanism sectarian and unamiable. The Montanists represented the latter school of thought. In the West they appear as stern enthusiasts, heroes in the days of persecution, bigots in time of peace. At first their love of martyrdom, their sensitive purity, and their austerity of life, made them very popular. Gradually it became evident to the heads of the Roman church that their ill-regulated zeal might prove a source of disorder in the Christian body, and the representations of the Asiatic Praxeas, who had seen the Montanists in the country of their origin, sufficed to induce Victor to pronounce them excommunicate. The true scene of their influence in the West was, however, not Rome, but Africa.

The Monarchians. The fact that Victor listened to Praxeas, whose opinions were unorthodox, and that the orthodox Montanists were censured, was characteristic of the Roman policy. Freedom in matters of opinion was granted by the early popes, at the price of uniformity in practice. We have already shewn the weakness of the Roman bishops in their action towards those who held Monarchian opinions; none of them indeed seemed capable of grasping the true theological significance of the doctrinal tendencies of the age. Nevertheless this unscientific frame of mind had its merits. The very vacillations of Zephyrinus and Callistus in dealing with heresy reveal a definite line of policy. The Roman church desired breadth and comprehensiveness, and preferred conciliation to rigid definitions of dogma. It is not without significance that, down to the very eve of the outbreak of the Reformation, the church of Rome could claim the merit of having exercised great toleration in matters of religious speculation.¹ The Eastern Church

1. Even Gregory VII., the great upholder of the Papal supremacy, shewed no rancour against Berengarius, who denied the popular doctrine of transubstantiation. See Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. IV., p. 118.

still boasts of her orthodoxy, the Western of her catholicity.

The disputes between the Catholic and Puritan parties in Rome culminated in a serious quarrel between Callistus, the successor of Zephyrinus, and Hippolytus, the greatest scholar of his church and age. We are in possession of the views of the latter given in his *Refutation of All the Heresies*. According to Hippolytus, Callistus was a most disreputable prelate. In early life he had been the slave of Carpophorus, a pious and wealthy ornament of the church of Rome. He had induced many of the poorer members of the community to trust their money in a commercial enterprise which Carpophorus had placed in his hands. Like other business transactions conducted by men of piety with the money of the widow and orphan, Callistus' bank failed. His patron, anxious to clear himself from all complicity, pursued Callistus as he was escaping from those whom he had defrauded. Callistus was just setting sail, when he saw Carpophorus gesticulating to the sailors, calling on them to deliver up the fugitive. He immediately jumped into the sea in hopes of being drowned, but was rescued and delivered to his master. As a punishment he was condemned to work in the *pistrina*. After a time Carpophorus, moved by the grief of the defrauded investors, liberated Callistus, who professed himself able to recover some of the cash. Instead of doing this, he tried to obtain the honour of martyrdom by disturbing a synagogue service. He was now accused before Fuscianus the praefect of the city; and Carpophorus, more zealous for the honour of the church than mindful of the truth, declared that Callistus was not a Christian. The future pope was sentenced to work in the mines in Sardinia, and was thus occupied when the Christian confessors there were set free at the intercession of Marcia, the concubine of Commodus. Callistus managed to be included in the amnesty, and returned to Rome. We next find him in high favour with Zephyrinus, who gave him charge of the cemetery, a highly honourable position. Zephyrinus died in A.D. 217; and his place in the late pontiff's good

graces secured the election of Callistus to the Roman chair. Hippolytus' indictment now details the ecclesiastical offences of this Pope of damaging antecedents. Callistus is accused of favouring heresy, of decreeing that if a bishop sinned even unto death he should not be deposed, of allowing heretics to enter the Church without doing penance, of tolerating bishops and priests who had been guilty of second and third marriages, of having permitted free-born women to marry slaves, and finally of crowning his offences by allowing all sinners the chance of re-admission to the Church after doing penance. This curious history, illustrative of many phases of the middle-class life of Rome in the third century, must be regarded as a bitterly partisan account of the rise of a successful and perhaps not very scrupulous man. It is evident that Callistus' failings are exaggerated. It is indeed scarcely credible that so bad a man could have risen to the position of bishop of Rome at a time when the Church had departed but little from her primitive standard of morality. Against Hippolytus' charges must be set the common experience, that those who would fain narrow the sphere of salvation see the faults of their opponents through powerful magnifying glasses. The charity that thinketh no evil is seldom a companion of Puritanism. Callistus, when a slave, may have succumbed to temptation as alleged. But is it certain that the reproach of dishonesty does not more justly lie against his master, the good Carpophorus? In Rome, as elsewhere, masters who practised virtue themselves may not have been above allowing servants to make profit for them in questionable business transactions. At all events, Callistus seems to have led a life of irreproachable morality as a bishop.¹ Even Hippolytus can only accuse him of ecclesiastical offences, generally in the direction of what that austere Father considers to be a mistaken lenity. We need hardly add that the indulgence accorded to penitents by Callistus would not be reprobated by any modern church. The severer

1. Tradition says Callistus was killed in a tumult and his body flung into a well in the Trastevere where he lived. He does not lie in his own catacomb, but in one on the other side of the Tiber.

party had censured Zephyrinus for allowing persons guilty of carnal sins after baptism to have one more chance of repentance.¹ Callistus seems to have extended this act of mercy to those who had sacrificed in time of persecution. But not even the bishop of Rome could have done this by himself. The episcopal power was strictly constitutional in character, and Callistus' indulgence doubtless had the assent of the college of Roman presbyters. We may notice that during the Decian persecution the Roman presbyters, writing to Cyprian, speak of the *antiqua severitas* practised by their church, and pride themselves on their strictness of discipline. They say nothing of any break in the continuity of their policy in regard to offenders, and therefore so far ignored the charges brought by Hippolytus against Callistus. A bishop owing so little to antecedent prestige may well be supposed not to have acted without influential supporters in reforms so open to aspersion. We take it therefore that Hippolytus represented a discontented minority who wished to see no relaxation in that severe policy by which great offenders (subsequent penitence notwithstanding) were condemned to perpetual exclusion from the Church. In thus traversing a testimony, biassed as we believe by a narrow puritanical prejudice, we do not ignore the claims of Hippolytus to rank even with the greatest Roman Christians of the first three centuries. His *Refutation of All the Heresies* remains a noble product of his erudition, even though his zeal against Callistus may be thought to cast a blot on its reputation. One of the earliest Christian statues is a life-size figure of a bishop seated, said by some to be Hippolytus, but possibly intended to represent St. Peter.² On the out-

1. Yet this concession had the authority of the 'Shepherd': "*post vocationem illam magnam... unam poenitentiam habet.*" (Mand. iv. 3.) The same limitation seems to have obtained at Alexandria: Clement incorporates this Mandate in *Strom.* ii. 13, adding however the classical Scriptural passage, Heb. x. 26, 27.

2. The statue must have been erected either during the lifetime of Hippolytus or soon after his death, as the Paschal table which begins in A. D. 222 became manifestly erroneous in A. D. 241 when it was superseded. MacCarthy's *Annals of Ulster*, vol. IV., 1901, pp. xxxi—xl, clxii—clxvii.

break of Maximin's persecution Hippolytus was banished to Sardinia in company with Pontianus, the successor to the chair and policy of Callistus.¹ The two rivals died in exile, to all appearance reconciled in the common trial of their faith. Their bodies were brought back to Rome by Pope Fabian.² The impartial reverence of the Church included both Hippolytus and Callistus in the roll of her saints. A strange fate, however, overtook the memory of the former. He was identified with several legendary martyrs of the same name. Some fancied that he had suffered the fate of his more ancient name-sake, and had been torn asunder by wild horses.³ His very office in the Church was forgotten. One form of the erratic legend moves this Western theologian to a see in Arabia.⁴ Scientific archaeology has as yet failed to determine precisely the ecclesiastical status of Hippolytus. Bunsen considers him to have been a presbyter of Rome and at the same time bishop of Portus. Döllinger with more probability decides that he was a forerunner of the long line of antipopes, and that he allowed himself to be consecrated bishop of Rome in opposition to Callistus. Bp. Lightfoot in his posthumous work suggests that he held office as bishop of Portus with a general superintendence over such foreign Christians as came by sea to Rome.

The administration of Callistus may be said to anticipate the future trend of the Church's conceptions on three important topics. (1) We have seen that the ideal of a pure and exclusive community championed by Tertullian and Hippolytus begins to succumb before the now familiar conception of a mixed Church, retaining unworthy members within the fold and leaving the sentence of permanent exclusion to the final judgement of God. The stricter

1. Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, p. 66.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 223—235.

3. So Prudentius, *Peristephanon de Passione S. Hippolyti*.

4. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 20. Ἐπίσκοπος δ' οὗτος ἦν (Beryllus) τῶν κατὰ Βόστρον Ἀράβων ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἰππόλυτος ἑτέρας που καὶ αὐτὸς προεστῶς ἐκκλησίας.

view may seem to triumph in the conflict which we shall presently find Cyprian, the inheritor of Tertullian's theology, waging with the Novatian faction. But it is the ideal of Callistus that is destined to permanent ascendancy. The early rule of refusing a second re-admission to lapsed penitents survived indeed in canons of the Church, but Socrates tells us how it is traversed by the great Chrysostom himself. In 589 the council of Toledo vainly complains that it has become a dead letter in the West. Was it a personal experience of the blessed effects of administrative leniency in leading a sinner to repentance that made this Pope of questionable moral antecedents thus vindicate the wisdom of St. James's maxim, "Mercy glorieth against judgement"? It is significant, after reading Hippolytus' aspersions on the early career of Callistus, to find that the latter is the first Christian writer who insists on the *necessity* of evil as well as good elements in the Church of Christ, and who cites for this purpose the teachings of our Lord's parable of the tares growing in the field beside the wheat, and the more fanciful analogy of the Ark with its beasts both clean and unclean.

(2) Such a conception is naturally connected with a growing sense of the sanctity of the Church's objective agencies, the Kingdom of Christ being viewed in its external relations and mechanical efficiency, rather than as an ideal claiming actually to display the purity of heaven upon earth.¹ It is further worth noticing that it is Callistus who first enunciates that theory of the indelibility of Holy Orders which likewise was to become paramount. His opinions on this subject form part of Hippolytus' indictment. The attitude of Callistus may indeed well be contrasted with that of an earlier Roman bishop. At the close of the first century Clement is moved to reprove the Corinthian community for an actual deposition of presbyters. In a lengthy epistle he inveighs against the spirit of jealousy and uncharitableness displayed, but nowhere does he use the argument of unassailable sacrosanctity

1. Cf. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. II., ch. ii.

of office. The gist of the offence is in part centred not in any indelibility of function, but in the fact that the Corinthians had deposed from a consecrated vocation men who had led a blameless life. Here again Callistus may be contrasted with Cyprian, for Cyprian, despite his high conceptions of officialism, distinctly states that the episcopal office is forfeited if a bishop does not maintain the moral standard of the Gospel, and appears to have no notion of this theory of indelibility.¹ And again, the view of Callistus is evidently in advance of his time. Even as late as 633 a cleric wrongfully deprived is not only to be reinstated but reordained, the rule given by the council of Toledo being "*non potest esse quod fuerat nisi gradus amissos recipiat coram altario.*"²

(3) *Tu es Petrus.* (3) All are familiar with the mediæval interpretation of Matth. xvi. 18 as the charter of the Papacy, and it is this text which blazoned in gigantic mosaics meets the eye of the traveller who gazes up into the mighty cupola of St. Peter's church at Rome. It is Callistus who first cites this text as a promise not only to Peter but to those who are Peter's successors in the episcopal chair of Rome. Tertullian in the subsequent controversy disallows this interpretation, which it need scarcely be said is ignored or contradicted by the great Patristic commentators of the two succeeding centuries. Again we are reminded of the career of Cyprian, for forty years later the Roman Stephen again adduces this text in his controversy with his brother of Carthage.³ Cyprian weakly admits its relevancy so far as the pre-eminence of the Roman See is concerned, taking exception however to its application to an individual bishop of Rome. But again Callistus is practically far in advance of his times, interesting though the misappropriation of the text is as a herald of future history. We can scarcely read Tertullian's sarcastic terms '*episcopus episcoporum*' and '*pontifex maximus*'⁴

1. Cyprian, *Epp.* 65, 67, 68. cf. Harnack, *ut supra*.

2. *Dict. Christian Antiq.*, art. 'Orders'.

3. cf. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. II., p. 128.

4. *De Pudicitia*, l. 13.

in his controversy with Callistus, without reflecting, not only that these appellations were destined to be actually appropriated by the Popes although the great Gregory at the close of the sixth century still denounces the title "Œcumenical Bishop" as "proud and foolish" and "an imitation of the devil".¹

Any weakness or irresolution shewn by the bishops of Rome in the matter of the Monarchian dispute was amply atoned for by their conduct during the great persecution begun by Decius and continued down to the accession of Gallienus. Five successive Popes were martyred between A.D. 250 and 258. The great importance of the Roman church is attested by the Emperor Decius, who, after the martyrdom of Fabian, is reported by Cyprian to have said that he would rather see a rival for the Empire than a new bishop of Rome.² The church now remained for sixteen months without a bishop, and it was not till Decius was engaged in the Gothic war that a man was found to fill the vacancy. Cornelius was consecrated Fabian's successor in June A.D. 251, when a temporary peace was brought to the Church by the defeat and death of Decius. But this immunity from external annoyance was marred by internal discord. The question of the treatment of those who had 'lapsed' during the persecution provoked such bitterness as to give rise to a serious schism. The stricter party, at the instigation of Novatus, a presbyter of Carthage, a turbulent person whose factious behaviour in his own church will be hereafter noticed, leagued themselves in a schismatic community and took the name of *Cathari* or Puritans. They chose as their bishop Novatian, a man whose gloomy and saturnine temper reminds us of the Puritan leaders of a later age. Novatian had suffered a severe spiritual conflict before his conversion, during which he seemed like one possessed by a daemon. The prayer of an exorcist restored him to tranquillity, but serious bodily illness resulted from the

Persecution
under Decius and
Valerian.

Novatian Schism.
A.D. 251.

1. These observations on Callistus are supplied by the Rev. A. C. Jennings.

2. Cyprian, *Ep.* 51 (to *Antonianus*).

terrible mental anxiety through which he had passed. In this hour of seemingly mortal sickness he was baptized. On his recovery he applied himself to the work of a teacher, and his power of imparting knowledge won the favour of Bishop Fabian. Contrary to the practice of the Church, which was opposed to the ordination of *climici* (or persons baptized on what was wrongly supposed to be their death-bed), Fabian admitted Novatian to the rank of presbyter. In justice to Novatian we must add that he had no desire for promotion in the Church. His one wish apparently was to retire into austere seclusion.¹ The busy and intriguing Novatus found however in Novatian the man for his purpose. Henceforth he headed the party which denied all hope of pardon to such baptized Christians as had offered sacrifice, or even obtained certificates of exemption (*libelli*) from the heathen magistrates. This schism at Rome long distracted the Church, and Novatianism flourished in Asia till as late as the fifth century. During the Arian controversy the followers of Novatian were rigidly orthodox, and the value of the testimony of this ancient sect was highly appreciated by the Catholics. Very soon after the schism of the *Cathari* persecution was renewed, and Cornelius and many of his flock retired to Centumcellae in Etruria. The bishop died in 252, whether as a martyr or not is uncertain. His successors, Lucius, Stephen and Xystus, or Sixtus II., were all put to death. The influence of the Roman bishop in ecclesiastical affairs was now beginning to be felt in every part of the Empire. We shall see how Stephen interfered with the African Christians in the question of the validity of heretical baptism, as we saw in an earlier chapter how Dionysius, bishop of Rome (A.D. 259—269), criticised the language of his name-sake of Alexandria.² During the latter years of the third century we hear but little of the see of Rome, but in the days of persecution Marcellinus (A.D. 296—304) is said to have apostatised and confessed his guilt at a synod of three hundred bishops held at Sinuessa.³

1. Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 43.

2. See Chapter VIII., page 166.

3. Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils*, vol. I., p. 127, Eng. Transl. There

The Church of proconsular Africa and Numidia does not boast of an Apostolic founder. There is no record of the planting of Christianity in Africa, and we know nothing even of the church of Carthage till the appearance of Tertullian at the close of the second century. This is the more strange because from this time onward Roman Africa became a most flourishing centre of early Christianity. The vigour of the faith displayed by the African Church is unexampled even in primitive days. No province produced more brilliant examples of constancy in martyrdom. No church can boast more illustrious names than those of the three great Africans, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine. Nowhere, alas, has a more fatal example of the ills wrought by sectarian bitterness been manifested than here. Deeply impressive indeed is the history of these African Christians, great alike in their virtues and in their faults. The martyrdom of Perpetua and her companions (A.D. 203) gives a wonderful picture of the intensity of Christian convictions in this province. The *Acts* recording their testimony to the Faith must be read in full in order to appreciate how heroism was blended with Christian gentleness in their conduct and confession.¹ It is said that these martyrs belonged to the sect of the Montanists; the enthusiastic doctrines of this party found certainly their most congenial home among the fervent Christians of Africa.

Tertullian, the great exponent of Montanism, combines in himself the chief characteristics both of his church and nation. He was a man of education, and had practised as an advocate before he became a Christian. He possessed very great talents, considerable power and variety of expression, and a wonderful readiness of seeing the fallacy of an argument brought forward by his

are grave doubts as to the story of Marcellinus's apostasy. It is probable, as Hefele says, that it is a falsehood spread by the Donatists about the year 400.

1. Rendel Harris, *Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas*, and also *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, I. i. Mason, *Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church*, ch. v.

opponents.¹ The sincerity of Tertullian's convictions is as unquestionable as his zeal. He is a consistently high-hearted champion of the Christian Faith. But all is marred by his narrowness. His character was cast in a thoroughly Puritan mould. Tertullian is incapable of seeing any good outside his own circle. Unlike the Fathers of Alexandria, he can recognise no good in Philosophy; unlike the bishops of Rome, he acknowledges no virtue in moderation. The Bible appears to him unintelligible save to those who belong to the Church;² heretics have no right to be heard; their erroneous opinions, to use his own expression, place them out of court. A Christian who had lapsed was regarded by Tertullian in the same light as a deserter appears in the eye of a brave soldier who is a stranger to fear: he deserves no consideration. The mercy which the Church accorded to sinners (albeit severely limited) was to this zealot an offence. Tertullian was in fact unable to breathe the wide atmosphere of the Catholic Church. The narrow circle of the Montanistic community, which he probably joined at the time of the persecution of Septimius Severus, suited him far better.³

1. See his ingenious but cogent arguments against purchasing toleration, in his treatise *De Fuga in Persecutione*, quoted by Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 1., p. 168. The sixth chapter of this treatise, in which Tertullian combats the view that our Lord sanctions flight in persecution by His command to His Apostles in St. Matth. x. 23, "When they persecute you in this city, flee unto the next" (R. V.), is a good specimen of Tertullian's exegesis.

2. See Chapter VII., page 147.

3. Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, vol. 1., p. 254. Tertullian's writings shew the change of his theological opinions. Bunsen gives the following list:—

PRE-MONTANIST WORKS:—

Ad Martyres, *De Spectaculis*, *De Idololatria*, *Apologeticus* (afterwards recast and published in the two books *Ad Nationes*), *De Testimonio Animæ*, *Praescriptio adv. Haereticos*. "If we add to this book" says Bunsen "the admirable ethical treatises *De Oratione*, *De Patientia*, *De Baptismo*, *De Poenitentia*, *Ad Uxorem*, *De Cultu Feminarum*, we may say that this was his best period of literary power, viz. just before A.D. 202."

MONTANIST BOOKS:—

De Pallio (the mention of three emperors, Septimius Severus, Geta, and Caracalla, fixes the date at A.D. 207 or 208), *Adversus Marcionem* (A.D. 208), *De Corona Militis*, *De Fuga in Persecutione*, *Contra Genes*

But his genius was too great, and his aid too powerful to be ignored by the Church. Many of the treatises he wrote when a Montanist were too valuable contributions to the defence of the primitive Faith to be regarded as sectarian productions. The great bishop St. Cyprian prized his writings above all other theological works, and when he asked his secretary to hand him a volume of Tertullian he is reported to have said, "Give me the master."

Nor is the fanatical Montanist wholly unlike the more genial bishop of Carthage. Cyprian was superior to his teacher in breadth of sympathy, but he had not studied Tertullian for nothing. He agreed with his master in thinking that there was no virtue outside the Church. Tertullian in his controversies with Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, on the propriety of admitting persons guilty of carnal sin after baptism to reconciliation, and Cyprian in his efforts to sustain the episcopal power, were alike actuated by this belief. The difference between them lies in the fact that Tertullian wished to narrow the Church by his rigour, whilst Cyprian desired to win men to enter its pale.¹ The two agree in their admiration of a severe discipline towards sinners, but Tertullian advocates an impossible strictness with all the warmth of a theorist, whilst Cyprian in punishing offenders exercises the wise discretion of a practical man. A brief *résumé* of his life will suffice to shew that Cyprian claims a position among the greatest Christian bishops. Thascius Caecilianus Cyprianus was a man of birth, wealth, and station. By profession he was a rhetorician, and

Scorpice, Adv. Praxeam, De Exhortatione Castitatis, De Monogamia, De Pudicitia, De Jeuniis, De Virginitibus velandis, Adv. Hermogenem, De Anima, De Carne Christi, De Resurrectione Carnis, Adversus Valentianos, Adversus Judaeos.

1. As in the case of Cyprian's readiness to re-admit those of the faction of Novatianus who discovered that it was leading to a schism. Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian*, p. 163) remarks: "The temperate firmness and the serene joy of Cyprian's remonstrance, and congratulation to the confessors on their secession and return, place the 46th and 54th letters among the most delicate specimens of the collection, and are alone enough to give Cyprian a foremost rank among wise and loving saints."

possibly, like his 'master' Tertullian, an advocate. He was owner of some of the finest pleasure-grounds in Carthage, which he sold after his conversion for the benefit of the poor. His friends however evinced their esteem for him by repurchasing the property and restoring it to its former owner. Like Ambrose and other successful bishops, Cyprian had passed his early life in civil occupation. He was converted late in life and raised to the see of Carthage within two years of his baptism. He tells us that he was elected by the *plebs* of the church, who insisted on his being their bishop, and throughout his troublous episcopate he retained their support.¹ Among his clergy, however, five presbyters headed by Novatus regarded with implacable resentment this elevation of a novice.

The story of Cyprian's episcopate appeals to the sympathies of all Christian ministers who have suffered from the opposition of a factious minority. Historians have delighted in discovering in Novatus an opponent of the hierarchical assumptions of the bishops and an assessor of the ancient rights of the presbyterate. It seems more in accordance with human nature to assume that disappointed ambition lay at the bottom of his resolve to oust Cyprian from the position of bishop of Carthage. Novatus was one of the five presbyters whom Cyprian's election had offended. This "firebrand"² (as Cyprian not unreasonably designates him) found in an incident of the Decian persecution an opportunity of venting his spite on the new bishop. Cyprian had early withdrawn from Carthage, in order to govern the church from a safe retreat during this terrible crisis. The action evinces that higher courage which pursues the path of duty regardless of the imputation of cowardice. The first fury of the persecution abated, in the same spirit Cyprian returned to curb

1. Cyprian speaks very strongly on the responsibility laid on the people of choosing a fit and proper person as bishop. (*Ep.* 67. 2.) He says that a bishop is appointed by divine sanction, the suffrages of the people, and the consent of his fellow bishops. (*Ep.* 59. 6.)

2. "Fax et ignis ad conflanda seditiois incendia." And again, "Novatus qui apud nos discordiæ incendium seminavit." (*Ep.* 52. 2.) Archbp. Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 111.

an abuse characteristic of the age and place. A custom obtained that the Church's pardon should be accorded to recusants in deference to petitions from those stronger brethren who had attested their faith by suffering. The 'lapsed', who were very numerous after the persecution of Decius, were found by Cyprian to be clamouring for admission to the Church on the score of the merits of the martyrs and confessors.¹ Discipline demanded that those in authority in the Church should deal wisely and firmly with all who had shewn weakness in the hour of trial. To resist the interference of the confessors was however no easy matter, for the exaggerated reverence of the Carthaginian Christians gave to their wishes the force of commands. Novatus saw his opportunity. He put himself on the side of the confessors, and with the aid of a certain Felicissimus, an influential member of the diaconate, formed a strong party against Cyprian.² The bishop acted with great discretion. On the one hand he saved himself from the reproach of disregarding the confessors' claims; on the other, he avoided the danger of relaxing discipline. He accepted the *libelli pacis* granted by the confessors, but insisted that the bishop before he admitted any lapsed person to communion should be satisfied as to the genuineness of his penitence. A synod was held at Carthage, and the policy of Cyprian met with the approval of the African Church. The course of events shewed the factious and unprincipled conduct of Novatus and his unscrupulous supporter Felicissimus, who assisted him as deacon in the administration of the district in Carthage known as 'the Mount', possibly containing the Byrsa or Capitol of the city. Novatus visited Rome after the death of Fabian, A.D. 250, schism still attending his track; but there he found that the confessors were not on the side of leniency, and that the question of the lapsed was not

1. "Communicet ille cum suis" (*Ep.* 15. 4) was often the loose wording of the *libelli pacis* issued by the confessors. The abuse had already vexed the righteous Tertullian, cf. *De Pudicitia*, c. 22.

2. Neander (*Church History*, vol. 1., p. 324) says that Felicissimus probably used the control over the church funds, which he enjoyed as deacon, as a means of furthering the interests of his party.

agitating the Church in the same manner as in Africa. Heading the party of extreme severity, he thereupon procured, as we have seen, the election of the first anti-pope, the gloomy and fanatical Novatian.

As Cyprian uses language about the episcopal dignity which matches that of the Ignatian Epistles, his part in this episode has been depicted as that of a narrow-minded prelate bent on asserting his official claims.¹ The circumstances lead us to regard this as an unjust misrepresentation. We must bear in mind that, when Cyprian was elected bishop, he was chosen by the people to lead them in a most terrible crisis. The Empire under Decius and his successors was putting forth all its strength to crush the Church. The persecution was literally a war of extermination. Cyprian felt it his duty to God, and to those who had chosen him, to uphold his authority. Those who blame him ignore the fact that Novatus and his partisans were not the chosen leaders of the church. Their schism was in reality a revolt against the choice of the laity. No instance of Cyprian morosely excluding others from his counsels is alleged. It would seem, indeed, that he took the advice of his people whenever possible, and shewed a readiness to be guided by the decisions of synods.² Traditions of his personality represent no arrogant ecclesiastic, but a large-hearted and a singularly loveable man. His treatment of those Novatians who made their peace with the Church shews how generously he could forget the annoyances of former opposition. Nevertheless Cyprian, as has been shewn, shared some of the narrow views of Tertullian. It had long been the custom of the Roman church to allow that all

Cyprian's view
of Episcopacy;

Cyprian and
Re-baptism;

1. See Archbp. Benson's summary of the views of O. Ritschl and A. Harnack on the Eighth Epistle, sent nominally by the Roman clergy—a very illiterate production, which seeks to lower Cyprian in the eyes of his clergy by innuendos as to his motive for absenting himself from Carthage. *Cyprian*, p. 148.

2. During Cyprian's episcopate the following synods were held at Carthage: (1) the council which discussed the validity of Cornelius's election as bishop of Rome and the case of Felicissimus, April, A.D. 251; (2) the softening of penances, May, A.D. 252; (3) and (4) Sept.,

baptism in the name of the Trinity was valid, and Pope Stephen endeavoured to enforce this in Africa. Cyprian could not admit the validity of any rite performed outside the Church, and in his correspondence with Stephen, whilst he vindicated the liberty of his church and province, he shewed a less liberal spirit in regard to heretics than the Roman bishop.¹ From the martyrdom of Cyprian, A.D. 258, to the persecution under Diocletian, the history of the church of Carthage and Africa is of little importance. No Christian community, however, displayed more constancy and courage during that terrible ordeal. After the Edict of Milan, A.D. 313, the schism of the Donatists caused the divisions of the African Church to become a by-word in Christendom till they were in part allayed by the great Augustine.

**The Church of
Alexandria;**

The city of Alexandria has had a more powerful influence on the human mind than any other of antiquity, Jerusalem and Athens alone excepted. It united three continents and presented in itself the distinctive types of the main divisions of the human race. It was the permanent trophy of a conqueror divinely appointed, as Plutarch deems, to bring Greek culture to the barbarians:² to fuse (we may add) the ideas of East and West. Founded by Greeks, Alexandria became a centre of Greek philosophy and learning. Its situation made it the common mart of Europe and Asia, through which not only the trade but also the ideas of the East passed westward. Standing on African soil at the mouth of the great river of Egypt, Alexandria caught something of the spirit of that wonderful civilization and religion which

A.D. 253 and 254, Episcopal cases and an appeal from Spain against Rome; and (5) A.D. 255, (6) Lent, A.D. 256, (7) Sept., A.D. 256, on re-baptism. See Benson, *op. cit.*

1. Cyprian, *Epp.* 74, 75. In justice to Cyprian it must be remembered that the general view of baptism was that it purged all sins, and that sin after baptism was infinitely more heinous than before. Cyprian's desire may have been to give heretics who entered the Church the full advantage of the baptismal Sacrament.

2. Neander, *Church History*, vol. 1, p. 69. Mahaffy, *Silver Age of the Greek World*, p. 283.

was old when many ancient races of Europe and Asia were young, and still combined the animal-worship of a barbarous paganism with lofty doctrines of life and immortality. The same inconsistency manifests itself in the history of Greek and Christian Alexandria. We have repeatedly to contrast the profoundest wisdom and wisest liberality of thought with the most awful exhibitions of fanaticism and ferocity. The great school of Greek philosophy was in the zenith of its glory when the mob of Alexandria tore a man in pieces and devoured him.¹ The Alexandrian church, under its bishop, Cyril, was defining the creed of the world when the populace, urged on by frantic monks, tore the beautiful Hypatia to death limb from limb.² To Alexandria and Egypt we are indebted alike for the glories and the shame of the Christian religion—for the best specimens of Christian philosophers, scholars and theologians, and for some of the most repulsive examples of monastic brutality.

The history of the church of Alexandria may be said to precede Christianity, in the sense that many Christian ideas and usages existed there long before the introduction of the Gospel. The attempt to exalt Serapis into the position of a god for the whole world shewed how a tendency to universality in religion was already dominating heathenism.³ Here Judaism had translated its sacred writings into Greek, and had even evinced its sympathy with heathen philosophy by its attempt to prove that the sages of Greece had learned their wisdom from Moses and the Prophets. The Therapeutae had already formed communities in the neighbourhood of Lake Mareotis, near Alexandria, for the purpose of prayer and ascetic discipline.⁴ Renan, not without reason, infers that the presence of a liberal and active Judaism, which largely satisfied the cravings of

1. Juvenal, *Sat.*, xv. 80.

2. Socrates, *H. E.* VII. 15.

3. Serapis was introduced into Egypt by Ptolemy I. Tacitus, *Hist.* IV. 84.

4. Eusebius, *H. E.* II. 17; but see Prof. Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, in which the *De Vita Contemplativa* is called "a religious novel of the fourth century": it is not, however, certain that this is correct, Mr. Conybeare, in his edition of the treatise, being very strongly in favour of the Philonic authorship. For history of the criticism see Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 54 ff.

the human spirit, accounts for the comparatively late introduction of Christianity into Egypt. In the Christian history, with its lengthy list of towns visited by Apostles, Alexandria indeed is conspicuously absent. In the New Testament we have no mention of any community of Alexandrian believers; and Apollos, the only Alexandrian Jew whose name occurs in the Acts and Epistles, was connected with the church of Ephesus. We have to content our curiosity with the tradition quoted by Eusebius, that St. Mark, after publishing St. Peter's teaching to gratify the Christians of Rome, journeyed to Egypt and founded the Alexandrian church.¹

The constitution of the Church in Alexandria was somewhat unusual. The Christians divided the city into twelve districts, each of which was assigned to the care of a presbyter. Together the twelve presbyters formed a college which claimed the right of electing a bishop from their number, and (if we may credit Jerome) of consecrating him themselves.² This custom prevailed till the time of Demetrius, A.D. 189—232, who is said by Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria in the tenth century, to have changed this singular ecclesiastical arrangement by appointing three bishops in addition to the bishop of Alexandria, who had formerly governed the whole province.³ During the long episcopate of Demetrius the three great teachers, Pantæus, Clement, and Origen, presided over the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria. The conduct of the bishop towards the last-named scholar proves him to have been a strict and somewhat arbitrary upholder of the authority of his office. The church and city of Alexandria, however, were visited by severe calamities in the time of Demetrius, when his firmness must have been of value to the Christian community. The severe persecution of Septimius Severus took place A.D. 202; and his ferocious son Caracalla, two years before his death in 217, irritated by the railleries of the Egyptians, ordered a general massacre of the Alexandrians, in which many thousands

Bishops of
Alexandria;

1. Eusebius, *H. E.* II. 16.

2. See above, Chapter X., p. 227, n. 4.

3. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 230.

perished.¹ Demetrius was succeeded by two pupils of Origen, Heraclas (A.D. 233—248), and the wise and learned Dionysius (A.D. 248—265), called by Eusebius "the great bishop of Alexandria".² Reference has already been made in this work both to the persecution of Decius which was especially severe at Alexandria in the time of Dionysius, and to the plague and famine which visited the city during his episcopate. We have also had occasion to notice the wisdom and moderation displayed by the same bishop in the doctrinal disputes of his time.

Allegorism. Alexandria was the chief centre of a method of interpretation which has taken a very powerful hold of the human imagination. Allegorism, or the attempt to extract a twofold meaning from ancient writers and poets, was not peculiar either to Jews or Christians. It has its origin in the feeling that, whilst the venerable antiquity of certain books gives them a sanctity in the eyes of their readers, their contents are not always such as to inspire sufficient reverence. The plain narrative is accordingly assumed to conceal a profounder meaning at which the author only hinted in types and shadows. The philosophers of Greece applied this method in dealing with the poems of Homer. These were not only used as an educational manual for boys and students, but were also regarded in the light of a sacred record of Greek antiquity. In the hands of such teachers Homer became a manual of physical science and moral philosophy. To them the narrative, valueless in itself, was but a peg for the attachment of transcendental truths. The story of Paris, for example, is the history of the soul in its sensuous life, which sees not the other powers in the world but only Beauty, and says that the apple (*i.e.* the World) is the property of Love. The Odyssey, again, represented man as carried here and there on the sea of life by his passions, and tempted by the siren-voice of pleasure.³ The allegorical method seems to have been first applied

1. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. vi.

2. Euseb., *H. E.* vii. Praef.

3. See Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1888, p. 64.

to the Jewish Scriptures in Alexandria by Philo. The Christian teachers followed in his steps. They found the Old Testament narratives often as perplexing as the philosophers had found the Homeric accounts of the gods, and felt more keenly than their rivals the necessity of proving their sacred books a compendium of all truth. Allegorism was their sole means of escape from the difficulty. Thus it is that Philo, Clement, Origen, and their less able disciples, persistently wrest the Scriptures into a collection of types foreshadowing their own peculiar notions.¹ The effects of this mistaken treatment of the writings held in reverence by the Church are still apparent in that absolutely unhistorical spirit in which certain modern commentators ignore the standpoint of the ancient author in their endeavour to make him the exponent of the theological views of their own day. Prompted originally by a rationalising spirit, allegorism has become the servant of those who refuse to avail themselves of increasing light in their perusal of the Scriptures. To the Alexandrian Fathers, however, let us add, we owe its remedy, no less than the transmitted disease. Origen, the most allegorical interpreter of Scripture, laid the foundation of a sounder method of study, which became the glory of the school of Antioch. His labours in the field of critical enquiry deserve the careful attention of the student.

Frequent allusion has already been made to the great name of Origen. A short *résumé* of the chief facts of his life may be of service to the reader before approaching the important subject of his critical labours. Origenes Adamantius, born 185, the son of Leonides, an Alexandrian Christian, was perhaps, as his name implies, of Egyptian descent.² His father gave him a thorough education, not only in the Christian but also in the Greek literature, and from the first Origen combined the diligence of a student with the fervour of a believer. When Leonides suffered

1. One very striking feature in Origen is his dread of the homeliness of Scripture. Bigg, *Church's Task*, p. 26.

2. Epiphanius calls him an Egyptian, Porphyry (ap. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 19) a Greek. The name Origen is derived from the Egyptian deity Horus.

martyrdom in the persecution of Septimius Severus, it was with difficulty that the mother of Origen prevented the boy from deliberately provoking the same fate. Leonides left seven children, of whom Origen was the eldest. The family was supported, partly by a wealthy widow, and partly by the fees received by Origen from his pupils. His zeal for Christianity, however, soon induced the youthful lecturer to abandon the work of teaching Greek literature. In order that he might devote himself completely to sacred studies, he sold his manuscripts for a pension of 4 *obols* (about 6*d.*) a day. On this scanty pittance he managed to live the life of a strict ascetic. At the early age of eighteen, Origen was appointed by bishop Demetrius to succeed his former master Clement as the head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, A.D. 204. His lectures were largely attended, and he appears to have possessed a singular power of arousing the enthusiasm of his disciples. Among these was Gregory Thaumaturgus, afterwards bishop of Neocaesarea, who has described the method of his exposition. We gather that he made it his aim to interpret by the light of Christianity all that was valuable in the old philosophies. Porphyry relates that Origen himself attended the school of Ammonius Saccas, the great Neo-Platonist.¹ If he did so, it was doubtless with the laudable purpose of keeping himself abreast with the best pagan philosophy of the day. From a similar motive in regard to Judaism he departed from the custom of his age and studied Hebrew. Opportunities were not at this time far to seek, for his mother, as we infer from the account of Jerome, had also acquired that language. In view of the rarity of such attainments we may perhaps conjecture that she was a Jewess by birth.

In A.D. 215 a serious tumult at Alexandria compelled Origen to leave the city. He retired to Palestine, where he was received with great honour by Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea, who invited him to expound the Scriptures in the religious

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Origenes', vol. IV., p. 99. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 19.

assemblies of the Christians. This appointment, rarely accorded to a layman, was considered by bishop Demetrius as an infringement on the privileges of the clerical order. He peremptorily recalled Origen to his duties at the head of the Alexandrian Catechetical School, A.D. 219. Origen on his return entered upon a new sphere of activity. Hitherto he had been a teacher; now, at the instigation of his friend Ambrosius, he began to publish his lectures. Ambrosius was a man of considerable wealth, and was able to hire a large number of male and female clerks to copy Origen's treatises.¹ He appears to have acted the part of both patron and friend, and Origen playfully calls him his "taskmaster" (ἐργοδιώκτης). Origen left most of the work of the Catechetical School to his colleague Heraclas, and devoted himself to the publication of the Commentary on St. John, and of his bold philosophical work on *First Principles* (περὶ ἀρχῶν). We have elsewhere had occasion to notice Origen's final breach with Demetrius. It is sufficient to observe here that its occasion was the great Alexandrian's receiving ordination as presbyter in the foreign town of Caesarea. In the year 231 Origen finally quitted Alexandria. The bishops of Syria welcomed him, and, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Demetrius, allowed him to teach at Caesarea, which was henceforward Origen's home. The persecution of Maximinus (A.D. 235—237) compelled him to withdraw for a while to Cappadocia. He here became the guest of Juliana, a Christian lady, in whose house he found some of the books of Symmachus, the translator of the Old Testament. In 238 Origen was again at Caesarea. He subsequently spent some time in Greece, and, besides visiting many places in the Holy Land, made two expeditions into Arabia by special invitation, to refute Beryllus of Bostra, and to explain the true doctrine of the Resurrection. Under the persecution of Decius this noted Christian teacher was selected for torture and a cruel imprisonment, which hastened his end. He died at Tyre (A.D. 253) at the age of sixty-nine.

1. *Hom. in Johann.* vi. 2. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 23.

The Hexapla. The Hexapla, that great monument of the industry of Origen, was long the glory of the church of Caesarea. In this work the Old Testament was presented to the reader with the Hebrew original and the different Greek versions in parallel columns.¹ The object of its publisher was both to shew the superiority of the ancient Septuagint version when compared with more recent translations, and also to emend its text. It must be remembered that the Christians of that uncritical age regarded the LXX with deep veneration, and that it was from this translation that they drew their arguments against the Jews. It was believed to be a divinely inspired work. Justin, Irenaeus, and Clement agree in relating the story of each of the seventy-two translators being shut up in different cells, and all producing the same version with verbal exactitude.² The Jews of Palestine, although they must have known how widely the LXX differed in places from the Hebrew, acquiesced in the Alexandrian version without much demur. When, however, they found that the Christian controversialists made large use of passages widely divergent from the original, they naturally began to recognise its blemishes. New Greek translations of the Scriptures were accordingly produced, and in these some of the so-called Messianic prophecies were so rendered as to lose their significance. Irenaeus, for example, points out that in the well-known verse (Isa. vii. 14), "Behold, a *Virgin* shall conceive," the versions of Aquila and Theodotion had altered the Septuagint's *παρθένος* into *νεάνις*, a *young woman*.³ Origen, in order to shew the excellence of the LXX, which had become the Christian Old Testament, placed it side by side with the other versions and the Hebrew original. The Hebrew occupied the first column; in the second was a mere transliteration—the Hebrew

1. Origen also published the four Greek versions by themselves. This is known as the Tetrapla. Euseb., *H. E.* vi. 16.

2. Bleek, *Introd. Old Test.*, vol. II., p. 397. Irenaeus, iii. 21. Clem. Alex., *Strom.* i. 22. Justin Martyr, *Cohort. ad Graec.*, c. 13. Epiphanius (*de Mens. et Pond.*, cc. 3, 6, 9—11) only differs in making the seventy-two interpreters work in pairs in thirty-six cells.

3. Iren., *Haer.* III. 23.

being put in Greek characters. Aquila's version came next: then that of Symmachus; the LXX and the translation by Theodotion occupying the last two columns. In some passages two other versions were added, the work being called the *Hexapla* from the six principal columns. We have said that emendation formed part of Origen's design. Where words in the original were not expressed in the LXX the hiatus was filled up. Where words in the LXX had no counterpart in the Hebrew an obelus indicated the divergence from the original.¹

The publication of the *Hexapla* was a great step towards the science of Biblical criticism. A new school of Biblical exegesis arose in the Church. We have seen how the fantastical system of allegorizing the Scriptural narrative led the Alexandrian Fathers astray. A corrective to this was provided by the school of Antioch. The Syrian Christians, who had supported Origen in his dispute with Demetrius, continued his work. A noble line of textual and grammatical commentators carried on what the great Alexandrian had begun. Pamphilus, and his friend and disciple the historian Eusebius, Lucian the Martyr, and Dorotheus, were the prominent scholars during and after Diocletian's persecution;² and their method of interpreting Scripture was inherited by the greatest of the Antiochene Fathers, John Chrysostom. The history of the fourth and fifth centuries shews how the difference between the two great schools of Alexandria and Antioch distracted the Christian world—the mysticism of the one leading to Monophysitism, the literalism of the other to the error of Nestorius. In a sense the controversy between allegorism and literalism in interpretation is an eternal one. Allegorism, with all its extravagances, maintains the truth

1. For full information as to the rules observed by Origen in restoring the text of the LXX, see *Prolegomena in Hexapla Origenis*, Field, *Hexapla*, vol. 1. Hier. in *Ep. ad Titum*. See Dr. Swete, *Introduction to Old Test. in Greek*, Pt. I., c. iii.

2. Eusebius and Pamphilus copied the LXX from Origen's *Hexapla*. Lucian the Martyr also devoted much attention to the text of the LXX.

that beneath the surface of such writings as the Jewish and Christian Scriptures lies a deeper and fuller meaning. Literalism, despite the good sense and calm judgment which are its boast, sometimes results in the true sense being sacrificed to the supposed exigencies of grammatical or critical canons.



CHAPTER XII.

CONSTANTINE IN THE WEST. THE EMPIRE AND THE CHURCH.

**Effects of the
Edict of Milan.
A.D. 313.** THE Edict of Milan¹ is one of the turning-points in the history of the world. Though to all outward appearance it was merely an edict of toleration, giving every subject of the Empire the right to worship according to the dictates of his conscience, it was of far deeper significance. In recognising the right of the Christian Church to exist, Constantine had given her the power to rule. The association which had survived such an attack as Diocletian's great persecution had proved to mankind that it possessed a vitality, which would enable it ultimately to crush all the effete pagan religions within the limits of the Roman empire. That Constantine as a statesman recognised the significance of his action is shewn by the fact that he very soon earnestly set himself to work to unite and consolidate the Church, and before he was even a Christian catechumen took an interest in the question of that deepest mystery of the Faith, the relation of the Word or Son to the God and Father of All.

**Constantine's
position towards
the Church.** It requires but little knowledge of human nature to credit Constantine with a real belief in the spiritual character of the Christian Faith, and with much genuine conviction in adopting it. To ascribe to the Emperor no higher motive than a desire to utilise the Church as an engine of government would be to do him no small injustice, as well as to mistake his personal

1. Vide supra, p. 92.

character. Nevertheless we are tolerably safe in attributing to Constantine a certain amount of deliberate policy in sanctioning and encouraging the development of the Christian Church. He had been sent by his father Constantius at the age of eighteen (A.D. 292) to the court of Diocletian, and had been a special favourite of that statesmanlike emperor.¹ This was long before the outbreak of the persecution, and the youth may, even at that early age, have recognised in the Church the possible ally of a good ruler. His experience of the persecution under Galerius may well have convinced him that a hostile policy was a totally mistaken one; and his subsequent rivalry with Maxentius revealed to him the advantage of the support of a body like the Christians, desiring public tranquillity and a regular government. But political motives were not the Emperor's sole reason for gradually repudiating Paganism. It has been observed that military leaders have often proved very susceptible to religious influences.² The peril to which they may be at any moment exposed makes such men naturally seek protection from above; and a general whose efforts have been crowned with constant success, or who is about to undertake some desperate enterprise, often attributes the former to divine protection, and approaches the latter resolved to trust in that power which has hitherto preserved him. Constantine's career seems to justify this observation. In early life he believed himself to be under the peculiar protection of the Sun-god. At the supreme crisis of the contest with Maxentius, however, he appears to have decided that the God Whose adversaries had perished so miserably³ was the most powerful assistant he could invoke. Eusebius' account⁴ of his vision and of the

1. Euseb., *Vita Const.* i. 19. The courtly historian compares him to Moses in the palace of Pharaoh. Diocletian is admitted to have been very favourable to the Christians early in his reign.

2. Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire*, vol. i., p. 213.

3. Both Hercules (Maximian) and Severus had perished at the hands of the executioner, and Galerius had died of an awful disease. Broglie, *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 243.

4. Euseb., *Vita Const.* i. 27, ἐνωεὶ δὴτα ὁποῖον θεοῦ ἐπεγράψασθαι βόηθον indicates the pagan attitude of the Emperor's mind at that time.

adoption of the Labarum as a standard, shews what a strange mixture of pagan and Christian ideas existed in his mind.

The mysterious appearance which had such an effect on Constantine has been related by Eusebius and Lactantius, who were both contemporaries of the Emperor.¹ Their accounts differ very materially, and their conflicting evidence throws a doubt on the story. That Constantine thought he had seen a vision, or even that he actually did see something, seems evident, but the nature of the apparition is not equally clear. The miraculous character of the vision has been called in question on various grounds, the strongest of which seems to be its inconsistency with the character of the Gospel dispensation and the teaching of its Divine Founder. That He who had foretold that they that used the sword should perish by the sword should consecrate war by making the cross on which He had redeemed mankind a charm to secure victory in battle, is sufficiently incredible. How is the difficulty increased when we reflect that the warrior thus frequently favoured by visions from on High² was about to shed the blood of his own son in such an intrigue as might befit the palace of a Herod or a Philip II. of Spain! But however we

1. Eusebius, *Vita Const.* i. 28. Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 44. Eusebius, writing after Constantine's death in A.D. 337, says that the Emperor had told him and swore to the truth of his words, that just after midday he and the whole army had seen a luminous cross in the sky above the sun, inscribed with the words 'By this conquer'; and that the ensuing night Christ had appeared to him directing him to frame a standard like it as a means of victory. Nothing is said about the miracle by Eusebius in the Tenth Book of his *History* published in A.D. 326. According to Lactantius, just before the battle at the Milvian Bridge "Constantine was directed in a dream to cause the heavenly sign to be delineated on the shields of his soldiers, and so to proceed to battle." The triumphal arch of Constantine records that he had saved and avenged the Roman republic "instinctu Divinitatis, mentis magnitudine". And the fact of some divine manifestation at this time to the Emperor is alluded to vaguely in *Paneg.* 313, and precisely by the pagan orator Nazarius. See *Constantine the Great* by J. B. Firth (*Heroes of the Nations*), pp. 94 ff.; Abbott, *Philomythus*, p. 165.

2. Καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ θεοφανείας αὐτὸν πολλάκις ἤξειον, says Eusebius, *op. cit.* i. 47. Crispus, son, and Fausta, wife, of Constantine were executed A.D. 326.

regard the conversion of Constantine and the attendant miracle, we must admit that the story reveals to us the fact that we are on the threshold of the middle ages. It is no long step from the legend of the Labarum, which made the Cross the ensign of the army that fought the battle of the Church, to the proclamation of religious warfare. The age in which Christ appeared to Constantine, and ordered him to fight with a good courage against Maxentius, foreshadows that in which St. Peter invites Charles Martel to attack the Lombards. It breathes indeed the spirit of the time when the Cross was taken by the Christian nations on the eve of the first Crusade.

Constantine's
policy after the
Battle of the
Milvian Bridge,
October 28th,
A. D. 312.

Apparently the first act of the Emperor Constantine was to put forth a rescript tolerating all religious bodies. The text has not come down to us. Neander infers that it gave a person leave to continue in the religious body in which he happened to be at the time, but did not permit him to forsake it for another.¹ De Broglie on the other hand supposes that it contained a permission to all sects to practise their religion, even although their cult was repugnant to the interests of morality.² The heathen religion was treated with the utmost respect by the cautious emperor. He accepted the title of Pontifex Maximus, which indeed was retained by his successors for nearly a century; and although he does not appear to have sacrificed to the gods at the time of his triumph, his medals even at a later period bear their images. In A. D. 314 he omitted the *ludi saeculares*, which ought to have been celebrated at Rome; and to the great indignation of the Romans, he refused to take part in the rites of Jupiter Capitolinus.³ But despite this partial withdrawal from heathen practices, the Arch of Constantine, erected in 315 to

1. Neander, *Hist. Church*, vol. III., pp. 17-18. Gaston Boissier, *Fin du Paganisme*, vol. I., p. 49, on the Edict of Milan.

2. Boissier says of the first rescript: "Nous ne savons quelles difficultés en rendirent l'exécution impossible. Quelques indices feraient croire qu'il était conçu dans des termes d'une généralité qu'il semblait s'étendre à des sectes ennemis de toutes morales, et favoriser par là une licence périlleuse." *op. cit.*, vol. I., p. 240.

3. Robertson, *Hist. Church*, vol. I., p. 258.

commemorate his triumphs, shews that he had not altogether broken with all pagan associations. Although the inscription says that the Senate and Roman people dedicated the arch, the language may be assumed to represent the feelings of the Emperor. His victory over the tyrant Maxentius is represented as achieved "*instinctu divinitatis*". This ambiguous phrase may express either the divine nature of the τὸ δῖον of Plato, or the power of that true God Whose worshippers the Emperor had begun to favour. Eusebius says that the figure of Constantine at Rome, erected by the Emperor himself, bore a spear in the form of a cross, and that the inscription attributed the victory of the Emperor to that saving sign.¹

The Edict of
Milan.
A. D. 313.

Constantine had summoned Licinius to meet him, and the imperial conference took place at Milan. This city, the capital of Maximian Herculius during his tenure of empire, would naturally be preferred by Constantine to Rome, where he was troubled by the claims of the Senate and the pagan proclivities of the majority of the inhabitants. Moreover, Milan was a city more suited to the promulgation of a new policy than Rome with her great traditions of the past. The immediate occasion of the interview was the marriage of Licinius to Constantine's sister. The importance of this event in the eyes of the latter emperor was so great that the aged Diocletian was invited, but he refused to come. He was broken by ill-health, and by sorrow at the cruel treatment which his wife and daughter had received at the hands of Maximin Daza. On receipt of a brutal and insulting letter from Constantine he refused to touch food and died.² The text of the famous edict is somewhat obscure,³ but its main provisions were, that each man

1. Euseb., *Vita Const.* I. 40. δὸν σταυροῦ σχῆματι.

2. Dr. Mason says in a foot-note, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 341: "This is Lactantius' account. . . . Eusebius knows nothing of the suicide. The Younger Victor (*Epit.* xxxix. 8) places his death in the nearest relation to Constantine's threatening letter, . . . but he makes the mode poison. Eutropius has the same story word for word. . . . Zonaras (XII. 33) records a legend that he aimed at the Empire and was executed by order of the Senate."

3. An abridgement of this rescript is given by Lactantius, *Mort. Persec.*, c. 48, and a Greek translation by Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 5.

should have leave to worship in whatever way he thought fit, and that no one should be prevented from either practising or embracing the Christian Faith. It likewise provided that the property of the Christian corporation which had been confiscated during the persecution should be restored.

Constantine's victory over Maxentius was a turning point in the history of the Empire. The divided administration planned by Diocletian was doomed, and a reconstitution of the government was accompanied by great legislative activity. The favour which Constantine had shewn to the Christians makes us anxious to discover how far Christian influences were at work in shaping his administrative labours. In laws promulgated in a Christian state we may reasonably look for greater mercy towards criminals, and for a mitigation of the hardships suffered by the weak or helpless. On the other hand, the teachers of the Gospel are disposed to be less indulgent than heathen lawgivers to acts of impurity and kindred offences, which are ignored, or regarded as very trivial, by legislators imbued with the lax ideas of a pagan morality. Accordingly we shall seek for the influence of Christianity in Constantine's legislation when it affects (1) Criminals and debtors, (2) Slaves, (3) Children, (4) Marriage; and to these we may add (5) The Christian Church.

As early as A.D. 314 Constantine forbade the infliction of capital punishment upon any person, unless he either confessed his crime, or the testimony of his accusers was unanimous. It was forbidden to brand slaves and criminals on the face, because it is the image of the heavenly beauty. Debtors to the *fiscus* were not to be punished by scourging, but to be kept in free custody; nor were accused persons to be imprisoned in dungeons without light, nor to be unnecessarily loaded with chains. The *acta* in criminal cases were to be shewn to the defendant and his advisers, as in civil actions. In addition to this, in criminal cases all men were to be tried by the magistrate of the province, because crime effaces all distinctions of rank.

Legislation of
Constantine,
A. D. 312-323:

(1) Criminals and
Debtors;

(2) *Slaves*; Slavery, with the exception of war, has been the evil most difficult to eradicate from the world; but though the primitive Church did not openly denounce this practice, the tendency of the Christian religion has ever been in favour of personal liberty. Nor may we overlook the fact that there had been a certain advance in humanity even during the time in which the Roman empire was still heathen. The brutal maxims of Cato the Censor in regard to slaves had long ceased to be popular. Tacitus speaks of the public indignation caused by the execution of the four hundred slaves of Pedanius Secundus as early as A.D. 61;¹ and Seneca in one passage uses language in regard to slaves which greatly resembles that of St. Paul.² Crucifixion and the breaking the legs was abolished apparently in 315. In the following year Constantine allowed slaves to be liberated in Christian churches. In 334 a most beneficial law forbade the families of slaves to be divided when estates changed hands.

(3) *Children*; In most heathen countries the natural custom of exposing children, whose parents are either too poor or too selfish to maintain them, meets with no public reprobation, and is extensively practised. In the Roman world the practice had become fearfully common;³ and from the first, Christian compassion had taken the children thus cruelly abandoned under special protection. Constantine's legislation sought to remedy this evil, a sure proof that the Church had made her influence felt in his policy. In 315 a law, due partly no doubt also to the alarming decrease of the population of the Empire, was issued from Naissus in Dardania, ordering that those children whose parents were too poor to support them should be maintained at the expense of the *fiscus*. In 322 the public distress caused a law of more questionable wisdom to be promulgated; the sale of children, which had been forbidden by Diocletian, was legalised, and children who had been exposed by their parents and rescued by a compassionate stranger, could not be claimed from

1. Tacitus, *Ann.* XIV. 42.

2. Seneca, *de Beneficiis*. 1 Tim. vi. 2, Alford's note.

3. Tert., *Apol.*, c. 9. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xiv.

their preserver. Exposing children was not punishable till the time of Valentinian, A.D. 374.

(4) **Marriage and the relation of the sexes;** The Christian religion of this period regarded marriage in a two-fold light. On the one hand it exalted it to its true position of a sacred and perpetual union between man and woman; on the other, it lowered the institution by preferring chaste celibacy to marriage. Constantine recognised both these Christian tendencies. He removed the liabilities attaching to celibate life by the ancient law, by freeing unmarried and childless persons from the taxes laid specially upon them.¹ This, we are told, was a change very acceptable to the Christians. In regard to the sanctity of marriage, he sought to put an end to the sin of incontinence by laws which reflect more credit on his zeal for purity than on his legislative wisdom or his humanity. A servant who had been party to seduction was to have boiling lead poured down her throat. Both the guilty parties were to be punished with death.

(5) **The Christian Church.** It was Constantine's aim to make the Church a privileged body, and his legislation shews that his policy was to make the clergy gradually take the place of the heathen priesthood as a distinct order in the State. In dealing with the Church his object was gradually to transfer to Christianity from heathenism all that had hitherto made it attractive in the eyes of the people. The Church was made a corporation capable of receiving legacies,² and the clergy were exempted from the office of *decurion*, a public position which at one time had been considered an honour, but which, by reason of the holder's penal liability to the government for the taxes of his district, had become an odious and burthensome public duty.³ This was as early as 313, and two years later the lands of the clergy were apparently exempted from

1. Euseb., *Vita Const.* iv. 26, 28.

2. *Codex Theod.*, xviii., laws 1, 2, 3. De Broglie, vol. I., p. 307.

3. See Guizot, *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*, Lect. II. For a discussion of the *curiales*. &c., see Bigg, *Church's Task*, Excursus on Lect. IV.

taxation.¹ In 321 the first day of the week (*dies venerabilis solis*) was ordered to be kept as a holiday and day of rest,² thus giving the day honoured by the Church a public recognition. But the effect of imperial favour was not wholly salutary. The hope of pleasing the Emperor and the desire of sharing in the privileges he had granted to the Christians induced many impostors to seek admission into the pale of the Church, whilst the exemption from the decurionate made several men of curial rank join the clergy for the purpose of evading the duties of that troublesome office. Constantine did not deprive the clergy of their privilege directly: but in providing against its abuse he dealt the Church a severe blow, by preventing anyone belonging to the *curiales* from taking holy orders. Thus the influence of wealth and education was arbitrarily withdrawn from the clerical order. The number of priests was also limited by statute, and they were to be chosen from the poor, "because the rich must contribute to the necessities of the age, and the poor should be nourished by the wealth of the Church."³

The most noticeable feature in the Christian advisers legislation of Constantine is the strong stamp of the personal influence of the Emperor which it bears. Constantine is remarkable for having promulgated an almost entirely new constitution, in which nearly every relation of human society was altered, without meeting with any serious opposition. That he was not resisted by heathen subjects, among whom passive obedience to the will of the ruler had become almost a second nature, is less wonderful than that the Christian Church, which had fought and conquered in the death struggle with the persecuting emperors, should calmly submit to his decrees. We may account for this by the fact that the

1. Robertson (*Hist. of the Chr. Ch.*, I. p. 258-9) quotes the Theodosian Code, XII., tit. 1.

2. Euseb., *Vita Const.* IV. 18. *Codex Justin.* XII. 3. Eusebius perhaps, and Sozomen expressly (I. 8), say that Friday was also to be observed, but nothing of this is found in the laws of the Theodosian Code.

3. See Broglie, vol. I., p. 307. *Codex Theod.* XVI., tit. 2, laws 3 and 6.

Church from the death of St. Cyprian to the rise of St. Athanasius had produced comparatively few men of commanding abilities.¹ The notable exception to this rule is Hosius of Cordova. Notwithstanding his having in extreme old age signed the heretical creed of Sirmium, Hosius seems to have been a man of much sanctity and capacity, which gave him great influence with the Emperor. He was certainly with Constantine in A.D. 313, as his name is mentioned in the latter's epistle to Caecilianus of Carthage.² He was not present at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, being presumably with the Emperor, who was on a campaign against Licinius in Pannonia. In 316 he was evidently with Constantine, for when the Donatists were condemned in that year they spread abroad a most unfair report that the severity of the Emperor was due to the influence of Hosius. In A.D. 321 Hosius is addressed in the law permitting slaves to be liberated in the presence of the clergy.³ It may be added that Lactantius, in his position as tutor to Crispus, was often about the Emperor's person, and to the influence of this writer's *Christian Institutes* parts of Constantine's legislation may be due, especially his unsuccessful attempts to suppress the gladiatorial games.

The Church of Africa and the schism of the Donatists.

The Christianity of the African Church was from the first distinguished by a fervour apparently peculiar to the inhabitants of the ancient Phœnician colony of Carthage. The terrible energy of the affection which Virgil depicts in Dido, and the stern fixity of purpose which made Hannibal so formidable an enemy of the Roman people, reappear in the new Carthage which rose to opulence under the Roman empire. The fiery and uncompromising fanaticism of Tertullian found in the austere sect of the Montanists a more congenial home than in the wider bosom of the Catholic Church. In the severely orthodox Cyprian, who ruled the church on sternest hierarchical principles, and

1. I owe this idea to the exhaustive article on 'Constantine' in the *Dict. of Christian Biography*.

2. Euseb., *H. E.* x. 6.

3. Mr. Dale, in his essay on the Council of Elvira, makes some suggestive remarks about the life of Hosius.

indignantly repudiated the Roman bishop Stephen's charitable view of heretical baptism, we detect similar traits of character. Great and holy as St. Augustine was, it is a noteworthy fact that the more unamiable of the Reformers found his works strangely attractive, and the gloomiest of modern theological doctrines is due to his teaching on the mysterious subject of predestination. Is it fanciful to trace in the Spanish temperament of the middle ages a continuation of the splendid heroism, the intense devotion, and the gloomy fanatical spirit of the Africans of antiquity? Can we not fancy Tertullian under different circumstances a Torquemada, and Cyprian combining the wisdom and the ruthless vandalism of Cardinal Ximenes? We should naturally expect a church animated by so fiery a spirit of devotion to behave with heroism in times of persecution, and to be distracted by the most bitter intestine discords when a cessation of trials from without gave an opportunity for strife to break out within.

The African Christians perplexed by the question: What is the Church? Accordingly we find that a persecution in Africa was usually followed by a bitter dispute as to whether those who had shewn weakness and had sacrificed to idols should be re-admitted to the Church. The more austere party desired not only that those who had sacrificed and denied Christ should be excluded, but that all who had in any way saved themselves, even by an apparent compliance with the demands of the heathen rulers, should be deemed unworthy of continuing in the Church. The furious controversies in the church of Carthage during Cyprian's administration turned on this point, and Diocletian's persecution was destined to be followed by a schism resulting in the utter ruin of Christianity in the province of Africa. The real question at issue was whether the Church of Christ ought to consist only of those who had done justice to their Christian profession, or whether she ought to admit the weak,

1. He destroyed thousands of Arabic books of priceless value. Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, vol. II., p. 369.

the erring, and the ignorant, in the hope of elevating them by her teaching and discipline.

The church of Carthage had suffered most severely under Maximian and Maxentius. It is probable also that the Christians were more numerous and influential in this province than in any other part of Constantine's dominions. Accordingly his good will towards the Christian religion was displayed almost immediately in a letter to Caecilian, bishop of Carthage, and two rescripts to Anulinus, under whose administration the persecution had previously raged.¹ The officer was now commanded to restore the property of the church and to exempt Christian clergymen from the public burdens. Caecilian was informed that an imperial grant of three thousand *folles* of wheat had been made to the African, Numidian, and Mauritanian churches. At the end of the letter Constantine hints that he knew of disturbances in the church, but he had formed no adequate idea of their seriousness.² The reply of Anulinus informed him that a very influential party were opposed to Caecilian and had petitioned him to send a portfolio containing accusations against that bishop. The signatories of the petition begged the Emperor that the question might be settled by the bishops of Gaul.³

To understand the reason for this opposition to Caecilian it is necessary to go back to the days of the persecution. Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, had decided that his duty was to discourage any attempt to exasperate the government against the Church. To prevent any of his flock from blindly seeking the honours of martyrdom, he set his face against the practice of crowds of admirers

Constantine addresses himself to the African Church directly after his conversion, and finds that there is a disputed election to the see of Carthage.

Cause of the Dispute.

1. Milman, *Hist. Christianity*, vol. II., p. 299. See Mason, *Persec. Diocletian*, p. 154 ff.

2. Broglie, vol. I., p. 254. Euseb., *H. E.* x. 6 : καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐπιθυμῶν, τινὰς μὴ καθεστῶσης διανοίας τυγχάνοντας ἀνθρώπων, τὸν λαὸν τῆς ἀγιωτάτης καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας φαύλην τινὲ ὑπονοθεύσει βούλεσθαι διαστρέφειν, γινώσκῃ με Ἄνυλινῳ . . . τοιαύτας ἐντολὰς δεδωκέναι . . . κ.τ.λ.

3. Broglie, vol. I., p. 260. For documentary evidence in the Donatist controversy, see Dupin's edition of *Optatus of Milevis*. Aug., *Epp.*, 68, § 2.

visiting the Christian confessors in prison, and forbade his flock to honour those who had drawn persecution upon themselves by proclaiming that they had copies of the Scriptures. In pursuing this line of action Mensurius was only following St. Cyprian,¹ and his own good sense shewed him that many of these ostentatious confessors of Christ were men in trouble with their creditors or in difficulties with the police, and that they were really making a profit out of their sufferings.² But good sense is seldom popular among zealots, and the more fiery party of the African Church charged Mensurius with being himself a *traditor* of the sacred Scriptures committed to his care.³ But the unpopularity of Mensurius was small compared with that of his archdeacon, Caecilian. His cruelty was depicted by the zealots in vivid colours. The archdeacon, it was said, evinced his hatred of the martyrs by standing at the doors of the prison with attendants armed with leathern thongs in order to drive away those who approached with food or drink. Many of the martyrs, it was alleged, died of starvation, whilst the dogs devoured the food which piety had brought for their support. A dreadful picture was drawn by the Donatists, in after days, of the brutal Caecilian standing at the prison door unmoved by the shrieks and tears of the parents and relatives and friends of the confessors, who were prevented by him from approaching their loved ones for the purpose of bidding them a last farewell.⁴ Of course such charges, being of a kind frequently made by partisans, were entirely false, nor do they seem to have hurt Caecilian in the eyes of pious and reasonable men, for on the death of Mensurius in A.D. 311 he was chosen bishop of Carthage. He was consecrated by Felix, bishop of Aptunga. As might have been expected, a strong party in Carthage was found to be opposed to Caecilian, as sixty years before Novatus and his faction had opposed the election of Cyprian. A wealthy woman

1. Cyprian, *Ep.* 5.

2. Mason, *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 169.

3. The charges against Mensurius are to be found in Augustine, *Brevic. coll. cum Don.* III. 13.

4. See the Passion of the Albitinian Martyrs in Dupin, *Optatus of Milevis*, p. iv.

was the chief supporter of the malcontents. Lucilla, a Spanish lady of noble birth, who had a high reputation for piety, had been greatly offended by Caecilian's having forbidden her to worship the relics of a martyr not, apparently, recognised by the Church.¹ She revenged herself on him by entertaining a commission sent by Secundus, bishop of Tigisis and Primate of Numidia, at her house. The commission, though nominally intended to promote peace, planned in concert with Lucilla the best means of overthrowing Caecilian. Secundus, with seventy bishops from Numidia, soon arrived at Carthage. A meeting was held in a private house, at which Caecilian was deposed on the ground that he had been consecrated by Felix of Aptunga, who was declared to have been a *traditor* during the persecution.² Majorinus a reader, a friend of Lucilla, was consecrated bishop, and for a short time the faction opposed to Caecilian was called the party of Majorinus. As, however, Majorinus soon died, the schismatics received the name Donatists, either from their leader Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae, or from his more famous name-sake, the successor of Majorinus in the see of Carthage. Such then were the trifling causes of a schism which rent the Church of Africa in twain, and which was prolonged with a bitterness remarkable even in ecclesiastical disputes.

Constantine, finding that the dispute in the Church of Africa could not easily be adjusted, decided that the case of Caecilian should receive the attention of the bishops of Italy and Gaul. Accordingly he caused three Gallican bishops, Maternus of Cologne, Reticus of

Constantine's
policy towards
the Donatists.

1. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. 1., p. 175 (Eng. Trans.) Optatus' words are: "Lucillam scilicet nescio quam muliebrem factiosam... cum correptionem archidiaconi Caeciliani ferre non posset, quae ante spiritalem cibum et potum os nescio cujus martyris, si tamen martyris, libare dicebatur." Was it her superstition that was rebuked by Caecilian, or the adoration of the bone of one of those whose death Caecilian and Mensurius did not regard as a martyrdom?

2. The absurdity of the proceedings of this synod is shown by the facts (a) that Felix was afterwards proved not to have been a *traditor*, (b) that Secundus had admitted at the Synod of Circa that he had himself given up the sacred Scriptures. Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

Autun, and Marinus of Arles, with fifteen Italian bishops, to form a sort of commission (A.D. 313) under Pope Miltiades or Melchiades to hear both parties at Rome.¹ Caecilian appeared with ten bishops of his party, and his accuser, Donatus of Casae Nigrae, with a like number. The innocence of Caecilian was established, and Miltiades, who had shewn great fairness and moderation throughout, sent two bishops to Africa to proclaim the fact that Caecilian's was the Catholic party. The Donatists now declared that they had been unfairly heard, and that Caecilian was no bishop because he had been ordained by Felix of Aptunga, who was *ipso facto* excommunicate as a *traditor*. Here again they were foiled, for the question, by order of the Emperor, was investigated by the proconsul Aelian, and it was conclusively proved that Felix had not surrendered the Scriptures. Still the schismatics were not satisfied; and Constantine, who shewed un-

Synod of Arles.

A. D. 314.

wearied patience in dealing with them, ordered the bishops of the Western Church to assemble at Arles. Thirty-three bishops were present, among them three from Britain, Eborius of York, Restitutus from London, and Adelfius, or Adelfius, 'de civitate Coloniae Londinensium', together with a presbyter named Sacerdos, and Arminius a deacon.² Marinus of Arles apparently presided over this synod, which acquitted Caecilian, remarking in a letter on the subject to Silvester, the successor of Miltiades, that it was fortunate for his accusers that the Pope had not been present, or the sentence would certainly have been more severe.³ In the year following the Council of Arles, Donatus the Great succeeded the insignificant Majorinus as the representative of the faction in the see

1. Euseb., *H. E.* x. 5. With Miltiades is associated Marcus. Tillemont considers that he was St. Miroclus, bishop of Milan. He may also have been an important presbyter in the Roman church. Broglie, *op. cit.*, vol. I., p. 263.

2. Bright (*Early English Church History*) considers that Adelfius was bishop of Caerleon on Usk. The number of bishops is given as thirty-three because of the signatures: but probably many more were present. Firth, *Constantine the Great*, p. 175.

3. Huetle, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

of Carthage, and the separatists had now the advantage of a really able and energetic leader.

Constantine
pronounces
against
the Donatists,
A.D. 316.

For three years Constantine had avoided pronouncing any decision in the matter of the African schism. Caecilian was detained in Italy after the Synod of Rome, and again in 315, whilst Constantine was endeavouring to evade having to exercise his personal authority in a purely ecclesiastical matter. At last, however, the Emperor was compelled to act, and on Nov. 14, 316, Caecilian was declared innocent in an imperial letter written from Milan.¹

Donatism
becomes a dis-
affected party.
The
Circumcelliones.

The sentence was necessarily attended by executive measures to suppress the schism, and the Donatists were now liable to punishment if they persisted. Ursacius was ordered to deprive them of their churches. Many who withstood this mandate lost their lives. But Constantine's treatment of the Donatists can hardly be called a religious persecution. They had themselves appealed to the imperial decision, and after their case had been most carefully investigated both by churchmen appointed by Constantine and by the officers of the government, their charges against Caecilian were dismissed. Even their plea that he was no bishop was shewn to be valueless by their inability to convict Felix of Aptunga of the offence of being a *traditor*. Nor were they persecuted because of their religious opinions, but for disobedience to the decision of the imperial tribunal to which they themselves had appealed. The action of the government roused the Donatists to fury. There was already in Africa a fanatical body of men who wandered about among the huts of the peasants to excite their passions and inflame their zeal. They were known to the world as Circumcelliones, but styled themselves *Agonistae*, or Christian champions. During the Donatist troubles these men gathered together a vast number of discontented persons, proclaiming a species of communism, and wandering about the country with heavy clubs, called

1. Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire*, p. 295.

'Israels', which they used instead of swords, because our Lord had commanded St. Peter, "Put up thy sword." Africa in the fourth century became distracted by these formidable representatives of the worst form of fanaticism. They defeated imperial armies, and the Count Ursacius, the persecutor of the Donatists, was slain in an engagement with them. Life became a terror in the country districts, and St. Augustine tells us that the war-cry of the Circumcellions 'Praise be to God!' was more feared than the roar of a lion. The most extraordinary zeal for martyrdom was shewn by these sectaries, who often slew each other when their enemies refused to put them to death.

In 317 Constantine wrote to the bishops of North Africa urging them to forbear as far as possible from retaliating the injuries they had received at the hands of the Circumcellions. In 321 he granted the Donatists liberty to act according to their own consciences. The government did not attempt again to interfere till the reign of Constans, 338, and Donatism continued to increase in influence throughout Africa till the days of St. Augustine. This vitality can only be accounted for by supposing that, despite the glaring inconsistency of the leaders of the schism (many of whom were themselves *traditores*) in appealing to the secular power, there was a strong party in the Church of Africa opposed on principle to any *concordat* with the State. The Donatist's exclamation 'What has the Emperor to do with the Church?' was probably a genuine complaint on the part of many adherents of the sect.

Like Constantine, his brother-in-law Licinius had overthrown his rival Maximin in 313, and the Roman empire remained divided between the two conquerors. But a struggle for supremacy was inevitable, though the issue of a contest between two such generals was too doubtful to allow either to precipitate a war. In the first campaign of 314 Licinius was defeated, but not crushed, at Cibalis, and Constantine won a doubtful victory at Mardia. A fresh partition of the Empire was made, Constantine added Illyricum, Macedonia, Dardania, Greece, and part of Moesia to his dominions. Nearly ten years' peace

followed, but the inevitable breach between the two emperors came at last, and this time Licinius appeared as the champion of Paganism.¹ The war of 323 was so far a religious one.² The cause of Christianity was triumphant throughout. Defeated with great loss at Adrianople, Licinius retreated to Byzantium. Crispus, the son of Constantine, forced the passage of the Hellespont and destroyed the hostile fleet, and Licinius' hastily-raised Bithynian army sustained a total overthrow at Scutari (Chrysopolis) in Bithynia, near Byzantium. Shortly afterwards the heathen emperor tendered a grovelling submission at Nicomedia. Though spared, ostensibly in deference to the entreaties of Constantia, the jealousy of his conqueror could not suffer Licinius to live. His confinement at Thessalonica was soon succeeded by accusations of conspiracy and an informal execution.³

1. There were even martyrs under Licinius: Hefele mentions Basil, bishop of Amasia, *Hist. of the Councils*, vol. I., p. 199. Euseb., *Vita Const.* II. 1.

2. Euseb., *Vita Const.* II. 4.

3. St. Jerome (*Chron.* 2339) says 'contra jus gentium'. The more courtly Eusebius (*Vita Const.* II. 13) says 'Then Constantine handed over the hated of God by the law of war to the punishment he deserved.'



CHAPTER XIII.

ARIANISM AND THE COUNCIL OF NICAËA.

THE defeat of Licinius left Constantine master of the Roman world, and face to face with an embarrassment compared to which all his previous ecclesiastical difficulties must have seemed trifling. Arianism, beginning *cir.* 318 at Alexandria as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, was already increasing with portentous speed and was shortly to darken the whole Christian horizon. The bishop of Alexandria had had a dispute with one of his presbyters on a purely speculative question; mutual accusations of heresy had been followed by the excommunication of the presumptuous priest. The subject was one which none but men trained in dialectic subtleties could possibly comprehend, and which to the uneducated seemed to turn on mere hair-splitting definitions. Yet the result was to set house against house and family against family, to fill cities with confusion and the whole empire with disorder, to arouse the most furious passions and to make men at enmity with one another on questions which not one in a thousand could understand. The excitement caused by the Arian disputes seems to us almost incredible, until we realise how much religious questions occupied the mind of mankind in the fourth century. The legislation of Constantine shews that the government was able to exercise the most despotic power, to enforce a system of enormous taxation, and to regulate almost every action of the lives of its subjects. But to the Christian Church Constantine found it necessary to accord almost complete independence. In her the liberty and loyalty, which had

deserted the Roman world, had taken up a new abode. Her leaders bore on their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus as signs of their constancy in the late persecution, and had proved that neither force nor persuasion could influence them or their followers to yield a point when the Faith was at stake. The question which had been raised divided the Christian world into two parties, and everyone considered himself bound by his religious loyalty to range himself on one side or the other.

Our account of the development of the science of theology in the second and third centuries has already brought us to the threshold of the Arian position. We have seen how difficult it was to avoid the Sabellian error of confusing the Son with the Father and at the same time to maintain the doctrine of His distinct *hypostasis* without dissolving the Unity of God. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in a charge to his clergy insisted strongly on the unity in the Trinity, and made use of expressions perilously near to the language of the dreaded heresy of Sabellius. He thought, as Socrates informs us,¹ that he was gaining honour by his argument; but one of his listeners was on the watch to catch any error in doctrine that might fall from the bishop. This was Arius, a presbyter of Baucalis, a suburb of Alexandria. The great heresiarch was a tall, grave, ascetic man, whose solemn face and severe manner had made him much respected, especially by the fairer portion of the community. He had been a disciple of the martyr Lucian,² and added to a character for piety a reputation for learning and ability.³ His chief failing seems to have been an overweening vanity,

1. Φιλοτιμώτερον περι τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ἐν τριάδι μονάδα εἶναι φιλοσοφῶν ἰθεολόγει. Socrates, *H. E.* 1, 5. Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils*, vol. 1., p. 243.

2. Lucian was, like Paulus, a native of Samosata. He was the head of a critical, exegetical and theological school at Antioch. Domnus, who was bishop after the deposition of Paulus, appears to have suspended him from his functions. He was however reconciled to the Church, and died a martyr at Nicomedia, January 7, 312. His pupils were greatly attached to him and to one another. *Prolegomena to Athanasius*, (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*), p. xxviii.

3. Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. 1., part II., p. 231.

which no doubt prompted him to offer a popular solution of a doctrine which had remained impenetrable even to the minds of Clement and Origen.

System of Arius. (1) Starting from the essentially pagan conception of God as a Being absolutely apart from His creation, Arius could not conceive of a mediator being other than a created being, and found that between the Father and the Son there was the impassable gulf which according to his theory must separate the unbegotten, or uncreated, from that which is begotten, or created. The Father was therefore essentially isolated from the Son. (2) The creation of the Son as a second God Arius proceeded to explain by the logical method he had learned in the school of Lucian, and urged that He must be a finite Being. (3) Therefore the Son had no existence before He was begotten. Although He was created before the universe and before all time, there was 'once' (*πρωτέ*)—Arius avoided the use of the word 'time'—when He was not. (4) Assuming that the Son was a creature, and could not therefore be of the same substance as the uncreated God, Arius proceeds to declare that He was made out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*); (5) and he argues that the Son, being of a different essence (*οὐσία*) to the Father, can only be called God in a lower and improper sense. (6) As a creature, this pre-existent Christ was liable to change, and even capable of sin; nothing, as a matter of fact, keeping Him sinless but His own virtue.¹

What appears to us most repulsive in the scheme of Arius was in the fourth century its great attraction. To our minds there is something almost revolting in the way in which Arius thus coldly applies a shallow system of reasoning to the explanation of so profound a mystery as the relation of the Supreme Being to the Redeemer. We see no attractiveness in the theory which keeps God and man for ever apart, and we are unable to realise the idea of a Christ who is neither God nor

1. Harnack, *Hist. Dogma*, vol. IV., Eng. Trans. See my article on Arianism in Hastings' *Dict. of Religion and Ethics*, vol. I.

true man.¹ It was quite otherwise in the fourth century, especially when after the edict of Milan the heathen were crowding into the Church, bringing many of their old habits of thought with them, and being more anxious to win the favour of the Emperor by professing Christianity, than to acquire the true doctrines of the now privileged religion.² Arius in the popular judgment had simplified the Faith and brought Christian doctrine into accord with the generally accepted notions of the time. For the great attraction of Christianity for the men of the third and fourth centuries was, not its doctrines of Atonement and Redemption, but its Monotheism. The Faith had given life and reality to the unity of God, which even heathen philosophy had pronounced to be a necessary belief. Nor had the Christian teachers been less influenced by Neo-Platonism than that philosophy by Christianity. The Church teachers of the fourth century very frequently appeal to Philo, to Porphyry, to Plotinus, and other Neo-Platonists, in their belief that they could find in their writings the Christian conception of God. Certainly the Neo-Platonists had constructed a kind of doctrine of the Trinity. The Father was here the *ὄν*, the *αἰτίον*. This use of the term *ὄν* may have been the ultimate foundation of the subordinationism, from which the Eastern Church found such difficulty in freeing itself.³ In isolating God from the world Arius both satisfied the desire for Monotheism, and conformed to the prejudice which feared to unspiritualise the idea of God by bringing Him into contact with creation. At the same time he opposed the Sabellian heresy by giving the Son a distinct *hypostasis*.⁴ The heresiarch appears in addition to have possessed the abilities necessary for a successful demagogue. He appealed to the populace by writing verses in the style of a licentious

1. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 240. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 25, 26. Mr. Gwatkin thinks that Arius, like his followers at a later date, denied the humanity of our Lord. "It was simpler for Arius to unite the Logos to a human body, and to sacrifice the last relics of the original defence of our Lord's true manhood."

2. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

3. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

4. Gwatkin, p. 27.

Egyptian poet, Sotades, in which his doctrines were stated in a form easy to be remembered.¹ We are told that the Alexandrian mechanics sang the songs of Arius about the Trinity at their work and in the streets. Support of a more respectable character was accorded by the Syrian bishops, of whom the most learned was the historian Eusebius of Caesarea. A footing in the imperial palace itself was secured by the adhesion of the other Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, the spiritual adviser of the empress Constantia, wife of Licinius and sister of Constantine.

Arianism very dangerous to Christianity.

The tediousness of the Arian controversy, with its tangled intrigues and hair-splitting definitions, has sometimes hid from the modern historian the real importance of the issue. But the Fathers of the fourth century were not engaged in a mere dispute about words. The principles of Arianism were a serious menace to the well-being of Christianity, and the practical services of Ulfilas² the Gothic missionary, and other excellent men of this school, must not divert our attention from the gravity of their error. If God is a mere abstraction—the Platonic *ὄν*—a Being separated by an impassable gulf from the world, how can He be described as loving man, or how can man's love be directed to Him? If Christ is a created being, essentially different from God, His manifestation only reveals new gradations of being between the human and the divine, nor can it fulfil the purpose of bringing men nearer to God. And if Christ is not indeed God, we cannot offer Him the worship due to God alone. If, moreover, the Logos merely used the human body as a means of communicating with the world, mankind cannot turn to Him as to one who bore our human nature. Granted that many of the followers of Arius were Christians of the highest type, the logic they had used to prove the relation of the Son to the Father really led back step by step to the Pagan doctrine of

1. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. 1., p. 256. Socrates, *H. E.*
1.9. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, II. § 15.

2. For Ulfilas, see C. A. Scott, *Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths*.

an unknown and unknowable God, and to the worship of a demi-god.¹

**Arianism not
logically
tenable.**

In truth this system was, as Dorner points out, unsound in that which was regarded as its strongest point. It was illogical.

In isolating God from the world, Arius is logically conducted to the Epicurean doctrine that creation is the result of chance. This Arius does not dare to face; he accordingly gives this chance a seat in the will of God. Yet this will is actuated by caprice, for to what other motive can we assign the creation of the Logos as creator of the world by a God who is essentially divided from both? Again, when he represents the Father as entirely unknowable, and teaches that this attribute is necessary to His exalted nature, he remains confronted by the dilemma: If man cannot know God, and if the Son cannot reveal the Father to us, how can we know that He cannot be known?²

**Arianism a very
difficult heresy
to refute.**

Notwithstanding its unscriptural and illogical character, no heresy was harder to refute than that of Arius. The subordination of the Son had, as we have seen, been taught by such honoured teachers as Origen and the Alexandrian Dionysius; and more recently, Lucian of Antioch, celebrated as a scholar no less than a martyr, had taught a similar doctrine. It seemed only a step from the teaching of these divines to that of Arius, for though they may be honourably acquitted of heresy, their language appeared at times to countenance his conclusions. Moreover the Arians were quite willing

1. Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*, chap. vii. Gwatkin, *Arians*, p. 21 sq. See the second Discourse of Athanasius *Against the Arians*, ch. xvi., where Prov. viii 22 is discussed, and the argument is adduced that the worship which man is permitted to pay to Christ is a proof of His divinity. In the third discourse, ch. xxv. § 15, the same writer asks the Arians "Why they do not rank themselves with the Gentiles, . . . for they too worship the creature. . . ." "Arianism" says Dr. Harnack "is a new doctrine in the Church; it labours under quite as many difficulties as any other earlier Christological doctrine; it is finally, in one important respect, merely Hellenism which is simply tempered by the constant use of Holy Scripture."—*History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 41.

2. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 239. "The Arian Christology is inwardly the most unstable, and dogmatically the most worthless, of all the Christologies to be met with in the history of dogma." Schultz, *Gottheit Christi*, p. 65, quoted by Harnack.

to accept the strongest phrases used in the Scriptures on the subject of our Lord's divinity. They were prepared to admit that He was in the image of God, and the first-born (*πρωτότοκος*) of all creation. Provided they might teach that the Saviour's being was independent of that of the Father, they cared not what honour was paid to Him or what language was used in His praise, as it was always possible to explain it away by some evasion of the true sense of the passage.¹

Alexander excommunicates Arius. A.D. 321. Alexander, alarmed by the spread of these opinions, and finding that a certain Colluthus had made his forbearance towards Arius the excuse for a schism, summoned a council to meet at Alexandria, and excommunicated the heresiarch and his two followers, the bishops Theonas and Secundus. In order to refute the new heresy, he put forth an encyclical letter signed by his clergy, among whose signatures we find the name of his deacon Athanasius, in which he terms the Arians Exucontians (*οἱ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*).² Arius continued for some considerable time to hold assemblies in Alexandria, but was at last compelled to leave that city, and went first to Palestine and afterwards to his friend Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. From Nicomedia Arius wrote to Alexander, bishop of Byzantium, a long letter in which he set forth his opinions in a sort of creed;³ and also published his *Thalia* or *Spiritual Banquet* in verse for the use of the common people. The troubles in the East caused by the quarrel between Licinius and Constantine were to the advantage of Arius, who after being acquitted of heresy at a synod held by Eusebius, returned to Alexandria.

Constantine's letters to Arius and Alexander. Such then was the state of affairs when Constantine became master of the East. Although he could have had no special interest in the theological question, the

1. Athanasius, *First Discourse against the Arians*. In ch. xiii. the four favourite Scriptural passages used by the Arians in controversy are enumerated: Prov. viii. 22 (LXX), Heb. i. 4, iii. 2, Acts ii. 36.

2. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 4. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. 1., p. 252.

3. Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 256. Theodoret, *L. 4. Prolegomena to Athanasius*, p. xvi.

Emperor found it impossible to ignore it, for experience had taught him what disturbances in Egypt meant.¹ Accordingly Constantine sent Hosius of Cordova with letters to Alexander and Arius, exhorting them to peace, and blaming them for having presumed to disturb the Church by the discussion of so high a theme.² But it was too late for mediation, and Constantine was impelled to measures of more drastic character. He determined to restore peace to the Church by assembling a General Council.

It is not improbable that Hosius was the first to suggest to Constantine the advisability of thus settling the disputed question of the true place of the Son in the Godhead. The project, however, was a dramatic illustration of the new personal status of the Emperor.³ In Constantine's mind the notion of one Church and one Empire had in all probability been long strengthening, and the very name *oecumenical*, applied to this and other councils, proves that it was considered as representing the Roman empire. But at the great Council of Nicaea bishops from countries which lay beyond the imperial frontier were invited to be present. Persia and Scythia sent representatives,⁴ as well as the provinces acknowledging the rule of Constantine. The disinclination of the Western mind for transcendental theology is perhaps illustrated by the fact that the majority of the bishops were Orientals. The provinces of the West were indeed very inadequately represented. The Roman Silvester sent to the Council two presbyters, Victor and Vincentius; and Hosius of Cordova, the Emperor's friend and spiritual adviser, Caecilian of Carthage, whose election as bishop had caused the Donatist schism, and three other bishops, were the only other Westerns present,⁵

1. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

2. Socrates, i. 7. The historian describes the imperial letter as "wondrous and full of wisdom". Cardinal Newman, on the other hand, censures the presumption of an unbaptized person like Constantine taking part in a controversy on a purely theological question. Newman, *Arians*, p. 243 foll.

3. Gwatkin, *Arians*, p. 36.

4. Eusebius, *Vita Const.* III., c. 7.

5. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. I., p. 271.

though Constantine had done all that was possible to afford facilities for travelling by placing the public conveyances at the disposal of the Church's delegates.¹ The choice of Nicaea as a place of meeting was also favourable to a large concourse of bishops. Situated upon the shores of Lake Ascanius, which is joined to the Propontis by a navigable river, Nicaea was very easy to reach from all the provinces, especially from Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Greece and Thrace.² The quick eye for locality which is shewn in Constantine's choice of Byzantium for the site of his capital, is also exhibited in his fixing upon Nicaea as the meeting place for his great council. The name may also have influenced the Emperor as being of good omen for the success of his plans.³

The number of bishops present was, according to Eusebius, more than two hundred and fifty. Other accounts give three hundred and eighteen, and dwell on the fact that this number corresponds with that of Abraham's servants when he delivered Lot. Athanasius, who like Eusebius was an eye-witness, says that there were three hundred bishops at Nicaea.⁴ As the number must have varied during its sitting, and perhaps not all reached the locality ere the opening of the Council, it is easy to reconcile these discrepancies.⁵ Many of those present had suffered in the Diocletian persecution. Both at the time and afterwards, it was as an assemblage of confessors and martyrs, no less than as an Ecumenical Council, that this conclave claimed authority.⁶ A large number of dialecticians were present at Nicaea, some of whom had been brought by the bishops to assist them in their

Opening
of the Council.

1. Eusebius, *Vita Const.* III., c. 6.

2. Hefele, p. 270. Nicaea was only twenty miles from Nicomedia, which at this time was the capital of the Eastern part of the Empire. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. III.

3. Eusebius, *Vita Const.* III. 6: *πῶλις εὐπρέπουσα τῇ συνόδῳ νίκης ἐπιώνυμος*. The reason given in the probably spurious letter summoning the Council is the 'salubrity of the air of Nicaea'.

4. Gen. xiv. 14. Athanasius, *De Decretis*, c. ii. Towards the end of his life Athanasius accepted the mystical number 318. *Letter of the Bishops of Egypt etc. to those of Africa*.

5. Hefele, p. 271.

6. Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect. III.

debates, whilst others had doubtless been attracted to the Council simply by curiosity. A very characteristic story is told by Socrates, an historian of the fifth century. Whilst the Council was assembling, the dialecticians raised a discussion in which many were joining from mere love of argument, when suddenly a layman, who had been a confessor during the persecution, stepped forward and said abruptly, "Christ and His Apostles did not give us the art of logic or vain deceit, but naked truth to be guarded by faith and good works." This bold rebuke called forth universal approval, and gave a higher tone to all subsequent discussion.¹ Rufinus and Sozomen give a more dramatic turn to the story by making a philosopher, by name Eulogius, refute every Christian disputant, till an aged Christian priest or bishop, whom later tradition identifies with Spiridion of Cyprus, stepped forward and declared the Christian Faith to the philosopher. Unable to withstand the spirit with which the old man spoke, Eulogius forthwith submitted to baptism.²

The important question of the heresy of Arius was the first subject which occupied the Council after the arrival of Constantine. The bishops had begun by presenting to the Emperor numerous petitions stating their grievances against one another; but Constantine gathered these together and committed them to the flames, that the world might not know that Christian bishops had any differences among themselves. After this well-timed rebuke the real business of the Council began. It speedily became manifest that there were three ecclesiastical parties present. The extreme sections were represented by Arius and by Marcellus of Ancyra respectively. Prominent on the side of Marcellus was a worthier exponent of orthodoxy, Athanasius, the deacon whom Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, had brought to the Council. Marcellus was, however, a dangerous friend, and his subsequent language led to his being some years later not unjustly pronounced a heretic. Arius' warmest

1. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. III.
 2. Stanley (*Eastern Church*, Lect. III.) tells the story from Rufinus i. 3, Soz. i. 18, very graphically.

supporters were the bishops Theonas, Secundus, and the powerful Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was destined to do him yeoman's service in after days. Between these two extremes was the large majority of the Council, who disliked innovation and, for the most part, were unable to perceive the exact point of the controversy. The position of these men is illustrated by the acute remark of the historian Socrates, who regarded the affairs of the Church with the eye of a layman and a lawyer, and who loved the Christian Faith more than the Christian clergy. Speaking of a later phase of the Arian controversy, he says, "what took place resembled a fight in the dark, no man knew whether he struck at friend or foe."¹ A fear of heresy on the one hand, and of innovation on the other, made them waverers; yet it was by the vote of such as these that the matter had to be decided.

**Eusebius
of Caesarea.**

It is difficult in describing the state of parties at Nicaea to give Eusebius of Caesarea a place in any one of them. His name-sake of Nicomedia says that he shewed great zeal on behalf of the Arian doctrine before the meeting of the Council.² This statement, however, must be accepted with caution, as the Arians were most anxious to claim the alliance of the most learned bishop in the world, who was also the friend and counsellor of Constantine. It seems more probable that Eusebius' conduct was prompted by a sincere desire for peace, a dislike of rigid tests of orthodoxy, and a wish to see Arius treated fairly. He appears to have been no zealot: rather was he one who could appreciate the courage which inspired others to court the glories of martyrdom, without any burning desire to suffer in his own person. At a later time Eusebius was taunted with having escaped martyrdom by sacrificing. Bishop Lightfoot, however, reasonably argues that it is hardly likely that he would have been unanimously elected bishop of Caesarea at the close of the persecution, had

1. Socr., *H. E.* i. 23; see Gwatkin, p. 61. *νικτομαχίας τε οὐδὲν ἀπείχε τὰ γινόμενα οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἐφαίνοντο νοοῦντες, ἀφ' ὧν ἀλλήλους βλασφημεῖν ὑπελήμβανον.*

2. Theod., *H. E.* i. 5.

he been guilty of apostasy. But though this accusation, made by Potammon at the synod of Tyre, was in all probability without good grounds, Eusebius was not the man to be martyred.¹ Like our own Archbishop Parker, the erudite bishop of Caesarea probably had the skill to keep himself tolerably safe during the days of persecution, when men of more zeal but less discretion suffered death or at least torture.² His behaviour at Nicaea goes far to countenance this view. Let it be added that candour and liberality were in Eusebius joined with wide learning, and his moderate policy will not appear devoid of a moral justification. If he lacked the virtues which make a man a martyr or confessor, he was without those bitter prejudices which have marred so many otherwise saintly characters.

As Eusebius gave a creed to the Council, the phraseology of which, in spite of a very material alteration, became the basis of the famous Creed of Nicaea, his teaching on the subject of the Trinity deserves careful attention. He considers that the attributes of God can be predicated *sensu eminenti* only of the Father, who is indeed the τὸ ὄν. He alone is the representative of the *μοναρχία*. If another, the Son for example, were co-eternal with the Father we should have two eternals, and thus we should drift back into Polytheism. In order that He might create the world, the Father sent the Son, Who, after abiding in Him (ἐνδον μένων ἐν ἡσυχάζοντι τῷ Πατρὶ), became an *hypostasis* when He went forth from God. Yet He, as Son and Word of the Father, is Himself endowed with all divine attributes.³ Eusebius goes farther than Origen in glorifying the Son, by admitting that He is the Very Word, the Very Wisdom, and even the Very God (αὐτόθεος). As He was begotten before all the aeons, the Son is *ἀναρχος*, that is without beginning in time, for He was begotten out of time. By this means Eusebius avoided the objectionable language of Arius, and was able to deny that he had

1. Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos*, § 8. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68. 7.

2. Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. II., p. 311 δ.

3. He is the πλήρωμα θεοῦ ἐκ πατρικῆς θεότητος.

said of the Son ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, and to say that He was ever with the Father, though he does not use the term co-eternal (*συναιδίδιος*).¹ In its phraseology Eusebius' doctrine is inoffensive and represents the popular belief of his day. But if pressed to a logical conclusion, the result is Arianism, though he and others were unwilling to admit the extreme views of that heresy. Eusebius is interesting to us as the representative of the majority of Christians whose opinions were unformed, and who consequently tried to occupy a middle position in the controversy, being alternately attracted and repelled by orthodoxy and Arianism. In the controversies which followed Nicaea these formed the bulk of the Semi-Arian party.

**Opinions
of Athanasius.**

Men like Eusebius of Caesarea could not do more than postpone the question. The symbol most agreeable to this party would be a creed which would neither offend nor fully satisfy anybody, but would leave the Arian dispute much as it had been before. Arius and his friends knew perfectly what they wanted, and were not the men to be crushed by a majority, however large, which did not know its own mind. But on the other side there was also one man who was fully determined on his course of action,—Athanasius, the Alexandrian deacon. Though not yet thirty years of age, Athanasius had taken an active part in the controversy, and had already published two treatises on the subject.² Despite his comparatively humble rank in the Church, he was listened to with profound attention, possibly as the mouthpiece of his bishop, Alexander. A cursory glance at his theological system, as it is found in the treatises he wrote before A.D. 325, will shew how remote was the position of Athanasius from the cold definitions of Arius and the vague uncertainties of Eusebius. Like Arius, Athanasius distinguishes clearly between God and the World; but unlike him, he will not believe in the isolation of the

1. Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. II., pp. 219—224. Eusebius' views are to be read in his treatise *Adv. Marcellum*.

2. The *Λόγος καθ' Ἑλλήνας* and the *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ*. "*De Incarnatione Verbi*,"—they form, in reality, two parts of a single work.

Creator. God is in the World as the immanent principle of its harmony. When He saw man deprived by sin of his former spiritual union, the Father was touched with compassion;—it appealed to His pity (*ἔξεκαλέσατο*). But God could not deny Himself by accepting man's submission without atonement for his sin. Thus it was that the Logos, who had created man out of nothing, intervened to save man by suffering in his stead. Because the Logos took our nature upon Him, our nature possesses Him, He belongs to us; we constitute the body of which He is the Head. And being thus united to men, the Logos unites us to the Father, for He is the image of the Father, pre-existent, yet ever resting in God. Here we have a true view of God, His Word, the universe, and man. A Father who is a real Father, loving mankind, grieving over their estrangement from Him, and providing a means for their salvation. A real Son, the Word of the Father, ever with Him and yet with His own *hypostasis*. A universe, the harmony of which is due to the presence of God, of which it can be said "The Lord has touched its every part."¹ Mankind, alienated from God yet restored to Him by His incarnate Word, who became man that we might be made God.² Such then was the Christian system as it appeared to Athanasius. It seemed indispensable to a proper representation of the unity of the Godhead, that there should be left no possibility of a believer accepting the dangerous explanation of Arius.³

The learning, eloquence, and the court favour enjoyed by Eusebius gave him great weight at the Council. He had pronounced the inaugural address of the Council to the Emperor, and it was his ambition to be allowed to give a creed to the Church. Accordingly, after the creed of Arius had been read and torn in pieces by the indignant bishops,⁴ he produced a symbol, which he

1. πάντα γὰρ τῆς κτίσεως μέρων ἤψατο ὁ Θεός.
 2. ὁ λόγος ἐνηθρώπησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν.
 3. Dörner, *op. cit.*, vol. II., pp. 249—259. Page 251 is especially worthy of notice. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, pp. 349 ff.
 4. Theodoret, *H. E.* 1. 7, εὐθέως διέβρηξαν ἅπαντες, νόθον καὶ αἰσθητὸν ἀνομάσαντες.

averred had been long in use in his own church of Caesarea. His exact words are: "As we received from the bishops who were before us, both when we were catechized and when we received baptism (*τὸ λουτρίν*), and according to what we have learnt from the Holy Scriptures, and as we have believed and been in the habit of teaching both in our own presbyterate and in our episcopate. Thus believing, we lay this statement of our faith before you." It was in many ways satisfactory. It harmonized with Apostolic tradition in attributing the highest honours to the Second Person of the Trinity, and it was at the same time free from all suspicion of the dreaded heresy of Sabellius. It was, moreover, one which everybody could sign, if not *ex animo*, at least without doing violence to his conscience. But this was exactly what Alexander and his friends did not want; they had come to the Council, not to make an agreement between all parties, but to sift the matter thoroughly. Either Arius was right or he was wrong. No compromise was possible. The Council had no hesitation in pronouncing an unqualified condemnation of the views of Arius; not twenty members were found to vote for an Arianizing creed proposed by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Arius soon found himself with only five supporters. It was at this juncture that Eusebius of Caesarea brought forth his creed.¹ It was as follows:—

We believe in One God, Father, all-Sovereign, Creator of all things whatsoever, both visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, only-begotten Son, the First-born of all creation, begotten of God the Father before all the ages, by Whom also all things came into being, Who became flesh for our salvation, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Ghost. (We believe) that Each of these is

1. The use of the word Creed must not mislead the reader. The Council of Nicaea did not intend to issue a baptismal formula, but a universal test of orthodoxy to be signed by bishops upon occasion. The Nicene Creed is never called *σύμβολον* (except at the Council of Laodiceae, A.D. 363), but always *πίστις* or *μάθημα*, till its conversion into a baptismal profession in the fifth century. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 37.

and subsists: the Father truly as Father, the Son truly as Son, the Holy Ghost truly as Holy Ghost; as our Lord also says when He sends His disciples to preach: Go and make all nations disciples, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.¹

This creed, though perfectly inoffensive, was unsatisfactory to Alexander and the opponents of the teaching of Arius, since it left the two points at issue practically untouched. After his denial of our Lord's union with the Father, it was no longer possible to be content with the acknowledgment that the Second Person of the Trinity was "born before all the ages" (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων*) or that He was "First-born of all creation", since his followers could accept these expressions and still teach that the Logos was not eternally begotten. In like manner they were prepared to accept the expression *θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ*, for all things are of God, and the Son is, in a sense, God. A further objection to the proposed creed was the studiously ambiguous expression, which left the whole doctrine of the Incarnation in uncertainty.²

The creed of Eusebius was however accepted as the basis of the new symbol, but in an amended form. There was only one way of making Arianism impossible, and that was to use a word, which was not only unscriptural, but which was in bad repute as having been used by the heretics Valentinus and Paul of Samosata. The Son must be declared to be of one substance or essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father, in order to exclude Arius from the Church. The courage of the orthodox party in proposing to make use of such an expression was very great. According to Irenaeus it had been used by the Valentinians, and it had gained an evil notoriety in the East in the disputes about Paul of Samosata. The Arians could taunt their opponents with having borrowed the word from the armoury of heresy. The

1. Hefele, pp. 288, 289. The creed is found in Eusebius' letter to his church, given by Athanasius in his *De Decr. Syn. Nic.*, by Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 12, and Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8. Burn, *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 79.

2. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 39.

orthodox party, however, resolved to face the reproach of having used an heretical word as a means of over-throwing error. The *Homöousion* left no room for Arianism. If our Lord was declared to be of one substance with the Father, the whole theory of Arius, that He was of a lower nature, and capable of change and even of sin, entirely fell to the ground. According to Eusebius, Constantine wanted the creed already proposed to be accepted with the word *ὁμοούσιος* inserted: but the majority of the Council, by the advice of Hosius of Cordova, Eustathius of Antioch, Marcellus of Ancyra, and the other anti-Origenist bishops of the East,¹ decided to make six important alterations in the creed before them. They were, according to Prof. Gwatkin, as follows:—

1. In the words, “τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν,” πάντων (all things) was substituted for τῶν ἀπάντων (all things whatsoever), to exclude the creation of the Son and Spirit.² This shews how carefully the Council did its work.

1. See Bishop Bull, *Defence of the Nicene Creed*, p. 70 foll.; on p. 99 Bishop Bull quotes Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam*, c. 8: “Non ideo non utitur et veritas vocabulo, quia et haeresis potius ex veritate accepit, quod ad mendacium suum strueret.” See *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Prolegomena to Athanasius, p. xvii. It is certain that Athanasius was not the author of the word *ὁμοούσιον*. It is noticeable that even in his later writings he avoids using it, and in his *Discourses against the Arians* it only occurs three or four times. Athanasius, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. 303. The word *ὁμοούσιος* means ‘that which partakes of the same *οὐσία*, a word first used by Aristotle to express that which is self-existent (*χωριστόν*). The compound word *ὁμοούσιος* was first used by the Gnostic Valentinian to express the homogeneity of the two factors in the fundamental dualism of the universe. It is used in a somewhat similar sense in the *Clementine Homilies*, xx. 7. The term *οὐσία* was to Christian theologians liable to be misleading, because Origen had adopted the Platonic expression that ‘God is beyond all essence (*οὐσίαν*)’, thus connecting the word with the idea of something material. Thus the Origenist bishop of the East, in pronouncing against Paul of Samosata, repudiated the term *ὁμοούσιος* with the concurrence of Dionysius of Rome, who a few years before had successfully pressed it as a test word on his name-sake of Alexandria. The adoption of this word was therefore naturally repugnant to many, and it was not for many years, and only after the Cappadocian fathers had distinguished between *οὐσία* and *ὕψιστος*, that the Symbol of Nicaea found universal acceptance. See the Prolegomena to Athanasius, p. xxxi f.

2. See Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. iv., p. 54, and especially the note on p. 56. Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 171 n.

2. The Sonship of the Second Person was thrown to the front, and all subsequent clauses referred to the Son instead of to the Logos.

3. The words *τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς* were added to explain the word *μονογενῆς*.

4. *Ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως* became *Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί*. The two participles which the Arians had confused were thus carefully distinguished.

5. *Το σαρκωθέντα* was added *καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*.

6. An anathema was added.¹

The creed of the Council was therefore set forth in the following terms:—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὀρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητὴν.

Καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ—τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς—Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοι-

1. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 41, 42. See Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 138. Bethune-Baker, *Introduction to Early Christian Doctrine*, p. 168.

ωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.¹

Constantine after some deliberation agreed to this creed, and the majority of the Council subscribed to it without hesitation. Eusebius of Caesarea objected to the anathema; he took a day to consider whether he should sign at all, and referred the matter to the Emperor. Constantine (who apparently understood the Greek language imperfectly)² was able to assure the greatest scholar of his day that ὁμοούσιος involved no such material unity in the Persons of the Godhead as Eusebius feared might be deduced from it.³ Fortified by this weighty opinion, Eusebius signed the creed, and wrote to his congregation in Palestine to explain why he had done so. The letter does no honour to the character of Eusebius, who gives the language of the Arians a meaning which he must have known they did not intend.⁴ His name-sake of Nicomedia also subscribed to the creed, but his action brought him little benefit, as he was banished within the year. Arius was left with only five supporters, the bishops Theonas and Secundus, the presbyter Saras, the deacon Euzoïus, and the reader Achilles. They were all banished to Galatia or to Illyricum; Arius remaining some six years in the last-named province, where he may perchance have instructed Ursacius and Valens, who in after days championed his doctrines.⁵ But the

1. The theological student will do well to commit, if possible, this creed to memory, especially the anathema, which gives in a brief form the views held by Arius. The words underlined are in the Eusebian creed. Burn, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

2. Eusebius says that though Constantine addressed the Council in Latin he also spoke Greek, Ἐλληρίζων τῇ φωνῇ οὐκ ἔτι μὴδὲ ταύτης ἀμάρτυς εἶχεν, but see Valesius' note on Socrates i. 14.

3. See Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. iv.

4. Hefele, *Councils*, vol. 1., p. 291. The letter of Eusebius is found in the *De Decr. Syn. Nic.* Eusebius explains the words *πρὸν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν* as referring to our Lord's Incarnation. Neither the Arians nor the orthodox understood the words in this sense. Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. xviii.

5. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Prolegomena to Athanasius, p. xxxiv.

exiles do not seem to have hastened from Nicaea, as the name of Secundus appears among the signatories of the Council.¹

Nevertheless, the triumph of the *Homöousion* was more apparent than real. The vast majority of the bishops failed to comprehend the actual meaning of the point at issue. Constantine pressed them to accept the creed because he hoped that it would secure the peace of the Church; and the Arianizing party allowed the *Homöousion* to be acknowledged, in the hope that they could explain it away. The contest only began with the Council of Nicaea. Alexander, Eustathius, and Athanasius had won a great victory, but the war was not ended.²

Before proceeding with the history of the Council it may be well to pursue the Arian controversy to the death of Constantine. Constantine may in all probability have felt that in securing a practically unanimous assent to the Creed of Nicaea he had silenced controversy, and that henceforward the Christians would live in concord. The failure of the Synod of Arles to heal the Donatist schism gave indeed but a doubtful omen as to the success of the Council of Nicaea, still he may have regarded the practical unanimity with which the creed was accepted as an earnest of peace. He was destined to be speedily undeceived. The Arianizing party began to intrigue as soon as the Council closed. By A.D. 330 they felt themselves strong enough to attack Eustathius, bishop of Antioch. How his enemies managed to secure his deposition is not very certain. Various charges are suggested by the historians.³ In the meantime Eusebius of Nicomedia had returned from exile, and was once

1. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. IV.
 2. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 59.
 3. Among them one of fornication. See Gwatkin, p. 74, note. Dean Milman says "The unseemly practice of bringing forward women of bad character to charge men of high station in the Church . . . , formerly employed to calumniate the Christians, was adopted by the reckless hostility of Christian faction." Eustathius lived till 358. He was deposed with the full consent of the civil power, perhaps on account of his having been charged with defaming Helena. Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, c. 4.

more in favour with the Emperor. The time seemed to have arrived when the Arians would be strong enough to strike at their chief opponent, Athanasius, now bishop (or, as he was generally styled, pope) of Alexandria. But this required some caution. Marcellus of Ancyra, whose anti-Arian opinions verged on Sabellianism, was first attacked and condemned as a heretic. The next step was to prejudice the Emperor against Athanasius. He was accused of extortion and of magic; a darker insinuation—the murder of Arsenius, a Meletian bishop—was also added. At the Synod of Tyre, A.D. 335, Athanasius was formally charged with the murder of Arsenius, who was hidden by the bishop's enemies and only discovered by him with great difficulty. At the synod, however, the hand of a dead man was produced as evidence, but Athanasius presented Arsenius alive and with both his hands.¹ He then, seeing the impossibility of obtaining justice from such a tribunal, hastened to Constantinople and presented himself before the Emperor to demand a fair trial. His accusers were summoned, and this time made a charge of high treason against Athanasius; they declared that he had detained the Alexandrian corn ships, which supplied Constantinople with provisions.² The very whisper of such an accusation was enough to arouse the suspicion of the Emperor, and Athanasius was banished to Trèves, A.D. 336. The triumph of his opponents was complete: Arius wrote to Constantine a confession of his faith, which eluded the points at issue, but satisfied the Emperor,³ and the Emperor ordered him to be restored to the Church in Constantinople. To the great joy of the orthodox, he died on the very day appointed for his restoration.⁴

1. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, 8 and 38. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 29.

2. *Apologia contra Arianos*, 9. Eusebius said that Athanasius was powerful enough to do as he liked with the Alexandrians.

3. Hahn, *Symbale*, p. 256. Socrates, i. 26. Sozomen, II. 27.

4. Arius was seized with violent internal pains and died on the day on which he was to be restored to the Church. The orthodox regarded his death as a miracle. "Athanasius" (says Dean Milman) "in a public epistle alludes to the fate of Judas, which had befallen the traitor to the coequal dignity of the Son. His hollow charity ill-disguises his secret

Settlement of the
Paschal
Controversy. The
Meletian Schism.
The Canons of
Nicaea.

With the drawing up of the Nicene Creed the main business of the Council ended, but a few matters remained to be arranged before the bishops dispersed. The ancient Paschal controversy was settled by an agreement to adhere to the practice of the majority of churches, and to discontinue the mode of keeping Easter on the 14th of Nisan, as had been the custom in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Proconsular Asia. The church of Alexandria was entrusted with the duty of ascertaining the date of Easter every year and announcing it to the churches throughout the world. To this circumstance we owe the *Festal Letters* of Athanasius.¹ Several sects of Quartodecimans survived into the fifth century, notably an ascetic body, styled the Audians.

The Meletian schism also demanded the attention of the fathers of Nicaea. Its origin is obscure. Gibbon, in one of his biting sentences, says "it has been misrepresented by the partiality of Athanasius and the ignorance of Epiphanius." Hefele summarises the facts as follows:—(1) Meletius, an Egyptian bishop, held ordinations in other dioceses in times of persecution. (2) They were unnecessary, and Meletius never obtained leave either from the imprisoned bishops or from Peter of Alexandria, who was not incarcerated at the time. (3) Meletius despised the remonstrances of the imprisoned bishops, and would not listen to them or to Peter. (4) Accordingly Peter excommunicated Meletius. Epiphanius says that this schism, like the earlier schism of Novatian, turned on the question of the treatment of the lapsed. The Council acted

triumph." *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. II., p. 382. It should be noticed, however, that Athanasius regards the death of Arius as a punishment for perjury rather than for heresy: on the whole Milman's verdict appears harsh. Athanasius, *Ad Episcopos Aegypti*, § 19, and Ep. LIV. *ad Serapionem*.

1. Stanley, *op. cit.*, Lect. v. "The *Festal Letters* of Athanasius, preserved to our day by the most romantic series of incidents in the history of Christian documents." Dean Stanley refers his readers to Dr. Cureton's Preface to the *Festal Letters* of Athanasius. On the keeping of Easter, etc., see the wise and Christian remarks in Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22, a chapter which should be read, marked, and learned by all who engage in controversies about ritual.

with great tact and moderation by deciding that Meletius was to retain the title of bishop, but that the clergy whom he had ordained should be confirmed in their position by the laying on of hands, and then take rank below those ordained by Alexander. The Meletian faction subsequently supported the Arians.¹

The Canons of Nicaea are twenty in number, and provide, among other things, for the establishment of provincial councils to be held twice a year, for confirming the patriarchal rights of the sees of Alexandria and Antioch on the same footing as that of Rome, and for the recognition of the honour due to the bishop of Aelia (Jerusalem), saving, however, the rights of the metropolitan see of Caesarea.²

The Council of Nicaea has an absolutely unique position among Christian assemblies. As the first Ecumenical Council it marks the commencement of a new era. The very name *oecumenical* (*οἰκουμένηκη*) denotes its imperial character: we see in it the germ of the idea which exercised so powerful a fascination on the mind of the middle ages—that of the Holy Roman Empire, the union of the civil and ecclesiastical governments. At the same time it must be borne in mind that the Council of Nicaea had all the characteristics of an Oriental assembly. It was dominated, not by the Western ideal of Pontiff and Emperor ruling coordinately, but by the Eastern belief that the Emperor in himself represents all authority, both spiritual and temporal. This theory still remains in the Greek Church. Not only had Constantine the whole ordering of affairs at the Council: unbaptized as he was, he speaks as an *episcopus episcoporum*, and delivers public homilies on religion.³ The decrees of Nicaea are still held in reverence by every branch of the Catholic Church. The canons of the first four General Councils,

1. Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils*, vol. 1., p. 343 foll.
2. Bright, *History of the Four General Councils*.
3. He said to the bishops (but not at Nicaea) "You are the bishops of those within the Church, but I would fain be the bishop of those without, as appointed by God." Euseb., *Vita Const.* iv. 74.

except those which have been expressly repealed, are a part of the laws of England.¹ The Creed of Nicaea is the creed of Christendom. It has been shewn that there were blemishes even in this great Council, but notwithstanding we must ungrudgingly pay our tribute of admiration to the truly Christian spirit which prompted many of its decrees. The Meletians were treated with rare forbearance. The attempt to enforce celibacy on the clergy was stopped by the protest of the ascetic confessor, bishop Paphnutius. The rights of individuals were carefully guarded in the fifth canon, ordering the assembly of provincial synods. Best of all, there were so few denunciations of heretics that St. Jerome could say, "*Synodus Nicaeana omnes haereticos suscepit praeter Pauli Samosatensis discipulos.*"²

Constantine must have quitted Nicaea feeling that he had done a good work and achieved a marked success. He had, to all appearance, both organized and pacified the Church. The intrigues which subsequently caused confusion, and almost undid the work of the great Council, had not yet begun. The Emperor seemed justified in considering that he had given to his dominions a Church at peace with itself, ready to undertake the great work of elevating and purifying mankind without let or hindrance. Little did he suppose that this hour of triumph was the prelude to a dark and dreadful tragedy, destined to embitter the remainder of his life, and to leave on his name an ineffaceable stain. In the year 326 Constantine visited Rome for the last time. He arrived shortly before the celebration of the anniversary of the battle of Lake Regillus. He was injudicious enough to scoff at the pageant of the knights riding 'in all their pride'

1. Stanley, *op. cit.*, Lect. II. "It is well known that in one of the earliest Acts of Elizabeth, which undoubtedly has considerable authority as expressive of the mind of the foundress of the present constitution of our Church, the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon are raised as judges of heresy to the same level as 'the High Court of Parliament with the assent of the English clergy in their Convocation'."

2. Stanley (*Eastern Church*, Lect. v.) quotes Jerome, *Adv. Luciferianos*, c. 26.

to the Capitol in commemoration of the deliverance of Rome by Castor and Pollux, who were supposed to have fought for Rome and to have brought the news of the victory to the city. The people were infuriated at the Emperor's contemptuous attitude towards their pageant, and a riot ensued.¹

The popularity of Crispus, the eldest son of Constantine, excited the jealousy of his father, who perceived that the people were transferring their affections to the young Caesar. Crispus was sent under a strong guard to Pola in Istria, and there made away with. The Caesar Licinius, son of Constantine's sister and of his late rival, was also executed. Helena, the mother of Constantine, furious at the murder of her favourite grandson, accused the Empress Fausta of having caused the Emperor to put Crispus to death on a false charge. Later writers say that Fausta was guilty of adultery. At any rate, according to Zosimus' account, it appears that she was put to death by being suffocated in a bath. Great uncertainty overhangs these dark transactions, the truth respecting which will perhaps never be known.²

After the terrible scenes enacted in the palace, Constantine determined never to return to Rome. Before, however, he left the Imperial City, legend ascribes to him an action which, though without any foundation in fact, has left a more permanent impression on the Western Church than any historical event in his reign. It is said that he established the temporal dominion of the Papacy, by his famous donation to Silvester, bishop of Rome. The legend (which cannot be traced back to a period anterior to the Iconoclastic controversy in the eighth century) relates that Constantine, after cruelly persecuting the Christians and driving Silvester into exile, was smitten with leprosy. The Pope restored Constantine to health, and, in gratitude, the Emperor bestowed on him the sovereignty of the whole of Italy and of the West.³

1. Zosimus, II. 29.

2. Zosimus, according to Gibbon, ch. xviii., "may be considered our original." In the opinion of that historian he is wrong about the death of Fausta.

3. Gibbon, ch. xlix. ; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. I., p. 72, and note.

This wonderful story lived—such is the vitality of falsehood—for no less than seven centuries. Dante, a strong supporter of imperialism, believed it, and blames Constantine for enriching the Pope in such a way. The honour of refuting this impudent fiction belongs to Laurentius Valla, a scholar of the fifteenth century. It is to the credit of the clerical authorities of Rome that Valla was reconciled to the Church and buried (strangely enough) in the precincts of the Lateran Palace, which was perhaps the actual donation of Constantine to the Roman bishop.¹ A curious contrast is presented by the pagan story of Constantine's conversion at this time. According to one version, Constantine, stricken with remorse, sought purification at the hands of the Roman Flamens, but this was refused by them on the ground that their religion knew of no expiation for such crimes as his. According to another version, it was from the philosopher Sopater that he sought consolation, but without success;² however, an Egyptian magician from Spain (Hosius, bishop of Cordova), who had much influence with the ladies of the imperial court, told Constantine that in the Christian Church there were mysteries which could purify from every sin: accordingly the Emperor became a Christian.

If we compare these two widely different narratives we shall find that in one detail they agree, namely, that Constantine became a Christian after the execution of Crispus. But it is precisely at this point that they appear most unhistorical. Constantine was a patron of the Christian Church and a worshipper of the Christians' God twelve years previously; and he was not baptized till he was on his death bed, eleven years afterwards. Therefore neither his formal conversion nor his baptism had taken place at the time of his son's death. It is nevertheless possible that the harmony of the two accounts indicates some quickening of Constantine's religious convictions in view of the crimes

1. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, bk. XIII., ch. vi. Valla died Aug. 1457. He was a Canon of St. John Lateran.

2. Zosimus, II. 29, p. 104, edn. Oxon. 1679. Sozomen (I. 5) says that, even if Constantine had asked the advice of Sopater, that philosopher could not have forgotten that Hercules found expiation at Athens for crimes similar to those of the Emperor.

recorded above. We must not forget that in that age of transition such men as Constantine really fluctuated between Christianity and paganism. At Nicaea, in the society of bishops and divines, the Emperor must have felt himself a believer. Transported to Rome, in the midst of the pagan surroundings of the stronghold of the ancient faith, Constantine may have felt drawn towards the heathen rites. The unjust execution of his distinguished son, and the terrible retribution Fausta's folly compelled him to inflict upon her, naturally aroused feelings of profound sorrow and remorse. Constantine may have turned to philosophy in the person of Sopater, or for the consolation of religion to the Flamens. He found them alike unable to quiet the voice of an accusing conscience, and at last discovered by his own spiritual experience that Christ alone was the source of pardon. That Constantine was not immediately baptized need not surprise us, if we may believe that he was at least so far convinced as to become a Christian catechumen.¹ The legend of the Donation almost rises to the dignity of an allegory. Constantine probably made over to Silvester Fausta's palace of the Lateran. Shortly afterwards he left Rome. Thus he was in effect the first to lay the foundation of the papal supremacy in the West. Once the imperial seat was removed from Rome, the popes were free to give to the Eternal City spiritual power destined to prove more than a compensation for that of which she had been deprived by the transference of the seat of empire to the East.

The year following the departure of
The Holy Places. Constantine from Rome witnessed the
A.D. 327. restoration of Jerusalem to its position
of a Holy City. For two centuries it had borne the name of Aelia Capitolina, and a temple of Venus had stood on the site of the Jewish Temple. The Emperor's mother, Helena, at the persuasion of her son, had embraced Christianity. She visited Palestine, and was conducted to the places which are sanctified to Christians as the scenes of the work of our Redemption. She

1. Constantine, however, was only formally admitted to the catechuminate just before his baptism.

was supplied with ample funds by Constantine, and erected two churches, one marking the spot from which our Saviour ascended, another at Bethlehem. A third church was afterwards built over the cave of the Resurrection by Constantine himself. Thus much we gather from the contemporary account of Eusebius.¹ From the letter of Constantine to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, given by the same historian, we may infer that Helena made some discovery of the instruments of our Lord's Passion. The allusion is however obscure. We must wait seventy years to read in a Western writer the developed account of the 'Invention of the Cross'. According to Rufinus three crosses were discovered, and an inscription, detached from them, bearing Pilate's words, 'This is the king of the Jews.' To test the crosses a sick lady was placed on each, and was healed when put upon the True Cross. The historians all repeat this statement, and add that Constantine, receiving two of the nails used at the Crucifixion as a present from Helena, had one worked into the bit of his bridle, and the other placed in his crown or helmet. This latter incident has a real significance as an illustration of Constantine's position. His Christianity appears in his receiving the nails that pierced Christ with reverence, his pagan ignorance in the use he made of them.²

The closing years of the reign of Constantinople, A.D. 330—334. Constantine were occupied by the foundation of the New Rome which bears his name. It was to the genius of this Emperor, in fixing

1. Euseb., *Vita Const.* III. 26—42.

2. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. VI. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, vol. I., p. 267. Socrates, I. 9. Sozomen, II. I. Rufinus, I. 7—8. The *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (vol. II. p. 882 b) gives the evidence for the story very clearly. (1) A.D. 333, a Burgundian pilgrim says nothing of Helena, and mentions only the churches on Olivet and at Bethlehem. (2) Eusebius gives the story as stated in the text. (3) Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 346, speaks of the wood of the True Cross; (4) Chrysostom, A.D. 387, does the same. (5) Sulpicius Severus, A.D. 395, says that Helena built *three* churches, one on the scene of the Passion. Three crosses were discovered, and the right one ascertained by the miraculous raising of a dead body. (6) Ambrose, A.D. 395, says three crosses were discovered, one bearing the inscription. (7) Rufinus, A.D. 400, tells the generally received story.

his capital on the Bosphorus, that the Eastern Roman Empire owed that wonderful vitality which enabled it to survive so many almost unparalleled calamities and to outlive so many kingdoms. The building of Constantinople was a fit occupation for the ruler who had first recognised in Christianity the firm ally of the Roman empire. It was just that he who had assembled the first General Christian Council should lay the foundation of the first city which rose under Christian auspices and which for eleven centuries proved a real bulwark of Christianity. Constantine observed the usual ceremonies in founding the new city, and his conduct shews the ambiguous nature of his religious opinions. He attributed his action in selecting the site of Constantinople to the inspiration of God. Yet he held the golden statue of the Fortune of the city in his hands on the day of its dedication. With that theatrical instinct which he displayed on other occasions, Constantine marched spear in hand to trace the limits of the new city; remarking to a courtier who humbly enquired how far he proposed to go, "Till he that goes before me shall stop."

Baptism of Constantine, and his death, A. D. 337.

When his end approached, Constantine took the step from which he had hitherto shrunk, and declared himself a Christian. Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, the opponent of Athanasius, admitted him to the Church, first as a catechumen by the imposition of hands, then by baptism. On the feast of Pentecost, A. D. 337, the great emperor passed away. One of his last acts was to recall Athanasius from exile.

Character of Constantine.

The character of Constantine has been the subject of much discussion. The Eastern Church has canonized him; the Western, with greater discernment, has given him the honour of founding the temporal power of the Papacy, but refused him the title of saint. He is one of the few who have been awarded the title of Great—a title which the world seldom if ever bestows on its greatest men, but which has often been the posthumous heritage of those who have turned the greatness of others to their own advantage. As Alexander's conquests would have been impossible without the previous reign of his

father Philip—as Augustus owed his empire to the work of Caesar—as Frederick I. of Prussia, and not his more famous son, was the real founder of the military power of his nation—so Constantine's success was really due to the masterly policy of the forgotten Diocletian. In one thing, however, Constantine shewed his genius. His predecessors had seen in the Christian Church an enemy which refused divine honours to the Emperor: Constantine, recognising in her a purifier of the social evils of the Empire, almost persuaded the clergy to restore the ancient Caesar worship. The emperor Galerius died apologising to the Church and beseeching the prayers of the Christians. He is handed down to posterity by Lactantius as the Evil Beast: Constantine, on the other hand, passed away amid a chorus of episcopal benedictions, and to this day bears the title of the Equal of the Apostles (*Ἰσαπόστολος*). Not that he was without religious convictions. He did not, like our Queen Elizabeth, regard religion as one of the counters in the game of politics. On the contrary, he and all his family were extremely impressionable to religious influences. That Constantine believed himself to be favoured by visions from Heaven there seems to be no doubt. He was sincerely desirous to do his best for the interests of the Church. One is struck by his patience at Nicaea, and by the forbearance he shewed to the Donatists. But whether his patronage was on the whole advantageous to Christianity is very doubtful. In trying to settle the Arian question off-hand Constantine certainly attempted more than any human being could accomplish; but the blame lies rather with his ecclesiastical advisers than with the Emperor. As regards the deaths of Crispus and Fausta, it is hard to acquit or condemn Constantine. We know so little of the circumstances, that our judgment must remain unpronounced. It is equally impossible to define the Emperor's religious views by the terms Orthodox and Arian—we might even add, Christian and Pagan. He directed an age of change, and from time to time he changed himself. He was orthodox when he thought that the *Homöousion* would give peace to the Church, Arian when it failed; he was a Christian

at Nicaea, and a semi-Pagan when he traced the foundations of Constantinople; a true type of his age, unsettled, but ever drawing nearer to Christianity. Few men, we may at least say, have done such enduring work. Greater characters than his have passed and will pass into oblivion, but Constantinople will probably preserve his name for many future centuries; and as long as Christianity lasts it will never be forgotten that Constantine summoned the great and holy Synod of Nicaea.

When we pause at the grave of Constantine we seem to stand on a mountain top; before us lies the modern, behind us the ancient world. We are at the source of three great rivers of modern thought. The one representing the Eastern Church goes brawling down the mountain side, a copious but noisy stream, deafening us with its perpetual controversy; when it reaches the level country it breaks into many courses, which flow in silent and unbroken streams divided by mighty barriers from one another, all alike seeming unable to fertilize the land through which they glide. Westward there flows a more silent but a mightier river; every mile of its splendid course is full of interest; at one time it carries a flood of blessings, at another, its wrath destroys millions; at one part of its course it purifies all around; at another, it poisons the air with the pollutions it has received. Now loveable, now hateful; now gentle, now furious and terrible; now pure, now corrupted; now broad, now narrow—the Latin Church may at times cause disgust, but never indifference. Teutonic thought at last diverges from Latin Christianity. Its course lacks the uniformity of the Greek and the majesty of the Latin Church; but beauteous plants spring up by its sides, and goodly trees are nurtured by its waters. As we gaze from our mountain top, clouds yet obscure the horizon, which the eye longs to penetrate in the hope that all these waters may be joined together in the ocean of God's love.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY TO A.D. 361.

Conflict between Church and State under Constantius. FEW periods in the Christian Church are more momentous than the mighty struggle between the upholders of the Creed of Nicaea and its detractors, which ensued after the death of Constantine. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that by it the whole course of subsequent history is affected, and that principles were then developed which are dominant at this day. Not only had a theological question closely affecting every Christian worshipper to be decided, but a political problem of the most important kind presented itself. The significance of the reign of Constantine is that in it the civil power first sought the aid of the spiritual. The great emperor reversed the policy of his predecessors by inviting the Christian Church to assist him in eradicating the moral disease of the Roman world. The two hostile powers—the Church and the Empire—became allies, but the terms of the alliance were not settled, nor has the true solution yet been found. The Arian controversy is in fact the opening scene of the great drama of Church and State, and we are able to recognise how the apparently irreconcilable difference in the aims of the two powers became evident from the first. The essence of all progressive civil government must always be expediency. The wise legislator has to frame his laws with a view to the immediate needs of the people. He must consider not only the merits of every enactment, but the possibility of its enforcement. With the Church it is otherwise. Since her mission is to deal with verities

rather than possibilities, compromises, which are proofs of wisdom in a statesman, are in many cases rightly regarded as treason by a churchman. Thus it is that, however harmoniously the ecclesiastical and civil politics may seem to work together, circumstances will inevitably arise to place them in opposition to one another, the triumph of either being seldom unattended by dangerous consequences: nothing being more contemptible than a temporal ruler whose policy is swayed by a priesthood, save a priesthood which is the tool of a secular government.

In the fourth century Church and Empire united together in the work of ruling mankind. The emperors ceased to persecute, and sought the friendship of the Church. No sooner however had Constantine stretched out the right hand of fellowship to the Christians than the question arose, "What is the Church?" It was put in a practical form by the Donatists of Africa, who maintained that it was the remnant which had remained absolutely staunch during the persecution. The question to be decided in their case was simply whether certain bishops had or had not betrayed the Faith. The matter was fully investigated, but this did not prevent a schism, which at times took the form of a civil war. The Donatists when the State decided against them renounced its authority. "*Quid Imperatori cum ecclesiâ?*" was their famous protest. The Arian controversy raised the same point but in a more subtle form: "Were those men members of the Church who refused to accept a most difficult point of doctrine?" Constantine acted with great wisdom in the matter. He had assembled the Ecumenical Council which had arrived at a decision on the point at issue, and he considered that this ought to settle the question finally. But here the difference between the administration of the State and the principles of the Church became, for the first time in history, prominent. The former regarded tranquillity as the primary object to be obtained; the Creed of Nicaea was valuable in its eyes in so far as it ensured peace. Not so the Church. If the Creed of Nicaea

Principles
involved in the
contest.

were true it should be upheld at any cost, for Truth should never be sacrificed to purchase a delusive peace. Thus, while Constantine regarded the Creed as an olive branch, Athanasius looked on it as a notice warning off all heresies (*στηλογραφία κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων*),¹ and this accounts for the disfavour in which the Emperor in his latter days held the bishop of Alexandria. To his dying day Constantine respected the work of the great Council, but he wished it to be as an open door to admit men to fellowship with the Church; even Arius had only to bow his head and enter by it. To Athanasius the Symbol was like the sword of the Cherubim that turned every way to keep the way to the Tree of Life.

It seems probable that Constantine's son and successor, Constantius, had a far more definite policy than that with which he is generally credited. The very vacillations of his faith seem to indicate a certain consistency of aim. When we find that this emperor supported the Eusebian faction, then received Athanasius back into favour only to turn upon him with increased bitterness, then allowed the Arians their turn, and finally threw his influence into the scale with the Homoeans, we are inclined to pronounce him the most fickle of men. But, if we recognise that Constantius was trying to carry out the work of his father by incorporating the Church with the Empire, we shall acknowledge that he really tried to ascertain the will of the majority and supported in turn whatever party seemed most likely to represent it.² The great antagonist of the imperial policy was Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, one of the best types of those great rulers of the Church whom scorn of

1. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, p. 59.

2. Constantius was always influenced by his surroundings. Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* § 69. Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 7. Prof. Gwatkin (*Studies in Arianism*, p. 110) forms a most unfavourable estimate of this emperor's character. "Constantius" says Cardinal Newman "may be taken as the type of a genuine Semi-Arian; . . . balanced on this imperceptible centre between truth and error, he alternately banished every party in the controversy, not even sparing his own; and had recourse in turn to every creed for relief, except that in which the truth was really to be found."—*The Arians in the Fourth Century*.

all compromise where the truth is at stake has provoked to defy the power of the State. Athanasius joined to a singularly clear intellect a ceaseless energy and an indomitable will. He recognised in the Nicene doctrine a means of destroying Arianism, and he devoted all his powers to the support of the creed of the great Council.

The so-called Conservatives. This gave him an immense advantage over those of his opponents who agreed in repudiating the opinions of Arius as explained at Nicaea, but had no fixed principles of action. The majority of this heterogeneous party have been called Conservatives, from the way in which they shrank from accepting the unscriptural word *ὁμοούσιον*, which was the key-note of the Nicene formula; but conservatism was not their main characteristic. They had rather that instinctive dislike to clear dogmatic definitions which marks the would-be liberal or broad churchman.¹ The representative of this School was Eusebius of Caesarea, a man of vast erudition, but a courtier and opportunist by temperament and training. As a historian, he knew too well that it is almost impossible to say that any party in a dispute is entirely in the right; as a theologian, he disliked making a new creed to exclude men from the Church; and as a frequenter of the court he saw the need of forbearance in matters of doctrine. Such a man was totally unable to comprehend Athanasius's single-hearted devotion to a great doctrinal truth. Moreover, Eusebius and many others of his order had suffered morally by the alliance of Church and State. Whenever he writes about Constantine one feels that Eusebius prized the worldly glory which the Church gained by its alliance with the Empire, and was tempted to forget the purity of the one and the corruption of the other. To lose the

1. Professor Gwatkin, in his *Studies of Arianism*, seems to give the term 'conservative' two senses. On p. 91 he applies it to the bishops of Asia, whom he describes as being indifferent to the controversy, "and indifference is always conservative." On the other hand, on p. 46, he speaks of the creed presented by Eusebius of Caesarea at the Council, as "a truly conservative confession, which commanded the assent of all parties by demanding nothing": this latter is the very essence of so-called liberalism in religious matters.

imperial support seemed to such a bishop an evil which great sacrifices might be made to avert, and in this opinion the majority of the Oriental bishops concurred.¹ Eusebius' views were exaggerated in his successor in the see of Caesarea, the crafty Acacius, the type of a courtier bishop of the fourth century.

The leader of the first opponents of Athanasius was the other Eusebius, who was successively bishop of Berytus, Nicomedia, and Constantinople, after whom they were called Eusebians. These Eusebians have been defined as "the personal *entourage*" of the bishop of Nicomedia. The nucleus of the party consisted of the able and influential circle of Lucianists who secretly sympathized with Arius, but the majority were conservative Orientals who shrank from the dogmatism of Athanasius. The name Eusebian is not long applicable after the great Council of Antioch, at which the various aims of the different sections of the party became manifest. The bond that held the Eusebians together was dislike of innovation and fear of Sabellianism, but it was destined to become manifest that no common creed could unite them.² The long Arian controversy from 337 to 381 proved that the only possible solution was the acceptance of the Creed

1. It is remarkable that in his *Life of Constantine* Eusebius does not so much as mention Athanasius, and only alludes to Arianism. (μερικῶς, Socrates, I. 1.) He is however very anxious to place the Council of Jerusalem, which immediately followed the assembly at Tyre where Athanasius was condemned, on a par with that of Nicaea. *Vita Constantini*, IV. 47. His orthodoxy is defended by Bishop Bull, *Defensio Fid. Nic.* II. 9, § 20. Bp. Lightfoot, art. 'Eusebius of Caesarea', *D. C. B.*, vol. II., p. 347. Dr. McGiffert (Prolegomena to Euseb., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. xiii) asserts the orthodoxy of his later writings. Prof. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 107. Cardinal Newman (*op. cit.*, p. 263), on the other hand, regards him as an eclectic teacher and a most dangerous adviser for Constantine. For his reasons for subscribing to the Creed of Nicaea, see Socrates, I. 8; Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lecture IV.

2. The term Eusebians is an inexact equivalent of the oft recurring phrase of *περὶ Εὐσεβίων*, by which Athanasius in his *Defence against the Arians* means the personal *entourage* of the bishop of Nicomedia. In *Prolegomena to Athanasius* the real Eusebians are shewn not to be identical with the large political party which bears the name, and to which Eusebius of Caesarea belonged. They are to be carefully distinguished from the Semi-Arians, who appeared later and whom Athanasius in his *De Synodis* was most anxious to conciliate. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 71—73; Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 272 foll.

of Nicaea as explained by those who had found all conservatism in language or liberality in definition impracticable.

Partition
of the
Empire.

Constantine left numerous relatives, among whom he divided the splendid heritage of the Empire. The soldiers, however, decided that no collateral branch of the family should have a share in the government, and massacred all the imperial family except Constantine's three sons, Constantine II., Constans, and Constantius, together with two children, Gallus and his infant brother Julian, nephews of the deceased emperor. The empire was divided between the three brothers; the Gauls, Spain and Britain falling to Constantine II., who had fixed his capital at Trier (Trèves); Italy and Africa to Constans; and the Eastern provinces to Constantius, who was compelled to watch the Persians from the Syrian Antioch.

At this time the bishops in the Western Empire, imagining, no doubt, that all had been settled at Nicaea, were hardly aware of the importance of the Arian question. It is to the East therefore that our attention must be chiefly directed. Constantius was resolved to support the Eusebians, owing partly to the influence of an Arianizing priest who had access to his person, but chiefly to a third Eusebius, then the all-powerful eunuch of the palace.¹ The Emperor did not, however, prevent the return of Athanasius to Alexandria. The bishop entered the city on Nov. 23rd, 337, and at

St. Antony
appears
at Alexandria.

once set to work to reorganize his church.² The Arian faction, which was however very influential, claimed to have the support of the great solitary, St. Antony. With some difficulty the saint was persuaded to leave his retreat and to shew himself in Alexandria as the supporter of the Creed of Nicaea. No argument could be more convincing than the testimony of the hermit who was the marvel of his age and

1. Socrates, II. 2. Sozomen, III. 1.

2. Socrates, II. 3. Sozomen, III. 2. Theodoret, II. 1, the *Tenth Festal Letter of Athanasius*. Gwatkin, p. 136, 'The Return of Athanasius,' Note cc. Hefele, *Councils*, § 52.

country. Antony departed to his retreat in the desert on the third day of Messori (July 27) 338, after having confirmed his mission by numerous miracles.¹ In the meantime Paul, bishop of Constantinople, had been deposed and Eusebius translated from Nicomedia to the imperial city.

The Eusebians were bent upon the deposition of Athanasius, and new accusations were brought forward. He was accused of having acted harshly and uncharitably as bishop of Alexandria, and of defrauding the widows of Egypt and Libya by selling for his own benefit the corn provided for them by the Emperor. He was also charged with violating the canon forbidding a bishop deposed by a council to be restored to his see by the aid of the secular power. These accusations were despatched to the three emperors, and to Julius, bishop of Rome.² Just before Easter, 340, Philagrius the praefect compelled Athanasius to leave Alexandria for the second time; and Gregory, a native of Cappadocia, was with much violence installed as bishop in his stead. For seven years Athanasius was absent from his see, this being his longest period of exile.³

Appeal to Rome. The Eusebians had in 339 sent from Antioch Macarius a presbyter, with his deacon, to accuse Athanasius to Julius, bishop of Rome,

1. The visit of Antony to Alexandria rests on the statements in the *Life of Antony*, c. 69, supposed to have been written by Athanasius, and in the *Index to the Festal Letters*, x. But the very existence of the Saint is doubted. Prof. Gwatkin stated the case against it with great force in 1882, *Studies in Arianism*, Note B., pp. 99 foll.; but the appearance of the edition of Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* by Mr. F. C. Conybeare, which supports the genuineness of this description of Jewish ascetics in Egypt in the first century, and the careful discussion of the evidence for the *Life of St. Antony* in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene* edition of Athanasius, prove how much can be said on the other side of the question. See also *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, by Dom Butler, vol. i., pp. 215 ff.; and Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 58, 59.

2. Sozomen (III. 2) says that the main charge of the Eusebians against Athanasius was that he had returned to his see after having been deposed by a council with the consent of the civil authorities. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum*, c. 9. See also the encyclical letter of the bishops of Egypt in the *Apology against the Arians*, c. 3 foll.

3. Socrates, II. 8—10. Sozomen, III. 5. Theodoret, II. 3.

whither the bishop of Alexandria and his friend Marcellus of Ancyra had also betaken themselves. The behaviour of the Roman bishop, when appealed to by both religious parties in the East as arbiter, proved him to be well qualified to act as judge in so great a quarrel. The conduct of Julius was impartial and dignified, and is characterised by an absence of that arrogance of demeanour which was soon to be conspicuous in his successors. He refused to express any opinion till he had investigated the matter, for which purpose he summoned a synod of fifty bishops. As this assembly pronounced Athanasius and Marcellus innocent of the offences laid to their charge, Julius wrote to the Eastern bishops then assembled at Antioch, exposing their conduct towards both Athanasius and himself. This letter was addressed

to Dianius and Flacillus, and is pronounced to be "one of the ablest documents in the entire controversy". Julius writes with forbearance; though he had been himself greatly wronged by the Eusebians, he indulges in no recrimination, but points out clearly how uncanonical all their proceedings had been. The deposition of Athanasius, for example, was contrary to the acknowledged custom that no sentence could be pronounced against the bishop of Alexandria without the assent of the bishop of Rome; and the appointment of Gregory was utterly illegal, as an entire stranger ought never to be put over any church, but the bishops of the province ought to have ordained "one in that very church, of that very priesthood, of that very clergy". As regards the admission of Athanasius to communion, Julius shews that nothing was done till after most careful investigation, and that he was expressing not his own personal convictions but those of all the bishops of Italy. The whole letter is a proof of the vast superiority of the Roman church in calm dignity and moral tone to any Christian community in the Eastern provinces.¹

I. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. II., §§ 21—35. Socrates, II. 17. Sozomen, III. 10. The two last named, in their summary of the letter, imply that no canons could be passed without the consent of Rome; but Julius in his letter merely claims that the bishop of Alexandria

A large number of Eastern bishops met at Antioch in A.D. 341 to celebrate the dedication of the Golden Church erected by the Great Constantine; and the occasion was seized upon for the holding of a council to determine the Creed. We now enter upon a period of creed-making lasting for about twenty years, the object being to frame a confession of faith to supersede the Nicene Symbol. No less than four *formulae* were produced by this assembly; and another was issued from Antioch four years later, so that the metropolis of the East gave the name to five confessions of faith. All of these were inspired by a strong dread of Sabellianism and are characterised by the omission of the test word *ὁμοούσιον*. At the Council of Antioch the conservative element was in the ascendant, and three of its confessions are framed in the interests of the timid orthodoxy which shrank from the boldness of the Creed of Nicaea. The *first* creed has been termed an 'encyclical of the Eusebians of an evasive character', and opens with memorable words: "We have never been followers of Arius, for how can we who are bishops follow a presbyter?" It condemns the Sabellian teaching of Marcellus by asserting the eternity of Christ's Kingdom. The *second* Antiochian creed, better known as the Creed of the Dedication, may justly be styled the creed of the Eusebian party. It was ascribed to Lucian the martyr,¹ the master of Arius and Eusebius, one of the great scholars on whom the mantle of Origen had fallen. It is a most interesting document, especially the last clause and the anathema affixed. The Three Persons of the Trinity are declared to be three in substance (*ὑποστάσει*) but one in concord (*συμφωνία*), and an anathema is pronounced on all who say "that there was a time or season or age before the Son was begotten; or that the Son was a creature like one of the creatures". A *third* creed, a personal expression of faith, "God knoweth, whom I call as witness for my own soul that I thus believe," etc., was proposed by Theo-

cannot be proceeded against except by the Apostolic see. Hefele, *Councils*, § 56.

1. See Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 174, note 5.

phronius of Tyana, in which Marcellus of Ancyra was anathematized with the earlier heresiarchs, Sabellius and Paul of Samosata.¹

But the Arian influence was at work. The Eusebians were in the majority, but the small but able clique of Arian sympathizers held a private meeting after the Council had dissolved, and sent a creed to Constans in the name of that assembly, with a conclusion which, though resembling the Nicene anathema, gave the doctrine of Arius free admission to the Church. By the publication of this *fourth* creed of Antioch the Arians made a definite claim to impose their views on the Church, and for nearly eighteen years they adopted it as the formula of their party, replacing it in 359 by the 'Dated Creed' of Sirmium. Great disputes have arisen as to the character of the 'Council of the Dedication', as this assembly is sometimes styled. Its canons were widely accepted, and Hilary of Poitiers, the Athanasius of the West, calls it "an assembly of saints". Yet it was unquestionably composed of enemies of Athanasius, and its confessions of faith were intended to supplant the Creed of Nicaea. This inconsistency may be accounted for by supposing that it was mainly composed of what may be termed orthodox opponents of the *Homöousion*, i.e. men who were persuaded of the true Divinity of the Son, but did not realize that the acceptance of the test-word was necessary in order to maintain the Catholic doctrine.²

1. The creeds of the Council are to be found in Athanasius *De Synodis*, 22—25, the last chapter giving an account of how the fourth creed was drafted. For a discussion of the creeds see Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 115 foll., and also in Socrates, *H. E.* II. 10. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, pp. 172 ff. At first sight it is hard to see why even the fourth creed should have been unacceptable, and it is only by a careful perusal that it is evident that the compilers of it have laboured to make its language closely resemble the Creed of Nicaea, and at the same time to leave abundant room for Arian evasion. Notice especially the words in the final anathema against those who say *καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν χροῖος ἢ ἀλὼν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*.

2. To get rid of the difficulty of the high commendation of the canons of Antioch by Hilary of Poitiers (*De Synodis*, c. 32), the Council of Chalcedon, and Popes Zacharias and Nicholas I., two councils have been assumed—one of fifty bishops which made canons, and one of thirty or forty which condemned Athanasius. (*Mans.* II., 1305 note.) Hefele (*op. cit.*, § 56 ad fin.) has some very wise remarks

It may perhaps be considered a subject for regret that a moderate creed like that of 'the Dedication' did not supersede the more definite formula of Nicaea. But the expression of such regret would betray an imperfect apprehension of the spirit of the age. The Church of the fourth century was bound to speak with no uncertain voice on a matter of such supreme importance as the question of the precise relationship of the Son to the Father. Both Athanasius and the genuine Arians recognized this and fought for a definite object; and the Eusebian party, in shrinking from pronouncing on the real point at issue, was certain to be crushed between the two real combatants.¹ At the Council of the Dedication these wavering theologians were made the catspaw of the Arians, and time was destined to shew that in defeating Athanasius they had ruined their own cause. But Athanasius was not yet suppressed, and the turn of political events gave the great Alexandrian a splendid if transitory triumph.

Councils of
Sardica and
Philippopolis,
A.D. 343.

As the death of Constantine II. in A.D. 340 had left Constans master of two-thirds of the empire, Constantius found himself obliged to defer to his more powerful brother, who favoured the Nicene faith as received by the prelates of the undivided West. At the suggestion of Constans that the Eastern and Western bishops should assemble for a conference, Constantius sent representatives from his dominions to meet the Western bishops at Sardica, the modern Sofia in Bulgaria. The Council marks an epoch in ecclesiastical history as the first occasion on which the difference between the Eastern and Western branches of the Church became apparent. The Westerns, ninety-five in number, were accompanied by Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas, who, together with Hosius of

about the conduct of the bishops, and concludes thus: "Finally it must not be forgotten that, if the canons of the Antiochian Synod are to be spoken of as *Canones Sanctorum Patrum*, and their second creed is said to be published by a *Congregata Sanctorum Synodus*, still no one intended thereby to canonize the members of the Antiochian Synod as a body. If we understand the word 'holy' in the sense of the ancient Church as a title of honour, then a great part of the difficulty disappears."

1. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 175.

Cordova, once the trusted adviser of Constantine, had come from the court of Constans. The Orientals, offended at the presence of the accused bishops, demanded that they should not have seats at the Council, and, on their Western brethren declining to reject Athanasius and his friends as men labouring under a serious accusation, withdrew to Philippopolis within the dominions of Constantius. From this city they issued a very intemperate condemnation of the proceedings at Sardica, and put forth as their creed the Arian formulary which had been drawn up after the conclusion of the Council of the Dedication at Antioch, adding to it anathemas condemning the system of Marcellus. The Sardican council in the meantime investigated the cases of Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra, and acquitted both bishops, accepting Marcellus's explanation of his doctrines as satisfactory. It also passed the famous canons allowing deposed bishops to appeal to Julius, bishop of Rome, who had already shewn himself to be a most impartial judge in such matters. Constans sent two bishops, named Euphrates and Vincent, to Antioch to announce the decisions of the council to Constantius.¹

An attempt, as foolish as it was criminal, on the part of Stephen, bishop of Antioch, to throw discredit on the Sardican envoys, temporarily alienated Constantius from the Arianizing party, and in 344 another council was held at Antioch, which deposed Stephen for a vile plot against

1. This council is placed by both Socrates (II. 20) and Sozomen (III. 12) in the consulship of Rufinus and Eusebius, in the eleventh year after the death of Constantine the Great, viz. in A.D. 347. But the *Festal Letters* fix the date A.D. 343, *Index to Festal Letters*, xv. The council was presided over by Hosius of Cordova, whose signature is followed by that of Julius of Rome by his presbyters Archidamus and Philoxenus. Athanasius, *Hist. Arian. ad Monachos*, c. 16. Theodoret, II. 6. Prof. Gwatkin has a valuable note on the date of the synod; see also Hefele, *Councils*, § 58. Canons 3, 4, and 7 (5 in the Greek) give deposed bishops the right of appealing to Julius bishop of Rome, and this fact has raised a threefold discussion: (1) whether the right of appeal was given for the first time to the Roman See by the council, or (2) whether the council merely confirmed the inherent right of the Popes, and (3) whether the meaning of the canons is not merely that the right of hearing appeals was given to Julius personally.

the character of Euphrates of Cologne. The same assembly drew up a *fifth* creed of Antioch, known, from its great length, as the 'Macrostich', which vehemently condemned Marcellus of Ancyra and his follower Photinus, bishop of Sirmium.¹ After this council Constantius relaxed his severity against the Athanasian party and made overtures to the bishop of Alexandria himself. As the intruder Gregory was dead, there was no further reason for Constantius to hinder Athanasius's return to Alexandria, and after an interview with the Emperor the bishop was allowed to go back to his see. The populace poured out of the city to receive him, and he was escorted to his church with shouts of acclamation. It seemed as if the old democratic spirit had revived in the popular enthusiasm with which the Alexandrians welcomed back their bishop; and from this time Athanasius was supported by his countrymen in his long contest with the imperial authority.²

1. The treachery of Stephen is described by Athanasius in *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*, c. 20. Theodoret, II. 7. It is said that Euphrates was subsequently deposed by a synod of Cologne for Arianism, but the genuineness of the Acts is much questioned. Hefele, § 69. Socrates, II. 19. Athanasius, *de Synodis*, c. 26. The text of the Macrostich (called *μακροστιχος εκθεσις* by Sozomen, *H. E.* III. 1) is given in Hahn, *Symbole*, § 89. After reciting the fourth creed of Antioch, this creed, or rather thesis, shews: (1) That the terms *ἀγέννητος* and *ἀπαρχος* can only be applied to the Father; (2) In refusing to acknowledge three Gods, it is not meant to deny that Christ is God, for He is *θεός εκ θεού*: (3) Those who say that the Word has no separate existence apart from the Father, or that his kingdom has beginning or end, are to be abhorred (*βδελυσσόμεθα*), as the followers of Marcellus and Photinus (*Σκοτεινός*, Athanasius?); (4) A belief that the Son is like in all things to the Father is expressed; (5) The Patripassians and Sabellians are condemned, as well as (6) those who say that the Father begat the Son by necessity and not by His purpose and will. (7) The creed ends by declaring the indissoluble union between the Father and the Son. The necessity for publishing this long creed is to convince the Western Church of the way in which the heterodox (meaning presumably Athanasius, whom they dare not name, and Marcellus) had misrepresented the language of the Oriental Christians. The language of this creed in many places recalls forcibly that of the *Quicumque vult*. It was an expansion of the Creed of the Dedication, the explanations being given to conciliate the Western Bishops. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 176.

2. *Hist. Arian. ad Monachos*, c. 21, says that Constantius felt compunction at the treatment of Euphrates by Stephen; in c. 25 the joy at the return of Athanasius is described.

For nearly ten years Athanasius remained at peace at Alexandria; during which period, however, Arian intrigues were by no means idle, and it will be necessary to trace the steps by which Constantius was brought to consent to again remove Athanasius and to impose an Arian formula of belief on the Church. The previous contest had resulted in acceptance of the Creed of Nicaea by the Western Church, but the acquittal of Marcellus had led to its bishops having countenanced a misleading interpretation of the test-word. The Orientals, on the other hand, still saw more danger in the Sabellianism of Marcellus than in the Arianism of the Eusebians, and in their zeal to condemn his doctrines were prepared to be led into a repudiation of the *Homöousion*. The first object of the Arianizing faction was, as formerly, to strike Athanasius in the vulnerable point of his friendship with Marcellus.

The Western portion of the Empire was till 350 under the guidance of the emperor Constans, a warm supporter of Athanasius; and till 352 the policy of the Church was directed by the sagacity of the great Roman prelate Julius. After the death of Constans the Western provinces were under the sway of the usurper Magnentius, whose defeat by the generals of Constantius at Mursa in 351, and again at Mount Seleucus in 353, made that emperor sole master of the Roman world. Julius was succeeded in the see of Rome by Liberius, a rash but irresolute man, whom events proved to be totally unfit to cope with the difficulties of the situation.

Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, was the first object of attack on the part of the Oriental bishops. He undoubtedly held heretical opinions, but his condemnation did no small injury to the cause of Athanasius by creating an impression that the Nicene formula encouraged Sabellianism. He had, as we have seen, already been anathematized at Antioch in 344, where the bishops with somewhat laboured playfulness had, according to Athanasius, styled him *Σκοτεινός*, the man of darkness, instead of *Φωτεινός*, the man of light. Two Western synods had also pronounced against him.

The ten years
Peace. State of
Parties between
A.D. 346-356.

Condemnation
of Photinus,
A.D. 351.

one at Milan about 345 and one held at his own city of Sirmium in 347. The bishop however managed to defy his opponents till the defeat of Magnentius in 351, in which year a synod met at Sirmium and deprived Photinus of his see. An appeal to the emperor Constantius only resulted in the recalcitrant prelate being driven into exile.¹

The Nicene party
overcome in the
West at
Arles and Milan,
A.D. 353—355.

After the overthrow of Magnentius, Constantius, now master of the West, having left his cousin, the Caesar Gallus, in nominal command of the Oriental provinces, was able to turn his attention to ecclesiastical questions. Valens, bishop of Mursa, had obtained great influence by announcing to the Emperor, as he awaited the result of the battle against Magnentius with anxious trepidation, that the imperial troops had gained the victory. The assertion of Valens that an angel had brought him the news was readily believed, and he became the trusted adviser of Constantius. The Emperor was still further brought under Arian influence by his marriage with Eusebia, whose virtues did not prevent her attachment to anti-Nicene doctrine. After the final defeat of Magnentius the charges against Athanasius were renewed, and the Emperor's mind prejudiced against the great Alexandrian by accusations of his having not only caused dissension between the brothers Constans and Constantius, but also of having supported the usurpation of Magnentius. At a synod at Arles, Vincent bishop of Capua and Marcellus of Campania, the representatives of Liberius bishop of Rome, were induced to sign a condemnation of Athanasius on condition that the Arian heresy should be rejected in express terms. This condition remained

1. The dates of the different synods by which Photinus was condemned are very uncertain. The *D. C. B.* (art. 'Photinus') fixes the first Synod of Sirmium, on the authority of St. Hilary of Poitiers, in 349. Socrates (*H. E.* II. 29) gives an account of his condemnation after the enquiry held by Basil of Ancyra in 351. Hefele, *Councils*, §§ 71. 72. Hahn, *Symbolik*, § 90. For the opinions of Photinus: Neander, *Church History*, IV., pp. 93 foll. Photinus followed Paul of Samosata in making the *ἐνέργεια δραστηρῆ* of the Logos imply merely its enlightening influence on the *man* Jesus. The best treatise on the whole subject is Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra*.

unfulfilled; and Liberius, after indignantly repudiating the action of his legates, sent Lucifer of Calaris to Constantius to ask for another council. The Emperor granted the request of the Roman bishop, and in 355 one hundred Western and a few Eastern bishops met at Milan, where the Emperor was then residing. Constantius himself appeared as the accuser of Athanasius, and only three bishops—Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercellae, and Lucifer of Calaris—had the courage to brave exile by resisting the imperial pleading. Liberius was despatched to Beroea in Thrace for his contumacy in refusing the Emperor's presents sent by the hand of the chamberlain Eusebius; and the aged Hosius, president of the council of Nicaea, was banished to Sirmium.¹ The Western bishops were awed into a repudiation of the cause of Athanasius and the Creed of Nicaea; and in the February of the following year, 356, the soldiers under Syrianus the praefect of Egypt surrounded Athanasius in the church of St. Theonas at Alexandria. The bishop, who escaped with difficulty, was placed beyond the reach of his enemies. An intruding bishop was established in Alexandria, whose previous life emphasised the difference between political Arianism and the cause of Athanasius. George of Cappadocia, the Arianizing occupant of the see, had passed his early days in the business of contracting for the provisioning of the Roman army, and had been convicted of fraudulent practices.²

The Synod of Milan and the third banishment of Athanasius mark the triumph of the Eusebian party, which had opposed the adoption of the *Homo-ousion*. It had succeeded in getting rid of the chief supporter of the Nicene Creed and of the Creed itself. But the majority of this faction was not composed

The results of
the triumph of
the foes of
Athanasius.

1. Hefele, *Councils*, §§ 74, 75.

2. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, c. 24; *Apologia de Fuga*, 24. For George see Athanasius, *Hist. Arian. ad Monachos*, c. 51 and c. 75. Gibbon (chap. xxiii.) in a note says that "it is not absolutely certain but extremely probable" that this George became the patron saint of England, and, he might have added, the Megalo-Martyr of the Greek Calendar. *D. C. B.*, art. 'George (4)', vol. II., p. 640 a.

of Arians, but of bishops who, while condemning Arianism, and at heart in agreement with Nicene doctrine, disliked the word *ὁμοούσιος* as unduly favourable to Sabellianism. The events of the next few years tended to shew that there was no alternative between the acceptance of the Nicene formula and the toleration of the teaching of Arius. Of the four parties into which the Church was divided—Homoiousians, the supporters of Nicaea; Homoiousians or Semi-Arians,¹ who were ready to adopt the word *οὐσία*, but not to allow the identity of the Son's essence with that of the Father; Homoeans, who though Arians at heart desired to appear orthodox in language; and Anomoeans, or proclaimers of unblushing Arianism—only the first and last named could have any logical continuance. The other two had to decide whether they would fight under the banner of Nicaea or that of Arius. The Arians, having gained their point by the aid of the Eusebians, had no further use for these misguided Liberals, their object now being to induce the bishops to accept a formula which should have an orthodox sound but at the same time give countenance to any opinions which advanced Arians might advocate. The imperial residence was now fixed at Sirmium, which became, as Antioch had been some fifteen years before, a centre for the manufacture of confessions of faith.

The *first* creed, including many anathemas, had already been put forth at Sirmium in 351, on the occasion of the deposition of Photinus, so that the Arian symbol, suggested by a council meeting in 357 under the eye of the Emperor, is known as the *second* Sirmian Creed. The doctrines contained in this document were avowedly Arian. The newly coined *homoiousios* was rejected together with the Athanasian

The Creeds of
Sirmium:
First Creed, 351;

Second Creed,
or 'Blasphemy
of Sirmium',²
A.D. 357;

1. Sozomen (III. 18) says that the "followers of Eusebius and other bishops of the East, who were admired for their speech and life," said that *homöousios* might be applied to created things like men and animals, but *homoiousios* only to incorporeal things like God and the angels. Hefele, *Councils*, § 77.

2. This name is given by Hilary, bp. of Poitiers. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 18c.

homöousios, as equally unscriptural, and it was pronounced blasphemous to attempt to explain the generation of the Son of God, because the prophet had said "*Generationem Ejus quis enarrabit?*". The superiority of the Father and the subjection of the Son was also plainly declared. This bold avowal of Arianism was variously received. From Antioch, Eudoxius, after holding a synod in conjunction with Acacius of Caesarea, the successor of the learned but vacillating Eusebius, wrote congratulating Ursacius and Valens on having restored peace to the West.¹ Great alarm, however, was caused by the fact that Eudoxius and Acacius were under the influence of the arch-heretic Aetius, who pushed Arianism to its only possible conclusion by declaring that, if the Son is not of one substance with the Father, He must be unlike Him; and the Eusebians in Asia, who from their shrinking from open Arianism were henceforth styled Semi-Arians, began to protest. Their leaders, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Eleusius of Cyzicus, hastened to Constantius and convinced the Emperor that the Church would never become united under a symbol like the second Creed of Sirmium.² Accordingly, at a fresh synod held at Sirmium, the so-called *third* Creed, which had been previously drawn up at an assembly at Ancyra held at the invitation of bishop Basil shortly before the Easter of 358, was accepted.³

1. The second creed is given twice by Hilary: in his *De Synodis*, § 11, where it is headed *Exemplum blasphemiae apud Sirmium per Osiurn* (bishop of Cordova) *et Potomium conscriptae*, and in his *Adversus Constantium*, in which he styles it *Deliramenta Osi et incrementa Ursacii et Valentis*. Hahn, *Symbole*, § 91. It is found in Greek in Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 28, and in Socrates, II. 30. The use of both *ὁμοούσιον* and *ὁμοιούσιον* is declared to be unsuitable in speaking of the Son. Sozomen, IV. 12—15.

2. Sozomen, IV. 13, 14.

3. The so-called Third Creed of Sirmium is, according to Hahn (*op. cit.*, § 162), the 'Creed of the Dedication', which is affirmed in a synodical letter given in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73. It consists of a long exposition of the Trinity, and eighteen anathemas (Hahn has nineteen). It implies that *ὁμοούσιος* is Sabellian in sense by making it equivalent to *ταυτοούσιος*. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 161. Hefele, *Councils*, § 80. Mr. Bethune-Baker, however, calls the 'Dated Creed' the Third Creed of Sirmium; *Christian Doctrines*, p. 183.

**Fall of Hosius
and Liberius.**

To this period belongs the sad story of the fall of the venerable Hosius of Cordova and of the Roman bishop Liberius. The former, after a life spent in the service of the Church, was, in extreme old age, compelled by torture to renounce opinions to the defence of which he had consecrated the energies of a life-time, and he retired to his native Spain, to end a glorious career of usefulness in inglorious penitence. Liberius also returned to Rome to find a rival bishop, named Felix, in his place. What creed he signed is not known with certainty—possibly it was the Third Creed of Sirmium, which was based on the Antiochene Creed of the Dedication and the Sirmian condemnation of Photinus.¹ It was now the

I. There is little doubt that Hosius signed the Second Creed of Sirmium, issued in 357, but the case of Liberius is not so clear. Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 14), Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 37), and Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacr.* ii. 39) record the return of Liberius from exile without mentioning that he signed anything, which forms some presumption against the supposition of his having subscribed to so distinctive a creed as the Second of Sirmium. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 15) records that he was summoned by the Emperor to Sirmium, after the Council of Ancyra, and there signed a compilation of the decrees against Paul of Samosata and Photinus together with a formula of faith drawn up at Antioch at the consecration of the church; he then goes on to say that Liberius drew up a confession of faith in which he pronounced an anathema on all who denied the likeness of the Son to the Father. Athanasius twice plainly refers to the fall of Liberius (*Hist. Arian.*, § 41, and *Apol. contra Arian.*, § 89); though he speaks of him with very great respect and pity. It is possible that both these passages are later additions, but there is no reason to doubt that they were added by Athanasius himself. Jerome (*de Vir. Illustr.*, c. 97) speaks plainly of Liberius having signed a heretical document. Hilary (*Con. Constant. Imp.*, c. ii.) and Faustinus (Preface to *Lib. Precum*) seem to refer to a definite fall under compulsion, but their language is not clear. Parts of the correspondence of Liberius on the subject have been preserved in Hilary's writings (*Opp. Frag.* vi.) together with Hilary's comments on them; and these clearly speak of a signature to a heretical document which is described by Hilary as 'perfidia Ariana'. From this it would be quite certain that Liberius signed the second Sirmian formula, but for the genuineness of the fragment being doubtful; Hefele (*Councils*, bk. v., § 81) rejects it, but his arguments are answered by Renouf (App. to Eng. Trans. of Hefele's *Councils*) and Gwatkin (*Studies of Arianism*, v., note F.), both of whom suggest that the list of bishops, which seems not to agree with the rest and so to throw a doubt upon the genuineness of the whole, may be spurious. It appears, then, that Liberius signed a collection of documents drawn up at Sirmium in 358, though it is not clear whether this included the second creed of Antioch (Gwatkin) or the fourth (Hefele). Hefele (*loc. cit.*) thinks that this was the only document signed by him, and that at the same time he denounced any who denied the

turn of the Acacian or Homoean party to propose the *fourth* Sirmian creed, known—by the preface declaring that it was drawn up on the eleventh day before the Kalends of June in the consulship of Flavius Eusebius and Flavius Hypatius—as the ‘Dated Creed’. This creed declared our Lord to be similar (*ὅμοιος*) to the Father who has begotten Him, but left a convenient loop-hole for Arian evasion in the words *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, and forbids the employment of the word *οὐσία* as unscriptural.¹

The Councils of
Ariminum and
Seleucia and the
Creed of Nicé.
A.D. 359.

At this juncture Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea, alarmed at the progress of avowed Arianism, published a minute on the word *οὐσία* which has been described as “a practical surrender at discretion” by the Semi-Arians to the Homöousian party.² But Acacius and his friends were more than a match for the wavering Semi-Arians, and also, as the sequel shews, for the Homöousians when bereft of the powerful support of Athanasius. Constantius resolved to settle the religious question by two simultaneous councils. The Westerns were summoned to Ariminum, and a smaller assembly of Eastern bishops met at Seleucia.³ Valens and Ursacius, who undertook the

likeness of the Son to the Father, so that though he rejected the Nicene formula he still clung to the orthodox Faith. Newman, who discusses the whole question of the Sirmian Councils (*Arians*, p. 322, and App. III.), agrees with this, though he acknowledges that at first sight Liberius appears to have signed the second Sirmian formula. On the other hand, Renouf (*loc. cit.*) argues that the language of Athanasius, Faustinus, and Jerome, not to mention Hilary, clearly shews that the document signed was distinctly heretical. So also Gwatkin (*loc. cit.*) maintains that besides this formula Liberius signed the Second Creed of Sirmium; as does also Mr. Barmby (*D. C. B.*, art. ‘Liberius’), except that he allows some doubt as to whether it was the first or the second Sirmian formula. [I am indebted for this Note to the Rev. C. E. Garrard, M.A.]

1. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 8. Valesius says it was drawn up by Mark of Arethusa; Hahn, *Symbole*, § 93, note 581. See *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Athanasius, *Prolegomena*, c. ii. § 8, p. liv., for an excellent discussion by Bishop Robertson of the word *ὅμοιος* as applied to the Son.

2. Gwatkin, *Arianism*, pp. 168, 169.

3. The council was originally summoned to meet at Nicomedia, but its assembly was prevented by an earthquake; Nicaea was next

management of the Italian synod, found the bishops firmly attached to the Creed of Nicaea. In vain did they attempt to convince the council of the expediency of abandoning the *Homöousion*; the only reply they received was that "the business of the council was not to define what the faith was but to confound its opponents." The bishops then excommunicated Valens and Ursacius, and addressed a letter to the Emperor informing him that nothing but the Nicene Creed could give peace to the Church.¹ Constantius, who had started on 18 June, 359, for the army employed against the Persians, received the deputation from the council coldly, and ordered it to retire to Adrianople, but welcomed Ursacius and Valens with honour. The Emperor now decided to withdraw the obnoxious 'Dated Creed' in favour of one drawn up at Nicé in Thrace, as it was hoped that the auspicious name of the place would recall the memory of the great council held by his father. The new confession of Nicé was, however, more opposed in spirit to the old Creed of Nicaea than many of its predecessors.² To it, however, the deputies of the council were induced to consent whilst at Adrianople, and the praefect Taurus was ordered to enforce it on the bishops at Ariminum. Threats, misrepresentations, and entreaties were employed to induce them to subscribe to the new creed. They were told that their Oriental brethren had rejected the word *οὐσία*: Valens, who declared himself to be no Arian, begged the recalcitrant bishops, among whom was Phoebadius of Agen, author of a work against the Sirmian creed of 357, to subscribe

selected, but the Arianizers, fearing that a general council might prove unmanageable, persuaded the Emperor to hold two simultaneous synods. Sozomen, iv. 16; Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 7. The 'Dated Creed' was drawn up to be submitted to both assemblies. Seleucia was in Isauria and was called *Σελευκεία τραχεία*. Hefele, *op. cit.*, § 82.

1. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 10; Socrates, II. 37.

2. Socrates (*loc. cit.*) and Sozomen (IV. 19) say the Arianizers hoped that the less learned bishops would be misled into confusing Nicé with Nicaea. The creed of Nicé was a revision of the Dated Creed. Among other changes, it omitted the date, forbade the use of *ὑπόστασις* as well as of *οὐσία*, and omitted the words *κατὰ πάντα* from the clause *ὅμοιον θεῷ λέγομεν τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα*.

in the interests of peace. Winter was approaching, and one by one the bishops yielded, till at last the creed of Nicé was signed by the whole synod. Well may St. Jerome remark of this conclusion of the assembly at Ariminum, "The world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian."¹

The Easterns at Seleucia. A similar scene was enacted at Seleucia, where the Orientals declared themselves satisfied with their favourite Creed of the Dedication. Here Acacius and Eudoxius played the same part as Ursacius and Valens had done at Ariminum, by repudiating Arianism in the person of Aëtius, who was exiled. After this the deputies sent by the synod to the Emperor signed the formula of Nicé, which was ordered to be sent to all bishops; and all, including even Dianius of Caesarea and the father of St. Gregory Nazianzen, subscribed.² The victorious faction followed up their success at Constantinople in 360, where the Semi-Arian leaders were deposed, Macedonius from Constantinople, Eustathius from Sebaste, and Basil from Ancyra.

Death of Constantius. As is frequently the case, a man contemptible alike in character and abilities had by a crafty and unscrupulous policy succeeded where many abler men would have failed. Constantius had induced the bishops to assent to a creed which they detested, and had given the Church an external unity under an Arian symbol. The Emperor was still a comparatively young man, when after long years of patient intrigue he had succeeded, with the aid of Acacius, in forcing his creed upon the unwilling Church. But in the hour of his triumph Constantius heard that the legions of Gaul had pronounced in favour of his cousin Julian, and on 3 November, 361, death overtook him in the midst of preparations to meet his rival. The death of the last son of Constantine is a very important event in ecclesiastical history. From the edict of Milan to the Acacian synod of Constantinople in 360, the policy of making the Christian

1. *Ingenuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est. (Adv. Luciferianos, c. 19.)*

2. Socrates, II 40; Hefele, *Councils*, § 82.

Church a department of the Empire had been instinctively, if not deliberately, pursued. The real principle at stake in the great struggle was not evident to the combatants themselves. To them it appeared to be a most important, but at the same time a very intricate, theological question; but had Constantius lived, and continued to enjoy the victory secured by Acacius and Valens over Athanasius, it would have been no mere triumph of speculative error. The final establishment of the Creed of Nicé would have signified that the Church, unmindful of her divine origin, had surrendered herself completely to the will of the Emperor. The calm which Constantius would have secured for her would have been the calm of death. But the Church of Christ was not destined to share the fate of the decaying empire, the fall of which she was to survive in order to create modern civilization out of its ruins. It may be well regarded, moreover, as providential that Constantine had looked coldly upon Athanasius, and that Constantius had hated him; for these emperors, by loyally assisting in making the Creed of Nicaea a living power in the Church, might have done a far greater injury to the cause of Truth by persecuting for its sake, than they did by opposing it. Athanasius was undoubtedly incapable either of the baseness to which the Eusebians had stooped, or of the trickery of Acacius and Valens; but he was spared their temptations. Instead of having to force the Creed of Nicaea upon an unwilling Church, he had to triumph over misrepresentation and calumny and to prove the sincerity of his convictions by his sufferings. Twenty years, however, were destined to elapse before the final triumph of the Creed of Nicaea, during which the government in the Eastern provinces supported the Homoean Arians. The tragic reign of Julian is an important interlude between the two great periods of the struggle, since throughout the brief but most interesting reign of this emperor the Christians found that not merely a particular doctrine, but the very existence of their religion, was endangered.

CHAPTER XV.

JULIAN AND THE PAGAN REACTION.

Effects of the
reign of
Constantius.

THE reign of Constantius was ruinous alike to the Church, which had been rent by faction, and to the Empire, which had been enfeebled by oppression. The ecclesiastical policy of the Emperor had set house against house and divided families, and the disorganization of the public service by the frequent journeys of the bishops from council to council is mentioned by the pagan historian as illustrative of the maladministration of the period.¹ The ecclesiastical mistakes of Constantius shewed that it was no easy matter to unite the Church and Empire without both suffering injury, and his legislation had grievously offended the pagans, among whom were some of the noblest and wealthiest of his subjects.² It was natural therefore that an attempt should be made to reverse all that had

1. Ammian. *xxi.* 16: "Quae progressa fusius aluit concertatione verborum, ut catervis antistitum jumentis publicis ultro citroque discurrentibus per synodos (quas appellant) dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur rei vehiculariae concideret nervos." Gibbon renders the sense of this passage thus:—"Constantius cherished and propagated, by verbal disputes, the differences which his vain curiosity had excited. The highways were covered with troops of bishops, galloping from every side to the assemblies which they call synods; and while they laboured to reduce the whole sect to their own particular opinions, the public establishment of the posts was almost ruined by their hasty and repeated journeys." *Decline and Fall*, ch. *xxi.*

2. Constantius acted towards Paganism in a contradictory manner. On the one hand, in the Theodosian code, *xvi.* t. 10, l. 2, and *xvi.* t. 10, l. 5. there are laws of his promulgated in 341 and 353 commanding all sacrifices to cease. Beugnot (*Hist. du Paganisme*, p. 142) says that these laws may be regarded as spurious, and Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, ch. *xxi.*) remarks, "There is the strongest reason to believe that this formidable edict was either composed without being published, or was published without being executed." M. Gaston Boissier (*Fin du Paganisme*, vol. I., p. 77) finds

been done by the house of Constantine, by placing Paganism once more in the ascendant. The patronage which Constantius had extended to the Church had done so much more harm than good, not only to the Empire but to Christianity, that its withdrawal was an actual benefit to true religion. The manner in which this was effected is one of the most remarkable incidents in history.

The sole survivors of the collateral branches of the family of Constantine were Gallus and Julian, the sons of Julius Constantius, who bore the title of 'The Patrician'. The former was only thirteen years of age, the latter was but six, or according to Socrates (iii. 1) eight, when Constantine's relatives fell victims to the soldiery in 337. Julian's mother, Basilina, was a member of the Anician house, the noblest of the great Roman families, and a relation of Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople.¹ The two royal youths had been saved by the efforts of the Arianizing bishop Mark of Arethusa, and were protected by Constantius, by whom Julian was entrusted to the care of Eusebius, then bishop of Nicomedia. Mardonius, a eunuch of Scythian birth, who had been in the household of Julian's family, was made tutor to the young prince. Julian in his *Misopogon* has left us a picture of the miseries of his early education. Mardonius was a harsh master, a precisian and a martinet; the child was debarred from the pleasures natural to his age and station, and from the society of others of his own age. Julian's unhappy childhood may account for the development of his peculiar character, and for his desertion of Christianity.² Both Julian and Gallus

it difficult to reject the law, which in his opinion was not so much a formal enactment as a vague threat by which the Emperor hoped to drive waverers into the Church. On the other hand, the pagan apologist Symmachus in the days of Gratian praises the toleration of Constantius (*Ep.* x.), and Ammianus (xvi. 10) says that Constantius on the occasion of his visit to Rome in A. D. 355 was not offended by the sight of the temples and altars.

1. Rendall, *The Emperor Julian*, p. 37.

2. Yet Julian had very pleasant memories of the time spent on a property in Bithynia left him by his grandmother. This he presented to his friend Evagrius, and in the letter giving him the estate Julian speaks of the gardens, springs, and groves as reminding him of the happy days of his

were most carefully trained in the Christian religion. Constantius shewed much solicitude for their spiritual welfare, and seems to have arranged that they should be baptized, long before he himself submitted to that indispensable rite.¹

Julian had hitherto resided at Constantinople, but now, at the age of thirteen years, he was sent with his brother Gallus into partial captivity at the castle of Macellum, an ancient palace of the kings of Cappadocia. Gallus was very different in character from his brother Julian. His disposition was fierce and intractable, and his naturally unamiable temper was aggravated by the jealous surveillance and constant espionage to which he and his brother were subjected.² Julian, on the contrary, was of a somewhat dreamy and poetical temperament, and, as he soon displayed a decided taste for literature and study, his secluded life appeared to be rather qualifying him for a professorial chair than to be fitting him to play a practical part in life.

Julian soon lost his brother, the only companion of his solitude, and was left to the care of servants and spies. Constantius, after the revolt of Magnentius, feeling the burthen of the entire empire too heavy for endurance, appointed Gallus as Caesar over the five great dioceses of the Eastern prefecture (March 5th, 351), fixing his residence at Antioch, and marrying him to Constantia, the daughter of the great Constantine. It soon became evident that the Caesar and his wife were equally unworthy of the charge committed to them; but the

boyhood. *Ep.* 46. Mr. Glover (*Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, p. 50) attributes Julian's excellent morality to the influence of Mardonius. "On a beaucoup remarqué la tendresse avec laquelle Julien parle de Mardonius son premier maître," says M. Gaston Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, vol. I., p. 107.

1. Julian, *Misopogon*, 351 c. Theodoret, *H. E.* III. 1. Sozomen, v. 2. It is nowhere, however, directly recorded that Julian was baptized, though Gregory Naz. implies that he was. Gregory (iv. 23) says that both Gallus and Julian were enrolled among the clergy. The 'Readers', however, at Alexandria were not necessarily baptized. (Socr. v. 22.) As however the historian says they had to be fully baptized elsewhere, Julian had probably received baptism.

2. Rendall (*op. cit.*, p. 40) quotes Ammian. xiv., who says Gallus was as unlike to Julian as Domitian was to Titus.

manner in which the ruin of Gallus was contrived shews the cruel and cautious disposition of Constantius in its worst colours.¹

Till Magnentius was thoroughly crushed the Augustus allowed the Caesar to remain undisturbed; and it was not till 354 that a commission, consisting of Domitian the praefect of the East and Montius the quaestor, was sent to enquire into the administration of the provinces entrusted to Gallus. Stung by their insolent behaviour, the Caesar assembled the populace of Antioch, to whom his misgovernment cannot have been wholly distasteful, and appealed to them for protection. Both quaestor and praetorian praefect fell victims to the rage of the mob, indignant at the treatment to which the Caesar had been subjected. Constantius bided his time, and allowing Gallus to think that he was forgiven, gradually withdrew the veteran legions from the East, and sent flattering letters to the Caesar inviting him to visit him as a colleague. Gallus fell into the trap. Instead of proclaiming himself Augustus and committing his fortunes to the decision of war, he started to visit Constantius. He began his journey with pomp, and celebrated games in the circus at Constantinople. At Adrianople the infatuated Caesar was ordered to proceed with only a few attendants. On his journey westward the toils gradually closed round him. At Petovio in Pannonia he was arrested by the general Barbatio and stripped of the ensigns of his rank. He was thence sent to Pola in Istria, and closely examined, on the subject of his administration, by his enemy, the eunuch Eusebius. Constantius, on reading the depositions of his minister, had no hesitation in condemning his cousin to death, and Gallus was ignominiously beheaded. That he deserved his fate is certain, but the cowardly treachery of Constantius in thus luring him to his doom cannot be palliated, and it made a deep impression on the brother of the murdered Caesar.²

1. Ammianus (bk. XIV.) describes Constantia, the wife of Gallus, as the author of his crimes and misfortunes. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xix.

2. Julian, *Ep. ad Athenienses*.

Julian attracted to Hellenism. In the meantime Julian had been allowed to reside, first at Constantinople, and afterwards, when the jealous emperor dreaded the presence of the royal youth in the capital, at Nicomedia. He studied rhetoric under Hecebolius at both places, but his master was ordered to keep his pupil from listening to the dangerously fascinating lectures of Libanius. Julian however read the discourses he was not permitted to hear, and was delighted by their eloquence. The party of Hellenism seem to have already decided to make so promising a disciple as Julian their own. Everything contributed to their success. Julian, prejudiced against the religion of Constantius and his uncongenial guardians, was attracted to Hellenism alike by his ambitions and studies. The fame of Aedesius first attracted him to Pergamus. The aged philosopher advised Julian to seek wisdom from his favourite pupils, Eusebius and Chrysanthius.¹ These teachers artfully stimulated the young man's desire for further knowledge, and with apparent reluctance allowed him to extort from them the information that a certain Maximus had been able to obtain signs of approval from the goddess Hecate, who had smiled on him in her temple. (A.D. 351.)² Julian sought Maximus and was initiated by him into the mysteries. It is possible that at this period he apostatized, though he still openly professed Christianity. At any rate, his heathen proclivities had become apparent, to the great distress of Gallus, a Christian by conviction as well as by profession. The Caesar sent Aetius, the famous Arian, to his brother, to confirm his faith; and Julian, too prudent to rouse the suspicion of Constantius, shaved his head, wore the garb of a monk, acting as a *reader* in the church. It was many years before he dared to throw off the mask and declare his real belief.

Julian at Milan. On the death of Gallus in 354 Julian was ordered to Milan. For months his life hung in the balance. Constantius was at the height of his power. He was tyrannizing over the Church at

¹ Rendall, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

² Harnack in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*. See also Allard, *Julien l'Apostat*.

Milan, and Julian doubtless witnessed the unworthy intrigues of the Arianizing bishops at that disgraceful synod.¹ The treatment he experienced at the hands of Constantius intensified the hatred of Julian for his cousin; his life was in constant danger, and he had to simulate affection for one whom he regarded as the murderer of his brother, and whom he suspected of having caused the extermination of his family. Julian found in the Empress Eusebia a true friend, as she persuaded her husband to allow him to go to Athens to prosecute his studies.

At Athens. For six months Julian enjoyed the first period of happiness in his life; he seemed in some respects born to adorn an university.² Among men of real genius Julian was able to shine, for Basil, afterwards the great bishop of Caesarea, then the most favoured pupil of Libanius, and Gregory of Nazianzum, the Christian poet-father, were among his associates. The latter has left a portrait of Julian as he appeared at Athens. It is the sketch of a man occasionally seen at the present time in a place of learning—an awkward, absent student, unsightly in appearance and *gauche* in manner—a man whose life has been spent in study, unused to or contemptuous of the decencies of life. We see his nervous manner, his restless gait, the twitching of his shoulders, his head nodding as he walked. We hear of his harsh peals of laughter, the irrelevant questions he sometimes addressed to a companion in the street, now stopping abruptly, now turning suddenly to speak to his friend. The prophetic Gregory saw in the unsightly student the apostate emperor: but ordinary men must have considered that the brilliant scholar, whose awkwardness attracted attention, was fitted to be nothing but an eccentric professor.³ But neither Gregory nor anybody else could have suspected that within five years this odd student would have established a military reputation worthy of the greatest of Roman

1. De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire*, III., pp. 258 and 284. Rendall, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

2. Julian in his *Letter to the Athenians* calls Athens the hearth of his mother (*ἐν τῇ τῆς μητρὸς ἑστίαν*). Rendall, p. 56.

3. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* v. 23. Socrates, III. 23. Theod., III. 1.

generals. During his sojourn at Athens, Julian made another step in apostasy by being initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries.

As affairs were too serious for Constantius to do without the assistance of a colleague, Julian was summoned to Milan, and on 6 November, 355, declared Caesar. Helena, the youngest daughter of Constantine, was given to him for wife, and a household suitable to his dignity was formed for him. But he was not a free agent. Constantius, incapable of trusting anybody, bound his colleague with a chain of minute instructions, encompassed him with spies, and sent him to Gaul to conduct a dangerous war, without authority to act on his own responsibility.¹ Julian saw his danger, and as he passed the threshold of the palace he was heard to repeat the words of Homer—

ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταῖή.² (*Il.* v. 83.)

Him purple death laid hold of and stern fate.

On his arrival in Gaul, Julian found the land a prey to the barbarous Germans who were devastating the country, while the generals appointed by Constantius were either incompetent, or unwilling to assist the Caesar for fear of the displeasure of the Augustus. Julian reorganized the army, and drove the barbarians beyond the Rhine. Having thus freed Gaul from her invaders, he devoted himself to the restoration of the prosperity of the country, and to relieving the inhabitants from the cruel oppression of excessive taxation. He established himself at Lutetia Parisiorum, then a small town on an island in the Seine, of which he speaks with great affection in after days, contrasting the simplicity of the life of its inhabitants with the effeminate luxury of Antioch.³

1. Mr. Glover says that it was not possible to deal otherwise with one so inexperienced as Julian. *Life and Letters in IVth Century*, p. 55.

2. Gibbon, ch. xix. *D. C. B.*, art. 'Julian', p. 495 b. Ammian. xv. 8, 17.

3. ἐτυγχανον ἐγὼ χειμάζων περὶ τὴν φιλὴν Λουτετίαν, ὀνομάζουσι δ' οὖτως οἱ Κέλται τῶν Παρισίων τὴν πολέχυν· ἔστιν δ' οὐ μεγάλη νῆσος ἐγκειμένη τῷ ποταμῷ, καὶ αὐτὴν κύκλω πᾶσαν τὸ τεῖχος καταλαμβάνει, ἐβλίναι ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἀμφοτέρωθεν εἰσάγουσι γέφυραι κ.τ.λ. *Misopogon*, 340 D.

The jealousy, or perhaps the misfortunes, of Constantius interrupted the successful career of Julian in Gaul. In 360 the Persian war demanded more troops for the defence of the eastern frontier, and Constantius sent orders to Julian to despatch his best legions to the East. The Caesar obeyed the commands of his superior with reluctance, knowing well that the abandonment of Gaul by the flower of his army meant a renewal of the incursions of the barbarians. The inhabitants viewed the departure of the legions with despair, and the soldiers were unwilling to leave their homes for a distant campaign in the East. A mutiny took place, and the army saluted Julian by the title of Augustus. The Caesar rebuked the zeal of his soldiers, who threatened him with death if he did not accept the proffered honour. The very fact that the army had proclaimed Julian Augustus was enough to make Constantius his implacable foe; and, as acceptance of the dangerous honour made but little difference in the heinousness of the offence, Julian consented to assume the title. He tried to avert civil war by a letter to Constantius respectfully begging him to confirm the decision of the army.¹ But it seemed inevitable that the question should be decided by an appeal to arms. Julian celebrated the feast of the Epiphany in January, 361, at Vienne. This was his last act of hypocrisy. From henceforth he declared himself an open and avowed Pagan. His rapid march from Gaul to Illyria belongs properly to the secular history of the Empire.² Julian took up his abode at Sirmium and reorganized the provinces of Illyria and Dalmatia, before prosecuting the war; but on November 3, 361, Constantius died at Mopsucrenae, and Julian was sole emperor. He heard the news as he crossed into Thrace. War was no longer necessary; Julian, as the last representative of the Flavian house, having been nominated Augustus by the deceased emperor on his death-bed.

**Julian sole
Emperor.**

1. Ammianus Marcellinus (XVIII. 28) says that Julian sent a threatening letter to Constantius with the more conciliatory epistle.

2. It is related with great spirit in Gibbon, ch. xxii.

Julian entered Constantinople on December 11, 361, amid the universal enthusiasm of the people. Themistius the famous orator had written to welcome him to the capital, and Julian replied in the language of a philosopher, declaring his preference for a life of meditation to one of active labour as a sovereign. One of his first acts was to appoint a scholar and a soldier as consuls for 362. Mamertinus was an orator and a poet; Nevitta a barbarian officer, whose nomination was intended to gratify the numerous soldiers enlisted from beyond the frontiers of the empire. The Emperor's treatment of his consuls shewed how greatly he prized the forms of the ancient Republic. He allowed his imperial dignity to be effaced for the moment before the majesty of the consular power, and with ostentatious humility paid a fine to the treasury for having pronounced the emancipation of a slave in his own name instead of that of the consul who was present. He harangued the Senate of Constantinople and sought their advice, and did his best to act the part of an officer of the Republic, of which he was in reality absolute master.¹ These amiable follies, however, might

**Early reforms of
Julian.**

cause a smile, but they did not seriously injure so distinguished a warrior as Julian in the public estimation. Nor was he content with playing a part. With the same vigour with which he had reorganized Gaul, Julian set himself to purify the corruptions of the imperial court. The numerous officials, the eunuchs, spies, cooks, and barbers, who had preyed on the public in the days of Constantine and Constantius, were dismissed with contempt, and palace retrenchment was accompanied by measures of financial reform throughout the Empire. A vast number of beneficent laws were passed to restrict the oppression of the tax collectors. Indiscriminate exemptions from the decurionate were removed, and only really deserving persons were henceforth to be excused from that unpopular office. Nothing was

1. Gibbon, ch. xxii. "The emperor on foot marched before their (the consuls') litters; and the gazing multitude admired the image of ancient times, or secretly blamed the conduct which, in their eyes, degraded the majesty of the purple."

more remarkable than the amount of work accomplished by the new emperor, who lived the life of an ascetic philosopher, despised all luxuries, and denied himself the hours of needful repose in order that he might perform the military, legislative, and literary duties he imposed on himself as emperor, chief magistrate, and philosopher.¹

But if Julian was frugal in his personal expenses, he was lavish in his patronage of learning. Letters were sent to the philosophers inviting them to court, and they appeared in swarms to partake of the imperial bounty. But to the disgust of their patron these men of wisdom, notably Maximus, whose spiritual communings with the unseen world had so impressed the youthful Julian, were instantly perverted by the atmosphere of the court, and forgot their philosophy in order to enjoy the luxuries of their new position. A few clung to their ragged garments and abstained from shaving, but lived in debauchery. Julian protested and wrote against these false cynics, but in vain.² He himself was the only one who lived the life of a consistent philosopher. It is but just to say that Libanius refused to come to the court, and remained proof against the supplications of his illustrious pupil. Julian had included Christian men of letters in his invitation; he begged Basil to come and speak with him "as friend to friend". The heretic Aetius, who accepted his invitation, was rewarded with an estate. The work of vengeance on the base ministers of the late emperor was not forgotten amid the reforms of Julian. Justice cried aloud for the punishment of such miscreants as Paul surnamed 'the Chain' from his activity in arresting suspected criminals, Apodemius, and Eusebius the chamberlain, who had plotted the death of Gallus. A commission, presided over by Sallustius the praetorian praefect, and consisting of the consuls Mamertinus and Nevitta,

1. Socrates, III. 1. Ammian., XXII. 4.

2. Rendall, *op. cit.*, p. 156. Socrates (III. 13) gives an account of Hecebolius the Sophist—a Christian under Constantius; a Sophist under Julian; and a blatant penitent who begged the worshippers to trample on him as salt that had lost its savour, when Paganism was no longer profitable.

Arbetio, a man of known severity, Jovinus, Julian's master of the horse, and Agilo, was appointed to try the offenders. Paul and Apodemius were burnt alive. The vile eunuch Eusebius was executed, with many others, some of whom were innocent of the abominations of the late reign. The unjust severity of the commissioners cannot be laid to the account of Julian, who had always asserted the principle that every accused person had a right to be heard in his own defence. The court was not happily chosen, and a judicial machinery of the kind, if once set in motion, is liable to go on till it transgresses the limits of strict justice.¹

Thus far nothing has been said of Julian's religious policy the most important feature in Julian's policy, his attitude towards religion. Like all his family, Julian was very susceptible to the influences of religion and even of superstition, and his constant expectation of visions, oracles, and all sorts of communings with the unseen world, find a parallel in the vision and dream which led Constantine to give his support to Christianity.² Two alternatives were open to Julian when he formally declared himself a Pagan. He might have preferred the religion of Rome to that of Greece. The former was an aristocratic and somewhat formal profession of faith in the eternity of the imperial city and her gods; it appealed little to the imagination but much to custom and association, and, as subsequent history proved, had a very powerful and enduring hold on men's minds. Julian would have found a very formidable ally against Christianity had he fixed his residence in the West and enlisted Roman prejudices on his side. But both circumstances and inclination led him to the East. Julian was a Greek by taste and education. He turns instinctively to Greek philosophy for guidance; he reminds the people of Alexandria and Constantinople that they are Greeks;

1. Rendall, p. 154. Even Julian's admirer Ammianus condemns the excessive severity of this court.

2. Mr. Glover says (*Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*): "In this feeling of the dependence on Heaven and the constant reference of everything to the divine, he is very like Constantine."

his hero and exemplar is Alexander the Great.¹ He was naturally disposed, therefore, to desire the restoration of Hellenism under the form of Neo-Platonism. Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jamblichus, the great masters of this school, had laboured to unite religion and philosophy, and had sought to stimulate the former by the practice of theurgy.

Ideal of
a great Hellenic
Church.

Julian was desirous of erecting a Pagan Catholic Church on the basis of Neo-Platonism,² in which all ancient cults were to be preserved and their rites practised, whilst their true significance was to be expounded by philosophers. An exalted morality was expected of the priesthood. Hitherto the priestly office had been held by hereditary succession and had not involved any moral obligation. Julian desired to change this, and to make the pagan clergy take the place of the Christian, as custodians of the moral and physical well-being of the people. The priests were to live frugally, bring up their families in the practice of virtue, dress plainly except when engaged in the performance of sacred rites, avoid theatres and taverns, and generally to behave as models of grave decorum and serious morality. Hospitals and houses for the reception of strangers were to be founded, and the charity of the pagans was to surpass that of the Christians.³ The high-priest, like the Christian bishop, was expected to visit his diocese, and correct his unworthy clergy. Julian himself as Pontifex Maximus stood at the head of this hierarchy. Even the Jews were to be included in the new scheme of comprehension, and Julian wrote to their patriarch in the most friendly terms, requesting the prayers of the nation, and commending the sacrificial system of the Law of Moses. In

1. Throughout the unfortunate and impolitic Persian expedition Julian strove to imitate Alexander's conduct. Gibbon, ch. xxiv.

2. Rendall, p. 251.

3. Julian, *Ep.* 49, to Arsacius high-priest of Galatia: "Then exhort the priest not to frequent the theatre, nor to drink in inns, nor to engage in any shameful or disreputable trade or craft," &c., &c. Rendall, p. 109 f. Among other things the pagan clergy were not to read erotic novels. Glover, p. 64. Care was to be taken to have good musical services in the temples (*τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐπιμεληθῆναι μουσικῆς*). *Ep.* 56.

order to render this again possible, Julian actually commenced the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem. The Jews shewed the utmost zeal in undertaking the work, which was interrupted by an astonishing miracle. As the workmen began to dig the foundations, balls of fire burst forth and drove them from the spot.¹

Julian's attitude towards Christianity was not dissimilar to that adopted by Constantine towards Hellenism. He tolerated it, but hoped to reduce the Church to insignificance by withdrawing from her all public favour. Nothing can be more worthy of a philosopher than Julian's language on the subject of persecution. The Galilaeans are not to be insulted or persecuted, persuasion only is to be used to bring men to the true religion.² In pursuance of this policy all the Christians who had suffered exile under the regime of Constantius were allowed to return to their homes.³ Perhaps Julian hoped that intestine disputes would thus arise to distract the Church, but the general drift of his policy of toleration is apparent, and it cannot be denied that the ideal Julian had set before him was not altogether ignoble. For it must not be forgotten that, even under Constantius, Paganism was the State religion, and that the emperors had favoured the Church not because of, but despite their position. The title of Pontifex Maximus, assumed by Constantine and his sons, made them, despite their acceptance of the Christian Faith, the actual heads of the ancient religion. Julian was

1. The earliest testimony to this miracle is Gregory of Nazianzum, late in the year A.D. 363 or early in 364, if we except a fragment of a letter from Julian himself cited by Warburton (*Julian*, bk. IV.) and Newman (*Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles*), but considered by Dr. Abbott (*Philomythus*, p. 185) not to refer to this event. The pagan historian Ammianus, writing about twenty years after Julian's death, bears testimony to the interruption of the work of building the Temple, XXIII. 1. Rendall, p. 113. Gibbon, ch. xxiii. "The subsequent witnesses, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, &c., add contradictions rather than authority," says Gibbon in one of his foot-notes.

2. Julian, *Ep.* 52. Rendall, p. 217. Socrates (III. 12) attributes Julian's aversion to use compulsion to his having observed the honours paid to the confessors in the days of Diocletian.

3. Socrates (III. 1) says he did this in order to brand the memory of Constantius with cruelty.

only fulfilling the duties of his station in interfering for the benefit of Paganism; and he did no wrong in withholding his favour from the Christians, who had only enjoyed the sunshine of imperial goodwill owing to the private and personal convictions of his predecessors.¹

Julian misled
regarding both
Christianity
and Hellenism.

The failure of Julian's efforts was due to two erroneous assumptions. The Hellenizing party, according to the sanguine expectations of the Emperor, needed only a little encouragement to inaugurate a great religious revival; he imagined that the worshippers of the gods had, like himself, groaned under a Christian tyranny, and that they were ready to make a great effort to check the growth of the Church. Experience shewed that Julian had calculated on a spirit which was non-existent in Paganism. The Pagans, it is true, bore no good-will to the Christians, but they were not ready to make their religion into a serious earnest faith and to submit to the rigid control of a hierarchy of philosophers and pedants. The very worshippers of the gods smiled at his superfluous zeal as they saw Julian marching at the head of religious processions, inspecting entrails, and sacrificing hecatombs.² To the Emperor the Hellenic religion was, what it never had been to its professors, a serious earnest philosophic faith, wholly alien to the joyous pleasure-seeking worship of ancient Greece. If on the one side Julian misjudged the Pagans, he was equally mistaken in his estimate of Christian zeal. He judged the Christians, no doubt, by the time-serving bishops who had frequented the courts of Constantius and Gallus, and thought that the withdrawal of the imperial protection would reduce their numbers to insignificance. He was quite unaware of the immense weight of passive resistance with which the Church was able to oppose every step in his policy, and he found to his cost at Antioch that the Christians had popular favour on their side. In addition to this, Julian was unable to comprehend the noble intolerance

1. Beugnot, *Histoire du Paganisme*.

2. Especially at Antioch. Rendall, p. 141.

of the Church, who would neither suffer a Pagan revival to despoil her of her children, nor allow the limits of her influence to be circumscribed. It was not possible to degrade the Church from the position she had attained without a severe struggle, nor was it possible to tolerate and at the same time to depress her. In making the attempt Julian incurred a more deadly hatred than he would have done had he persecuted like Galerius. Julian might have supported Paganism, and left the Church free though shorn of her privileges, without endangering the Empire; but when he tried to revive Paganism and to restore its shrines, when he tried to make the Church rebuild the temples which his predecessors had granted to her, and when he entered the lists as a controversialist, he failed completely, and began to find that the toleration, which he had striven to maintain, was impossible. Had he lived, he would have been obliged either to play the odious *role* of a persecutor, or to have abandoned his attempt to create a Pagan Catholic Church.

Julian's reign falls into two periods. **Two Periods in Julian's reign.** During the first, he was full of hope that his religious project would succeed. His general policy at this time was one of scrupulous toleration. During the second, he began to see the hopelessness of his undertaking, and to annoy the Christians by all means in his power. He realized the difficulties of his position at Antioch, just as he was preparing for the Persian war.

Laws of Julian. In the laws of Julian, preserved in the Theodosian code, the name of Christian is but once used, in an edict ordering all who claimed exemption from the decurionate on the ground of being Christians to be restored to the tax-roll.¹ A law which fell with more force on the Christians was the order to restore the property of the temples and to rebuild those which had been demolished. Not only was great injustice shewn in confiscating lands which had been bought with what seemed a good title, because they had belonged to temples, but the Christians

¹. *Codex Theod.*, xiii., t. 1, l. 4. Beugnot, p. 192.

felt it a point of conscience not to surrender to Pagan uses places or vessels which had been dedicated to the service of Christ.¹ Mark of Arethusa, who had preserved the lives of both Julian and Gallus, suffered under this edict. He had demolished a temple in the days of Constantius, and used the materials to erect a church. He was ordered to restore the site and rebuild the shrine, or to pay for the damage he had done. He refused, and was cruelly treated by the pagan mob, who, exasperated by his patience, smeared him with honey and hung him up in a net exposed to the insects and the intolerable heat of the sun. Yet this torture could not persuade the aged bishop to yield so far as to repair a heathen shrine, nor would he listen to any offer of a compromise.²

An edict, dated Feb. 363, forbade the celebration of funerals by day, and, as this was dated from Antioch, it may possibly have been intended to prevent the Christians from converting funerals into public demonstrations against the Emperor, especially when we remember that the famous riots about the bones of St. Babylas had but recently occurred.

Attempts to
influence
religion in the
army.

Julian naturally sought to gain over the army to his way of thinking. He had but little difficulty in inducing the soldiery to conform. Religion was with many of them a matter of discipline, and the success and popularity of their emperor smoothed away many difficulties. Nevertheless, that great pains were taken to avoid giving offence to the Christians in the army, the following incident will shew. On the occasion of some special donative Julian himself was present, and the soldiers were ordered to sprinkle a few grains of incense on an altar in loyal acknowledgement of the imperial *largesse*; but no Pagan image was set up, and no Pagan god was invoked. The soldiers regarded the act as a matter of military etiquette. That evening the

1. Rendall, p. 165.

2. This Mark was the author of the Sirmian Creed of 351 (Socrates, II. 30; Sozomen, v. 10); where, however, Valesius tries to distinguish between Marcus the Confessor and the Homoean leader. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Marcus', vol. III., p. 825 b. Rendall, p. 167.

Christian soldiers made the sign of the Cross, and their Pagan comrades ridiculed them for having offered sacrifice to the gods. There were only a few assembled at a mess-table, but the conduct of the believing soldiers made the affair conspicuous. Thinking that they had been entrapped into an act of idolatry, they rushed towards the palace proclaiming their loyalty to Christ. Julian ordered this breach of military discipline to be punished, and the ringleaders were condemned to be flogged. The sentence was, however, remitted in deference to public opinion.¹ Some officers of rank are reported to have refused to allow themselves to be polluted by Pagan ceremonies. Valentinian is said to have been banished for contemptuously shaking off the lustral water, with which a Pagan priest had sprinkled him; but the truth of this narrative is, to say the least, questionable.²

Julian aimed a far more serious blow at the Christians by his educational policy. No edict adverse to the Christians is found in the Theodosian code, but a rescript prohibiting Christians from teaching the classics appears in the collection of Julian's epistles. On 12 May, 362, he enacted a law confirming doctors of medicine and professors in their existing immunities from the public burthens.³ This was followed by an edict ordering that no professor should be allowed to teach till he had been examined as to his competence, and his appointment had been sanctioned by the *curiales*, with the consent and confirmation of the *optimi*. This might in some cases prevent the appointment of Christians as public teachers, but it could not do any serious harm. The date of the famous educational rescript is uncertain, but the most probable view is that it was promulgated after Julian had been soured by his visit to Antioch.⁴

1. Sozomen, v. 17.

2. Theodoret, *H. E.* III. 12; a somewhat late authority for an imperial confession of Christ!

3. Julian, *Ep.* 41. Rendall, p. 205. For a most valuable account of the educational system of this period see Gaston Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, bk. II., 'Le Christianisme et l'éducation romaine.'

4. "Issued" says Mr. Rendall "June 17, shortly before Julian's arrival at Antioch."—p. 207. *Cod. Theod.*, xiii., t. 3, l. 5.

After a preamble setting forth the duty of every professor to practise virtue, and to teach the desirability of honesty to his disciples, Julian points out the extreme dishonesty of teaching what one does not believe. The Christian teachers of classical literature, who do not believe in the gods, are therefore called dishonest men, who for the sake of a few pence stifle their convictions. The religious terrorism, says Julian, practised by the Christian emperors in the past, forced many worthy men to hide their real opinions; but, as now there is no excuse for this, those who teach Homer and Hesiod must believe in the immortal gods. If they refuse from conscientious motives, "let them" says Julian "go to the churches of the Galilaeans and expound Matthew and Luke." No act of Julian's caused more indignation. The very Pagans condemned it.¹ From what we can gather from other sources we see that it was rigidly enforced, and that it succeeded in driving the Christian professors from the schools. Proaeresius, the master of Julian at Athens, rejected the Emperor's assurance that he should be unmolested, and resigned his chair.² The two Apollinarii at Laodicea set to work to construct classical text-books, modelled on the ancient works, for their Christian scholars;³ Victorinus, the great master of eloquence at Rome, refused to desert the cause of God, and retired from the schools.⁴

One Christian teacher was the subject of Julian's special animosity. Athanasius had returned to Alexandria, after the riot in which his predecessor, the infamous George, had been murdered. In September, 362, he had held a small but very important council, which had contributed greatly to the union of the Church, and he had also baptized some Pagan ladies.⁵ Julian saw in the veteran bishop too dangerous an enemy to the cause of Hellenism to be

Julian and
Athanasius.

1. Ammianus (XXII. 10) says of the edict that "it must be plunged into everlasting silence". Rendall, p. 212.

2. Rendall, p. 215.

3. Socrates, III. 16; Sozomen, v. 18, who says that Gregory of Nazianzum joined in this work.

4. See Augustine, *Confess.* VIII. 2, for the conversion of Victorinus Afer.

5. Julian, *Ep.* 6, 51. *Index to Festal Letters*, xxxv.

suffered to remain at Alexandria, and ordered the Alexandrians to expel him forthwith, threatening them with penalties if they disobeyed. He wrote to Ecdicius, the praelect, ordering him to chase Athanasius from Egypt. Words fail him to describe his hatred of the bishop, and the letter ends curtly with the significant word *διωκείσθω*. The Alexandrians petitioned in favour of their bishop, and in reply Julian wrote to contrast the works of Jesus with the splendid deeds of Alexander and the Ptolemies.¹ Athanasius was forced into exile, but prophesied as he fled that this was a little cloud which would soon pass over. The Emperor's death verified his prediction and enabled him to return in peace.²

Before, however, continuing the record of acts which betray Julian's hostility against the Church, it may be well to give a short description of the provocations suffered by him during his sojourn at the Christian city of Antioch. The serious and earnest Pagan emperor and the populace of the pleasure-loving Antioch with Christian sympathies, were very soon at irreconcilable enmity. In May, 362, Julian passed from Europe to Asia, and after a long progress through Asia Minor arrived at Antioch early in July. The polished but effeminate population of the capital of the East cared nothing for military glory, nor for the manly virtues which Julian had displayed in Gaul, preferring Constantius, with his many vices but stately bearing and splendid retinue, to the philosophic hero's undignified appearance and dirty beard. In their own words, they preferred the Chi and Kappa (*Χριστός* and *Κωνσταντίος*) to Julian.³ Julian's sojourn at Antioch was one continued disappointment. Owing to the fact that forces were being massed there for the Persian campaign,⁴ famine prices prevailed in the city; and in order to prevent

1. Julian, *Ep.* 6, 26, 51. The language the Emperor uses in regard to Athanasius, *οὐδὲ ἀνὴρ ἀλλ' ἀνθρωπίσκος εὐτελής, κ.τ.λ.*, is unworthy alike of a prince and a philosopher.

2. Rufinus, i. 34. Rendall, p. 194.

3. Julian, *Misopogon*, 357, τὸ Χῖ, φασίν, οὐδὲν ἠδίκησε τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲ τὸ Κᾶππα.

4. Socrates, III. 18.

corn being sold for an excessive price the Emperor unwisely decreed a fixed rate, and imported 22,000 modii from the neighbouring granaries, and even from Egypt. The grain was bought in the open market by large speculators, who evaded the law and sold it to the people at famine prices, thereby increasing the distress. The municipal senate protested; and Julian, strong in the consciousness of the purity of his motives, and unwilling to own his mistake, ordered many of the principal persons in Antioch to be arrested. Though they were soon liberated, the insult was not readily forgiven.

The religion of the Emperor was as unpopular as his policy. The glory of Pagan Antioch was the Temple of Apollo at Daphne. The Emperor on visiting the celebrated shrine found it completely deserted save by one old priest, who informed him that he had nothing to offer to the god but a goose. Julian proceeded to restore the fallen worship to its former glories, and ordered the oracular spring of Castalia to be reopened, though it had been for centuries blocked up in consequence of its having revealed to Hadrian the secret that he would one day be master of the Empire. But the oracle was dumb, and no sound could be extracted by sacrifices and libations save the cry "The Dead, the Dead!" It was supposed that this was due to the presence of the bones of St. Babylas, bishop of Antioch, who had been martyred under Diocletian. They were removed, and the Christians made the ceremony an occasion for a demonstration. The procession, in defiance of the wrath of the Emperor, sang the words of the Psalmist, "Confounded be they that worship carved images."¹

The Temple of Daphne was burnt soon after this riot, and, as the fire was said to have been caused by the Christians, a youth by name Theodore was tortured on the rack for a whole day by Sallustius, the praetorian praefect.² The great church of Antioch seems to have also been closed at this time. Two soldiers,

1. Sozomen, v. 19; Rufinus, I. 35; Rendall, p. 194. Ps. xcvi. 7 (P. B.)

2. Socrates, III. 19, who says he had the story from Rufinus (I. 36).
Sozomen, v. 20. Theodoret, III. 7.

by name Juventinus and Maximus, are said by Chrysostom to have been put to death for quoting Scripture against Julian in a tavern. They suffered nominally for treasonable language and insolence to their officers.¹ But it is vastly to Julian's credit that he never revenged the irritating insults of the people of Antioch by any great severity. Many a Roman emperor, secure in the adherence of a devoted army, would have condemned the turbulent but effeminate mob of Antioch to the horrors of a massacre. Julian bore their taunts in silence, and contented himself with a strange revenge. He composed a satire on the inhabitants of Antioch, called the *Misopogon* or Beard-hater, from the ridicule which they had directed against his hirsute appearance. The work is a monument of the wit, the humanity, and the absence of judgment, of the Emperor. He placed himself in a false position by bandying satirical pamphlets with his subjects; but we cannot but admire the spirit which could satisfy itself with so harmless a vengeance. For Julian, as his letters from Antioch testify, felt the behaviour of the Christian

mob of that city acutely. We cannot fail to notice how his patience gradually failed him, and that his once impartial toleration began to disappear. In his letter to the people of Bostra, whose bishop Titus tried to prevent a collision between the Pagans and Christians, Julian advises that the bishop be chased from the city by the inhabitants, whom he had slandered by reporting their conduct.² This meanness of spirit, which could thus turn a good action of a bishop into an inducement for the mob to eject him, is equally noticeable in Julian's letter to Edessa. The Arians had attacked the Valentinians, and many outrages had been committed. Julian wrote to Hecebolius confiscating the entire property of the Church, handing the funds to the soldiery, and the land to the *fiscus*. "In this way" he adds sneeringly "they will learn prudence in poverty, and not lose that heavenly kingdom they still hope for."³

1. Theodoret, III. II. Chrysostom composed a sermon in their honour.

2. Julian, *Ep.* 52.

3. Id., *Ep.* 53.

The murder of George of Alexandria was as atrocious as it was deserved. The **Attack on the Christians.** disreputable pork-contractor, who had been made bishop of Alexandria in place of Athanasius, had behaved with rapacity and violence. Not only had he oppressed and persecuted the followers of his exiled predecessor, but he had insulted the Pagans by ridiculing their temples as sepulchres, and parading through the streets the obscene and ridiculous objects used in the Mithras worship. In 362 the mob arose and murdered the bishop, and after exhibiting his mangled corpse on a camel, they burnt it and cast the ashes into the sea. Though the Emperor indicted a severe reproof to the Alexandrians, he dwelt so much on the crimes of George that he created the fatal impression that similar acts might be perpetrated with impunity. Nor did the Pagans fail to interpret the wishes of the Emperor in accordance with their own desires.¹ At Heliopolis the heathen revenged the conversion of the temple of Venus into a church, by murdering Christian virgins and throwing their entrails to the pigs.² At Gaza, three brothers, Eusebius, Nestabus, and Zeno, were martyred by the mob.³ According to one account, Julian was seriously angry at this outrage; but Sozomen says that he remarked "What need to arrest the fellows for retaliating on a few Galilaeans for all the wrongs they have done to the gods?" At Dorostolus, in Thrace, St. Aemilian was burned alive for 'sacrilege'.⁴ St. Basil, a young presbyter of Ancyra, was accused of seditious preaching and insulting the idols. He was brought before Julian and condemned by him to have seven strips flayed from his body every day. He flung one of them in the Emperor's face, crying "Take, Julian, the food you relish." On the departure of Julian from

1. Julian, *Ep.* 10; Socrates, 111. 3. "You will, no doubt," writes the Emperor, "be ready to say that George justly merited his chastisement; and we might be disposed perhaps to admit that he deserved still more acute torture!"

2. Sozomen, v. 10.

3. Sozomen, v. 9.

4. Rendall, p. 180.

Ancyra he was put to death.¹ Several persons who richly deserved punishment were enrolled among the martyrs, notably George of Alexandria, and Artemius the military praelect of Egypt, who is said to have suffered death for his zeal against the idols, but who merited a worse punishment than beheading, for having supported George in his iniquities and extortions.

Julian's
book against
the Christians.

Julian, not content with opposing Christianity as an emperor, entered the lists as a literary critic of the Church; and so great was the influence of his book, that Cyril, bishop of Alexandria a full generation after his death, found it necessary to refute his arguments. The book has a singularly modern tone, owing to Julian's having, unlike most ancient opponents of Christianity, a considerable knowledge of the Old and New Testaments. He sees traces of polytheism in the religion of ancient Israel; he notices the differences between St. John's Gospel and the three earlier ones; he declares Christianity to be a mingling of the worst elements of Hellenism and Judaism. He ridicules the story of the Fall of Man. Libanius considered it a better refutation of Christianity than that by Porphyry.²

Death of Julian.

On March 5, 363, Julian left Antioch on his ill-fated expedition against Persia. The details of the war need not be here related; suffice it to say that Julian shewed that he still possessed the virtues of a soldier, but forgot that the part of a hero trying to equal Alexander the Great was fraught with disaster to the enfeebled empire of Rome. His death, and the retreat of the Roman army after ceding provinces to Persia, form a melancholy sequel to the noble promise of his early career.

Julian's life and reign had proved conclusively

1. Sozomen, v. 11. The scars of the martyr had *miraculously* disappeared when he was brought to execution. "A marvel which" says Mr. Rendall "might cause temporary uneasiness to the most credulous." The acts of the martyrdom are in Ruinart.

2. Gaston Boissier, p. 128. The arguments of Julian against Christianity have been collected by Newman. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*.

that Christianity must of necessity be the religion of the Empire. His attempt to reconstruct Paganism had but demonstrated the incurable weakness and rottenness of the old religion. Though he may never have uttered them, the words put into his mouth by the Christian historian are true:—"Thou hast conquered, O Galilaean."¹

1. Theodoret, III. 20; Sozomen, VI. 2. Julian is said to have upbraided the sun. The note on the passage in Theodoret, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, points out that *ἡπάτηκας ἤλιε* is not very dissimilar in sound to the exclamation reported by that historian.



CHAPTER XVI.

CONCLUSION OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY IN THE EMPIRE.

Survey of affairs after the death of Constantius. THE reign of Julian was but an interlude in the struggle by which the Church was distracted. For a short time the contending parties paused to avert a common disaster, but no sooner was the danger over than they resumed hostilities. The death of Constantius was the real turning point in the controversy; since had he lived for another twenty years, Homoean Arianism might have been so firmly established as the official creed of the Empire,¹ that nothing but a serious revolution could ever have displaced it. That emperor's sudden death in A.D. 361 checked the Arianizers in the very moment of their triumph, for the withdrawal of external pressure in favour of any particular formula of belief gave everybody the opportunity of declaring himself under his true colours. A survey of Christian opinion at this time in the different parts of the Roman world will at once explain the situation of the various parties.

The West adheres to the Nicene Creed. In the Western division of the Empire all forms of Arianism had been merely of exotic growth, and it was only by fraud or violence that any formula save that of Nicaea had ever been adopted. If at the Councils of Milan and Ariminum the Westerns had proved unfaithful to Saint Athanasius and the *Homöousion*, it was due to the fear of imperial displeasure, and still more to the

1. Athanasius says expressly that the Arian chiefs considered the Church a mere department of state, *νομίζοντες πολιτείας βουλῆς εἶναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*. *Ad Monachos*, quoted by Canon Jenkins.

dexterous party management of Ursacius and Valens. No sooner therefore did the news of the death of Constantius become public than the Occidental bishops reverted to their old allegiance.¹ The apostasy of Ariminum had no permanent effects; Liberius returned to Rome to teach the doctrine which he had in a moment of weakness repudiated. From henceforth the Nicene formula was firmly established in the Western portion of the Empire, which was fortunate after Julian's death in enjoying the advantage of the government of an emperor who abstained from interfering with religious belief. Valentinian, who was chosen emperor after the brief and inglorious reign of Jovian, took up his abode in the Western provinces, leaving the Eastern countries to the care of his brother and colleague, Valens. Though a Christian by conviction, Valentinian maintained the strictest impartiality in matters of religion, ruling his subjects with a justice marred only by occasional outbursts of severity.²

Athanasius
and the Council
at Alexandria,
A. D. 362.

The Christians of Egypt, under the influence of their great but persecuted leader Athanasius, were faithful to the orthodox cause. Since his expulsion from Alexandria in A. D. 356 Athanasius had been a wanderer, at one time taking refuge amongst the solitaries in the desert, at another visiting his adherents in secret; perhaps actually present during part of the synod of Ariminum, and once the guest of a Christian virgin of great beauty, who protected the champion of Nicaea by concealing him from his enemies. George of Cappadocia, the Arian bishop of Alexandria, fell a victim to the fury of the pagan mob, which his indiscreet language had provoked, and when Athanasius returned under the edict of Julian permitting all exiled bishops to come back to their homes, he was able to hold a small but most important council at Alexandria, resulting in a complete understanding between the

1. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 181. Even before the breach between Julian and Constantius the Gaulish bishops had met at Paris to ratify the Nicene faith and excommunicate the Western Arians.

2. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 227. De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire*, vol. II., p. 12.

Western and Eastern supporters of the Nicene Creed. The former had no adequate equivalents for the terms *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, used by the Greeks to designate the one essence of the Trinity and the special personality belonging to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Athanasius, who understood Latin, was able to appreciate the position of the Occidentals, and to persuade them to agree that *substantia*, which they had previously used to render *ὑπόστασις*, should from henceforth be the equivalent of *οὐσία*, and that the word *persona* should be the accepted rendering of *ὑπόστασις*.¹

The Eastern provinces were destined to be in the first instance the battle-field of the Arian controversy. Here public opinion may be described as being inclined to orthodoxy, but preferring the creed of Antioch to that of Nicaea. This phase of opinion was represented by bishops like Basil of Ancyra, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and Eustathius of Sebaste, as well as by prelates like Gregory bishop of Nazianzus, whose son and namesake is celebrated as one of the greatest theologians of the Eastern Church. These, having suffered at the hands of the Homoeans, who shewed no mercy to their former allies after their triumphs at Ariminum and Seleucia,² were drawing closer to the adherents of the Nicene symbol. They were encouraged in this by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in Gaul, whose strenuous adherence to the *Homöousion* has won for him the title of 'the Athanasius of the West'. Hilary, after being condemned in 356 by a council at Biterræ, held by command of Constantius under the auspices of the Caesar Julian, had been banished to Asia Minor, where

1. The decrees of the Council of Alexandria are given in a *Tome* or letter to the Church of Antioch published in the works of Athanasius and used by Rufinus, *H. E.* x. 29. Socrates (III. 7) wrongly says that this council refused to apply the terms *ousia* and *hypostasis* to God, and gives an interesting account of the use of the word *hypostasis*. Sozomen, v. 12; Jerome, *adv. Lucif.* 20; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 207; Hefele, *Councils*, vol. II., p. 277 (Eng. Transl.); Prolegomena to Athanasius, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. lviii.

2. At the Acacian synod of Constantinople, at which Macedonius, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and others were deposed. Socrates, II. 38—42; Sozomen, IV. 24. See Hefele, *Councils*, vol. II., p. 271.

he found the Semi-Arian party more in sympathy with his opinions than he had expected, and was able to exercise much influence without obtruding himself into their councils.¹ As the flight of Athanasius to Rome resulted in securing the support of the West for the cause of Nicaea, so did Hilary's banishment contribute to win over the Asiatic provinces.

The Schism of Antioch.

An unfortunate display of excessive zeal for orthodoxy on the part of Lucifer, bishop of Calaris in Sardinia, hindered the restoration of a complete understanding between the Asiatic, Alexandrian, and Roman Churches. Soon after the Synod of Alexandria this energetic champion of the Nicene faith went to Antioch, where he found that Meletius, who had been appointed bishop by the Arians, had publicly preached in favour of the Nicene Creed and had been acknowledged as bishop by some of the orthodox, who were satisfied with his ministrations.² Lucifer, however, refused to recognise Meletius, and attached himself to the party which, since the deposition of Eustathius in 330, had preferred separation to communicating with bishops of doubtful orthodoxy.³ The consecration of Paulinus by Lucifer made the breach irreparable, and for a long time the Church of Antioch was divided between the supporters of Meletius, who had the sympathy of the prelates of the East, and those of Paulinus, whom Alexandria and Rome agreed in acknowledging as the lawful bishop.

1. Hefele, *Councils*, vol. II., p. 216. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 150 and 164—166, on the *De Synodis*, written by Hilary before the acceptance of the creed of Nicé. He was present at Seleucia. Hilary was especially impressed by such Semi-Arians as Eleusius, Eustathius, and Basil of Ancyra. Newman, *Arians*, p. 229.

2. Meletius, on being translated from Sebastia in Armenia to Antioch, was ordered by Constantius to preach on the crucial passage *Κόπιος ἔκτισέ με*, *Prov.* viii. 22. His exposition of the text was Nicene. For this he was sent into exile. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 183. Theodoret (II. 27) speaks of him with deep respect, and Gregory of Nyssa, who preached his funeral oration, alludes to "the sweet calm look, the radiant smile, the kind hand seconding the kind voice" of Meletius.

3. On the conduct of Lucifer, who was not present at Alexandria, see *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Proleg. to Athanasius, p. lviii.

The Emperor Valentinian received the purple on February 26, 364, and on March 29th he associated his brother Valens in the Empire, assigning to him the Eastern provinces. Valens, inferior to his brother both in character and ability, was a well-meaning and industrious man, who might have filled a subordinate place with credit, but was unfitted for the heavy responsibility of empire. In his ecclesiastical policy Valens endeavoured to continue that of Constantius, but he lacked the prestige of birth which had made the last surviving son of Constantine so potent in religious matters. Valens fixed his residence at Constantinople, now completely under Arian influences, the bishop being Eudoxius, the predecessor of Meletius in the see of Antioch. His successor was Demophilus, the last Arian bishop of the imperial city.¹

The Semi-Arians induced Valentinian to allow a synod to be held at Lampsacus in the autumn of 364, at which the bishops assembled pronounced the Son to be like to the Father as regards His Essence (*ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν*). Valens, however, influenced by Eudoxius, who persuaded him to accept Arian baptism in 367, reprimanded Eleusius of Cyzicus and the bishops at Lampsacus for presuming to despatch Eustathius of Sebaste on an embassy to Liberius, the bishop of Rome, promising to accept the Nicene Faith. In the year 365 an imperial rescript was put forth commanding the municipalities to drive out all those bishops who, having been banished by Constantius, had availed themselves of Julian's permission to return.² Athanasius had to leave Alexandria for the fifth time

1. Prof. Gwatkin (*op. cit.*, p. 234) attributes Valens's policy partly to the religious condition of the Eastern Provinces, "upon the whole the Homoean policy was the easiest for the moment," and partly to the influence of Eudoxius and the Empress Dominica.

2. Sozomen (vi. 7) gives a good account of the synod. The deputies met Valens as he was returning from Heraclea to Thrace. (Socrates, iv. 4.) For the date of the council see Prof. Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, Note M. For the embassy to Rome, Hefele, *Councils*, § 88. Eng. Transl.

during his long episcopate, but was very soon restored to his flock.¹

The position of Valens was, however, too precarious for him to imitate Constantius in expelling the great leaders of the Christian Church. In September, 365, Procopius, a kinsman of Julian, claimed the Empire, and Valens was only saved by the firmness of his generals and the timidity of his rival.² The first of the wars with the Goths in this reign occupied the years 367 and 368, ending in favour of the Romans, and resulting in a treaty between Valens and the Gothic leader Athanaric, made on a boat in the middle of the river Danube. But until Valens was freed from his serious political anxieties, he was unable to interfere actively in matters of religion.³ This emperor is accused of having been a party to a serious crime, which, if the charge were true, would place him among the worst of his persecuting predecessors. It is reported that he allowed Modestus, the praefect, to put eighty of the orthodox clergy on board a vessel, which was burned and deserted by the crew, who had received orders to leave the passengers to their fate. Happily, however, the evidence is not sufficient to warrant a belief that Valens was guilty.⁴

During the persecution of the Nicene Faith under Valens a new generation of theologians arose in Asia Minor of a very different type to those of the time-serving Eusebian or vacillating Semi-Arian party. Three men of strong

1. Meletius also returned to Antioch. The revolt of Procopius was no doubt the reason why they were restored. Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

2. Ammian. xxvi. 10. 3. Procopius's army was defeated at Nacolia in Phrygia. De Broglie (*L'Eglise et l'Empire*, p. 7) remarks that this rebellion was prejudicial to the extreme Arians, as Eunomius was a partisan of Procopius.

3. Dr. Hodgkin (*Invaders of Italy*, vol. i., pp. 160—183) describes this scene and gives an account of the oration of Themistius.

4. The story is told by Socrates (iv. 16) and Theodoret (iv. 24). Prof. Gwatkin does not accept it, partly on account of the enormity of the crime, partly because there is no contemporary evidence, and also because Modestus subsequently enjoyed the friendship of Basil. (*Studies of Arianism*, note N.)

individuality and great personal holiness, knit together by ties alike of blood and friendship, appeared on the scene, and by their efforts the Eastern Church declared finally in favour of the Nicene doctrine. Gregory of Nazianzus and the two brothers, Basil bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia and Gregory bishop of Nyssa, share the credit of removing all difficulties experienced by the Christians of Asia Minor and Syria in accepting the dogma of the consubstantiality of the Son. This remarkable trio belonged to the Christian aristocracy of their province. Gregory was the son of the bishop of Nazianzus, Basil and his brother the grandsons of a lady named Macrina, who with her husband had suffered in the days of the Diocletian persecution. Their parents—Basil an eminent advocate, and his wife Emmelia—were Christians of wealth and position. The eldest sister, named Macrina after her grandmother, was deeply religious, and it was due to her influence that Basil determined to abandon a secular career.¹ In addition to the advantage of the influence of Christian homes, the three young Cappadocians enjoyed that of the best education of the age. Gregory with his brother Caesarius left Nazianzus to study at Caesarea in Palestine, and afterwards became the pupil of Didymus the Blind, master of the famous Catechetical School at Alexandria. Finally he went to Athens, where he was joined by Basil, whom his influence saved from those annoyances which have at all times beset a new-comer on entering a society of youthful students. Julian was at Athens at the time, and the future emperor appreciated the abilities of Basil, who was making for himself a great reputation as a student under Himerius and Proaeresius.²

On their return to their homes both Gregory and Basil were attracted by the ascetic lives of some of the more earnest Christians of their time. Gregory settled near his home at Nazianzus and became a fervent

Ascetic life
of Gregory
and Basil.

1. Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Macrina* (his sister). Basil, like Timothy, learned about God from his grandmother, Macrina, *Ep.* ccxxiii., § 3.

2. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Prolegomena to Basil. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* XLIII.

ascetic, not, however, entirely abandoning all human duties; for we find him complaining that the distractions of life and troubles with servants hindered his spiritual progress.¹ Basil, on the other hand, having visited the famous solitaries in the Egyptian deserts, in Palestine and in Coele-Syria, returned to Asia Minor prepared to organize religious communities, and to assist his friend Eustathius of Sebaste in introducing monasticism.² He himself settled at Annesi, where his father had possessed an estate; and a friendly and even playful correspondence took place between Basil and Gregory, who was invited to join his retreat.³ The two when companions in asceticism occupied themselves in completing the collection of the best passages of Origen known as the *Philocalia*.

Basil's early activity.

But Basil was not fitted for the peaceful life of an ascetic student, and his active and masterful disposition drove him to take part in the ecclesiastical politics of his age. If it was his misfortune to be compelled to sever many friendships he had formed, owing to his associates proving unworthy of his confidence, it was probably an advantage to him to have been acquainted with men of widely different views. Julian's apostasy, the vacillations of Eustathius of Sebaste between orthodoxy and Arianism, and the heresy of Apollinarius, all cost him friends, but taught him valuable lessons. We find him in A.D. 359 accompanying the bishops Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste on an embassy to Constantius from the Synod of Seleucia,⁴ and leaving his home at Caesarea because the bishop Dianius signed the creed of Nicé. It is pleasing, however, to

1. *Dict. Christian Biog.*, art. 'Gregory of Nazianzus'. He says of his retreat *τρόπων γὰρ εἶναι τὴν μονήν, οὐ σωμαίων. Carmen de Vita sua.*

2. "Inside Mount Taurus the movement came chiefly from the Semi-Arian side. Eustathius of Sebastia has the doubtful credit of starting it in Pontus." Gwalkin, *op. cit.*, p. 231, on the rise of asceticism.

3. Basil, *Ep.* xiv.; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* ii. Basil was keenly alive to the beauties of nature.

4. According to the Prolegomena to Basil, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, the presence of Basil of Ancyra rests on the authority of Gregory of Nyssa, and of Philostorgius, the Arian historian.

record that Basil returned to his native town, and that Dianius died completely reconciled to him.¹ So great was his popularity at this time, that he was able on the death of Dianius (A.D. 362) to influence the election to the metropolitan see of Caesarea in favour of his friend Eusebius, by whom he was made a priest. (A.D. 364.) Basil's relations with his bishop were not always friendly, but he was ultimately reconciled to him by the kindly help of his friend Gregory.²

When Eusebius died in A.D. 370 Basil did not shrink from undertaking to fill his place, and by the strenuous efforts of his friends he was placed in the high position of Metropolitan of Cappadocia and Exarch of Pontus, which he held for nine years. He set himself to reform the state of his diocese, and province—the latter including Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, and the Greater and Lesser Armenia.³ He discovered that great irregularities prevailed in the matter of ordinations, and was specially troubled by a fanatical deacon named Glycerius, who seems to have combined the Corybantic excesses of his native land with Christian worship.⁴ Basil devoted much time to the work of regulating the monastic system, and extensive charitable institutions sprang up under his fostering care. Round the church so many buildings arose for the benefit of the needy,—hospitals, workshops, and the like,—that these received the name of the New City,⁵ and Basil's view of the way in which the rich ought

Basil
as bishop of
Caesarea.

1. Basil, *Ep.* 51.
2. Several of the bishops objected to the election of Eusebius and were ready to put Basil in his place; to avoid this, Basil retired to his monasteries in Pontus. Prolegomena to Basil, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. xx.
3. For the localities mentioned in connexion with Basil, see Ramsay's *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*.
4. Prof. Ramsay in his *Church and the Roman Empire*, ch. xviii., suggests that these excesses were before the time of Basil a not uncommon part of "a great religious meeting" in Asia Minor.
5. Basil's Ptochotropheion, as it was termed, consisted of a church, a palace for the bishop, lodgings for the clergy, for the workmen employed in the works, and for the poor; a hospital for lepers was also established. *Greg. Naz., Oral.* xx.; *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Basil'. Prolegomena to Basil (p. xxi) quotes Prof. Ramsay, *Church and the Roman Empire*, p. 464: "The New City of Basil seems to have caused the gradual concentration

to contribute to the necessities of the poor was so comprehensive that he has been claimed as a forerunner of modern socialism.¹

Basil and Valens. The displeasure of an Arian emperor like Valens at such energy displayed by an orthodox prelate was much dreaded by Basil's friends, and when in A.D. 371 the court travelled through Asia Minor on its way to Antioch, a conflict seemed inevitable. The Emperor himself was by no means easy in his mind as to the result, and Modestus the praefect was sent to persuade Basil by alternate threats and arguments to make the imperial visit acceptable by conforming to the Emperor's wishes.² It is needless to say that the bishop's attitude was perfectly unbending. Euippus, a Galatian bishop, was excommunicated for daring to suggest that Basil should, at any rate for this occasion, modify his views; and when, in the presence of Valens, the imperial cook Demosthenes tried to influence him by threats, he was scornfully reminded that the place for an "illiterate Demosthenes" was the kitchen. When however Valens came all went well. It is said that the Emperor had intended to banish Basil, but, when his infant son fell ill, and was restored to health by the bishop's prayers, Valens seems to have relented, and not only did not molest the bishop of Caesarea, but admired his extensive works of charity and contributed to their maintenance.³ It is possible, however, that three years later Basil felt the effects of the imperial displeasure in the decree by which Valens divided the

of the entire population of Caesarea round the ecclesiastical centre, and the abandonment of the old city. Modern Kaisari is situated between one and two miles from the site of the Graeco-Roman city."

1. The Prolegomena to Basil, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. xvii, refers to the *New Party*, in 1894, pp. 82 and 83. On p. xlvii Basil's Sermon on Ps. xiv. (xv. in A.V.) against usury is given, in which Basil dwells with equal force on the crime of lending and the folly of borrowing on usury for purposes of extravagance and display.

2. Modestus afterwards became a personal friend of Basil, and six letters are addressed to him: 104, 110, 111, 279, 280, 281.

3. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* xx.; Socrates, iv. 26; Sozomen, vi. 16; Theodoret, iv. 16. The child was baptized by an Arian, and was believed to have died in consequence.

civil administration of Cappadocia by making Caesarea the capital of one portion and Tyana of the other. So closely were the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions already united, that Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, instantly asserted that, as metropolitan of a new province, he was independent of Basil.¹

Basil naturally resented any attempts to curtail the extent of his jurisdiction, and, in order to shew that his rights extended into the territory claimed by the bishop of Tyana, he nominated his brother Gregory to the bishopric of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory of Nazianzus to the see of Sasima, a wretched posting town utterly unfit for the residence of a man of devout and scholarly tastes and of a singularly sensitive nature.² Gregory yielded to the insistence of his friend, and when Eusebius of Samosata remonstrated on his appointing a man like Gregory to so obscure a see, Basil wrote in terms of profuse compliment, "I wish that Gregory might govern a church as great as his genius; but his genius is so great that all the churches under the sun united in one could scarcely equal it. As this is impossible, let him consent to be bishop, not in order to receive any honour, but to honour by his presence the place of his residence. It is in fact" adds Basil "the sign of a great soul not merely to be capable of great things, but to make small things great by its own virtue."³ Gregory did scarcely more than visit this uncongenial sphere of work, but spent most of his time in assisting his aged father at Nazianzus. He loyally supported Basil in his contest with Anthimus, but he deeply felt his unkindness in forcing him into such a position to gratify his hierarchical ambitions, and lamented in verse the ruin of a

1. Basil, *Ep.* 98.

2. Gregory of Nazianzus describes it in the *Carmen de Vita sua*, XI. 439—446, as a post town (*σταθμός*) where three ways met, without grass or water, dust everywhere, inhabited by a shifting population (*ξένοι τε καὶ πλανώμενοι*) and through which convicts and prisoners constantly passed. Gregory ends his description thus: *Ἀυτὴ Σασίμων τῶν ἐμῶν ἐκκλησία.*

3. Basil, *Ep.* 98, addressed to Eusebius of Samosata, Basil's intimate friend.

long and close friendship.¹ As the course of events will shew, Basil's action caused irreparable harm to the Eastern Church by preventing Gregory's election to the see of Constantinople. If this appointment of Gregory to Sasima be considered as a mistake on the part of Basil, we cannot with justice blame him for the far-reaching consequence of his error; nor can Gregory escape the reproach of having displayed a certain selfish petulance towards his friend.

In the disputes arising out of Arianism the most formidable obstacles in the way of a reunion of the Church were, firstly the distrust of Athanasian doctrines felt by the Oriental bishops, and secondly the vacillations of the Semi-Arian party under the pressure of the imperial dislike of the Nicene theology. In addition to these hindrances, the cause of unity was threatened by the schism raging at Antioch and the incapacity of the Roman See to appreciate the situation in the East. It was the work of the three Cappadocians to convince the theologians of Asia Minor and Syria that the Athanasian doctrine was the right one, and that, to those who clearly distinguished between Substance (*οὐσία*) and Person (*ὑπόστασις*), all errors of a Sabellian type are rendered impossible.² The Semi-Arian party had, in 367, united outwardly with the orthodox believers at the synod of Tyana; but such men as Basil's friend Eustathius of Sebaste were a perpetual cause of trouble to him, and when the breach between them occurred, Eustathius sought to do Basil all the injury in his power

Basil's efforts to mediate between East and West.

1. *Carmen de Vita sua*—

πόντοι κοινοὶ λόγων
 ἀμώστεγός τε καὶ συνέστιος βλος,
 νοῦς εἰς ἐν ἀμφοῖν.....
 διεσκέδασται ταῦτα κάρριπται χαμαί,
 αἶθραι φέρουσι τὰς παλαιὰς ἐλπίδας.

2. "The principal chiefs were the three eminent Cappadocian bishops, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa. But their teaching in reality modified the aspect of the Nicene formulas. The term *hypostasis*, instead of being a synonym of *usia*, was used to designate a person or personal subject, in distinction from Substance. This use of the term became current in the East." Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 143.

by publishing a letter which the latter had written years before to the heretic Apollinarius "as a layman to a layman". Nor was Basil altogether happy in the attempt made by his too officious friend Gregory of Nazianzus to vindicate his reputation for orthodoxy in his treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.¹ To these troubles was added the difficulty of obtaining the assistance of the Roman See to allay the quarrels of Eastern Christendom. The Roman bishop, Damasus, was resolved to support Paulinus at Antioch against Meletius, and seems to have resented Basil's presumption in addressing him on equal terms, whilst Basil himself complains of the superciliousness of the West (*τῆς δυτικῆς ὀφρῦος*).² A few letters passed between Basil and Athanasius, in which the bishop of Caesarea asked the help of the veteran champion of orthodoxy to assist him in pacifying the Church. Basil's statesmanlike mind is well shewn in the following remark in one of his letters to Athanasius: "We require" said he "men firm but kindly, who will shun causing new divisions by not unduly insisting on disputed points."³

Death of
Athanasius,
A.D. 373.
His character.

After an episcopate of forty-seven years, during which he had been on no less than five different occasions exiled for the Faith, Athanasius passed away. It is difficult to divest ourselves of preconceived notions in forming an estimate of his character. Posterity has either seen in him only the saint whom it is profane to judge as a man, or regards him solely from a modern standpoint,

1. Basil, *Ep.* 223 to Eustathius of Sebaste, who accused him of favouring Apollinarius because he had written to him twenty years before. De Broglie (*L'Eglise et l'Empire*) refers to Greg. Naz., *Ep.* 58, Basil, *Ep.* 71.

2. The chief letters of Basil on this subject are *Ep.* 70, which bears no address but was evidently intended for Damasus, *Ep.* 242, 243, to the Western bishops, and 239, where he complains to his friend Eusebius of Samosata of the ignorance and prejudices of Damasus, whom however he does not name.

3. Basil's letters to Athanasius are 61, 66, 68, 69. Marcellus of Ancyra is complained of, but it is satisfactory to know that Athanasius would not condemn the aged champion of Nicaea. "Even the great Alexandrian's comprehensive charity" says Professor Gwatkin "is hardly nobler than his faithfulness to erring friends." It is this chivalrous loyalty that makes Athanasius so much more attractive a character than Basil.

considering him as the type of those ecclesiastics who have fettered the Faith by the imposition of unnecessary dogmas, and barred the way to heaven by the invention of unscriptural tests. Those, however, who take the latter view of his character must bear in mind that neither the Arian controversy nor the word *ὁμοούσιος* were originated by him, since when Arius and Alexander began their theological dispute he was a boy, and when the Creed was framed he was of no higher rank than that of a deacon. The controversy was one in which no Christian individual in the fourth century could avoid taking part, least of all the great pope of Alexandria, who was second only to the bishop of Rome in ecclesiastical status. It was moreover, at any rate till 361, a controversy out of which hardly a single great bishop except Julius of Rome emerged with credit, and he died before the keenest phase of the struggle had begun. Of Athanasius it may safely be said not only that he never vacillated in his belief, but that in no single instance does he seem to have been actuated by personal malice; though the treatment he experienced at the hands of the Mareotic commission and the council of Tyre might well have provoked him to retaliation. Moreover, though his long career was spent in controversy on a single point in theology, there is no sign either of narrowness or bigotry in his character. So far from cultivating a pedantic adherence to mere phrases and catch-words, Athanasius was singularly careful not to offend in this respect; and it is worth noticing that throughout his theological writings the test word *ὁμοούσιος* occurs very rarely.¹ His frank willingness to welcome a former opponent to his side is an attractive feature in his character, and no one knew better how to smooth the path by which men could return from error to orthodoxy. The charm of his personal influence can only be estimated by its effect on others. Even Constantius could not resist it when Athanasius was present with him; and it is said that he was as much at home with the solitaries of the desert

1. Preface to the four discourses against the Arians. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. 303; see also Prolegomena to Athanasius, p. xviii.

and the working people of Alexandria as he was in the courts of emperors or in synods of bishops. Nor does Athanasius deserve the reproach of being the only man of his age who wished to narrow the limits of orthodoxy. In the fourth century, as the history of the Eusebian party proves, an indefinite creed was impossible, and the genuine Arians, who were the real opponents of Athanasius, were as ready to force their dogmas on the Church as the pope of Alexandria. Without, however, pronouncing even on the relative merits of either defeated Arianism or the triumphant Faith of Nicaea, we have only to contrast the tortuous measures of his opponents with the honest consistency and fair dealing of Athanasius, to bring into clear light his immense moral superiority. Among the many great men whom the fourth century produced, Athanasius occupies a pre-eminence to which, perhaps, Ambrose of Milan alone approached.¹

Every religious controversy leaves a fatal heritage of party rancour, and new subjects for disputation. By disregarding the wise advice of Constantine, Alexander and Arius were responsible for the beginning

Doctrinal
disputes arising
out of the Arian
controversy.

1. It is curious to observe the diversity of judgment in regard to the character of St. Athanasius. Dean Milman (*History of Christianity*, vol. 11. p. 411) says, "Yet even now, so completely has this polemic spirit become incorporated with Christianity that the memory of Athanasius is regarded by wise and good men with reverence. . . . It is impossible indeed not to admire the force of intellect which he centred on this minute point of theology, his intrepidity, his constancy; but he had not the power to allay the feud which his inexorable spirit tended to keep alive. . . . Athanasius in exile would consent to no peace which did not prostrate his enemies under his feet." Cardinal Newman, on the other hand, in his *Arians of the Fourth Century*, p. 356, says "In the height of controversy he (Athanasius) speaks with temper and candour, evidences of an enlarged prudence, to say nothing of Christian charity." See Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 66-70. Prolegomena to Athanasius, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. lxxvii. Athanasius was no doubt "purified and softened" by the sufferings he had endured, when he wrote in 359 "Towards those who accept all else that was written at Nicaea, but doubt about the *ὁμοούσιον* only, we ought not to behave as though they were enemies, but we argue with them as brethren with brethren, seeing they have the same mind with ourselves, but only question the name." Hort, *Two Dissertations*, p. 94. The late Canon Jenkins in a pamphlet on this period (publ. 1894) does justice to Athanasius, who, as he points out, in his correspondence with Basil objects to any addition to the Creed of Nicaea as a test of orthodoxy.

of an almost endless series of controversies, silenced only at last by the overwhelming triumphs of Islam. Macedonianism and Apollinarianism were the immediate offspring of Arianism; the one raising the question of the true position of the Holy Ghost in the Trinity, the other that of the relation of the Human to the Divine Nature in our Saviour.

Macedonianism. In attacking the proper Divinity of the Son, the theory of Arius naturally destroyed the Divine Nature, if not the Personality of the Spirit. At Nicaea however this question was not raised, and the Council was content with demanding a simple belief in the Holy Ghost. When the Semi-Arians were being reconciled to the Nicene doctrine, the question of the consubstantial Divinity of the Holy Ghost arose; the Nicene party asserting that it was the logical result of the belief in that of the Son, whilst some of the Semi-Arians, who took their party name from Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, objected to the imposition of further tests of orthodoxy.¹ Though this controversy never assumed the dimensions of that on the relation of the Son to the Father, and aroused no great popular emotion, it caused Basil some trouble, owing to the officious though loyal partisanship of Gregory of Nazianzus. Basil desired to make the Creed as promulgated at Nicaea the sole test of orthodoxy, and was consequently accused of attaching too little importance to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. After a sermon preached on September 7, 371, on the feast of St. Eupychius, Gregory Nazianzen betrayed to a monk his view of the prominence which should be given to teaching the Godhead of the Holy Ghost,

1. The Arians taught that the Holy Spirit was, as a creation of the Son, practically a third essence in the Trinity, τὸν γοῦν λόγον φησὶν (says Athanasius of Arius) εἰς ὁμοίωσιν δόξης καὶ οὐσίας ἀλλότριον εἶναι παντελῶς ἑκατέρῳ τοῦ τε Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. *Or. c. Arianos*, I. 6. Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, p. 79. Athanasius was in 358 compelled by the rise of the Tropicists in Egypt to declare his opinions on the Holy Ghost in the letters to Serapion. Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 91. The Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, was the first to condemn those who deny the Divinity of the Spirit; see *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Holy Ghost'; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 206; Hefele, *Councils*, vol. II., p. 277, Eng. Transl.

and attributed Basil's reticence in the matter to his wisdom in using "economy" in declaring the truths of the Faith. This laid Basil open to an attack from the monk, and caused him much anxiety.¹

The subtlety of the Greek and Oriental mind was destined to find a subject more fruitful of dispute even than the mystery of the exact relationship of the Persons of the Trinity. As Arius had set the whole Church into confusion by trying to offer an explanation of the Divine Nature of the Son, so Apollinarius was the cause of an even more violent controversy by propounding his theory of the way in which the Manhood was united with Godhead in the Person of the Saviour. But whereas Arius's doctrine was the cause of an immediate explosion, that of Apollinarius seemed at first but a small spark, which only broke out into a mighty conflagration when years afterwards Nestorius attempted to refute his teaching. Apollinarius, who had taken a prominent part in trying to preserve for Christians the form of a classical education in the days of Julian, said that in the God-Man Jesus Christ the Divine Logos took the place of the rational Human Soul, so that our Lord was not truly man, but One who had the body of a living man whose impulses were solely those of the Word of God; in other words, that He was incapable not merely of yielding to, but even of feeling either human infirmity or the power of temptation.²

Whilst a new brood of heresies were beginning their fatal life in the Eastern Church, so far as the Roman Empire was

1. Basil's treatise on the Spirit was written in A.D. 374, at the request of his friend and disciple Amphilochius of Iconium. De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire*, vol. II., pp. 123 foll.

2. Socrates (II. 46) attributes the lapse of Apollinarius to George, the Arian bishop of Laodicea, who persecuted him for his intimacy with Epiphanius the Sophist. Sozomen (v. 25) alludes to his early friendship with Athanasius. Theodoret, v. 3, and v. 11. Basil (*Ep.* 129) says the impiety of Apollinarius is like that of Sabellius. There is a full account of his system in Neander, *Church Hist.*, vol. IV., pp. 98—106, and in Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 239 f. Gwatkin (*Studies of Arianism*, pp. 206, 248) remarks: "If Apollinarius was forming another schism he was at least a determined enemy of Arianism." There were two of the same name, father and son; the latter is the heresiarch.

concerned the Arian controversy was approaching its conclusion. Valens was still persecuting the orthodox and keeping bishops like Peter of Alexandria and Meletius of Antioch away from their flocks, but the fearful catastrophe with which his life and reign terminated was approaching. The Goths, who had crossed the Danube, were roused to fury by the peculations of the Roman officials entrusted with the work of settling them within the frontiers of the empire. War broke out in 377, in which the Roman armies were at first successful, but in the great battle of Adrianople the Goths gained a complete victory and Valens perished with his army.¹ Since Hannibal's victory at Cannae the Romans had never known such a defeat; but whereas the young and vigorous republic could rise with renewed power to crush the victorious foe, the enfeebled empire seemed to have received a fatal stroke. It says much for the immense fund of vitality still possessed by the Romans, that the empire was not allowed entirely to succumb under this crushing blow.

Theodosius
made Augustus
in the East.

Valentinian, who had died in 375, had been succeeded by his sons, Gratian and Valentinian II., the former being a youth, the latter an infant under the tutelage of his mother Justina. Gratian, who under the influence of Ambrose, bishop of Milan, was the first emperor to refuse the pagan title of Pontifex Maximus, acted with conspicuous wisdom and generosity in appointing as his colleague Theodosius, the son of the deliverer of Britain, who had fallen a victim to the jealousy of Valentinian.² The new Augustus, who had lived in retirement in his native Spain since the death of his father, immediately repaired to the East, and set himself to restore the shattered fortunes of the Empire. The Goths were, fortunately, too imperfectly

1. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 286. Ammianus, bk. xxxi.

2. Socrates (iv. 19) connects the death of Theodosius—or Theodosius as he calls him—with the inquisition into the crime of magic owing to the attempt to discover the successor of Valens. Beugnot, *Hist. du Paganisme*, p. 242. Gibbon, chap. xxv.

civilised to reap the full fruits of their victory. They advanced on Constantinople, but were repelled by the citizens animated by the courage of the widowed Empress Dominica; nor were their forces sufficiently organized to remain together for a long campaign.¹ Theodosius won no brilliant victory, but patiently waited while the Gothic hosts melted away, many enlisting in the Imperial armies and being employed in distant parts of the empire. In 379 Theodosius received baptism at the hands of Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, being the first of the rulers of the East who had been admitted to the Church by an orthodox prelate.²

Death of Basil. His character. Basil died in the year that followed the battle of Adrianople, shortly before the triumph of the cause he had served so well. His death was a most serious loss to the Church, for had the orthodox party at Constantinople had the benefit of his firmness of character and sage advice, many fatal mistakes which were committed by them in 381 might have been avoided. What must strike us most is his astonishing versatility and energy. Basil is rightly considered one of the greatest of the Fathers; in him the scholar and the theologian were combined. His short episcopate of nine years had an abiding effect on the Eastern Church. He saved monasticism from degenerating into foolish extravagance and profitless asceticism, he arranged the services of the Church, he reformed the disorders of his vast province. In an age and country where inconsistency in religious principle was everywhere rife, Basil set the example of the most loyal adherence to the creed he professed, and the courage with which he refused to bow before Valens saved the cause of Nicaea in Asia Minor. Despite a certain harshness of character, and a tendency to confound the maintenance of his own dignity with the cause of Christianity, into which some saintly but less able prelates have occasionally fallen,

1. Socrates, v. 1. The citizens were aided by Saracen auxiliaries.

2. Socrates, v. 6.

Basil deserves the high honour which posterity has accorded to his memory.¹

**Gregory
of Nazianzus
at
Constantinople.**

New Rome was now the stronghold of Arianism, for since the deposition of Paul there had never been an orthodox bishop, and the see had frequently been presided over by arch-heretics. Eusebius of Nicomedia the supporter of Arius, Macedonius the heresiarch, and Eudoxius the spiritual adviser of the Arian emperor Valens, had all been bishops of Constantinople. The work of proclaiming the Nicene Faith was undertaken by the saintly and amiable Gregory of Nazianzus, who in 378 commenced his labours in a room which subsequently became the church of the Anastasia.² Despite the interruptions of the Arians, and Gregory's own ill-timed confidence in the cynic Maximus,³ who aspired to the bishopric, the work progressed, as the great eloquence of Gregory combined with his moral earnestness won numerous adherents. Theodosius did not enter the capital till Nov. 24, 380, when he ordered the Arian bishop Demophilus to conform to the doctrine of Nicaea or to leave the city. After quoting the Saviour's words, "When they persecute you in one city flee to another," Demophilus

1. Prolegomena to Basil, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, p. xxxii. "St. Basil is duly canonized in the grateful memory, no less than in the official bede-roll of Christendom, and we may be permitted to regret that the existing Calendar of the Anglican liturgy has not found room for so illustrious a doctor in its somewhat niggard list." For the omission some amends have lately been made by the erection of a statue of the great bishop of Caesarea under the dome of St. Paul's. Bp. Wordsworth places him in his proposed Anglican Calendar on Jan. 1. *Ministry of Grace*, p. 426.

2. Dr. Hodgkin (in his *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 343) says, "The mosque of Mehmet Pasha on the south-west of the Hippodrome and overlooking the sea of Marmora still marks the site of the Church of the Resurrection." St. Jerome became Gregory's pupil at this time. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Gregory of Nazianzus,' vol. II., p. 751 b.

3. Gregory was so infatuated with Maximus—or Heron as he was also called—that he pronounced an oration in his honour. Peter of Alexandria recognised him as bishop, and he was consecrated by five Egyptian bishops, who finished the ceremony in a flute-player's shop. He fled to Alexandria, and wanted Peter himself to retire in his favour! *Greg. Naz., Carmen de Vita sua*, xi. 808 foll. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Gregory of Nazianzus,' vol. II. p. 752.

departed.¹ The Emperor now decided that Gregory should be enthroned in the Church of the Apostles, whither he was conducted through a hostile crowd.² But the honour of numbering Gregory of Nazianzus among its bishops was never to belong to Constantinople.

In 381 one hundred and fifty bishops assembled at Constantinople to settle the affairs of the Church. The Council accepted the Creed of Nicaea, but in what form it is not easy to determine.³ The question of the bishopric of Constantinople was also decided. If work done for the Faith or personal reputation had been considered, Gregory must have been universally acknowledged as best fitted for the post. He was, however, not popular with several members of the Council. Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, irritated probably by the successful fraud by which Maximus had persuaded the Alexandrian Church to recognise his claims, bore Gregory no good will. Gregory's indifference to the relative claims of Meletius and Paulinus to the see of Antioch provoked the hostility of the supporters of the former, who did not like to be told that the quarrel would not be worth continuing if it had been about two angels instead of two men. The canonical objection that Gregory was bishop of Sasima, and could not be translated to another see, was raised. Weary with the clamour, Gregory

1. Socr., v. 7. Mistaking, as the historian avers, the true meaning of the passage. The 'other city' is the Heavenly Jerusalem!

2. This great religious revolution was effected without bloodshed. Gregory, *Carmen*, XI. 1325 foll.

3. The case is briefly this: the modern form, in which the Nicene Creed is now used, appears with a few divergencies in the *Anchoratus* of St. Epiphanius, A.D. 373, and this was acknowledged at Chalcedon, A.D. 452, to be the creed of the hundred and fifty Fathers at Constantinople. It was not, however, noticed by the Fathers at Ephesus. Prof. Gwatkin in his *Arian Controversy* (Epochs of Church History), p. 159, insists vehemently on the original Nicene Creed having been the only symbol recited at Constantinople. Hort (*Two Dissertations*) argues that the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed was the Creed of St. Cyril and the Church of Jerusalem. Heurtley, *De Fide et Symbolo*; Bright, *Canons of the First Four Councils*, p. 91; Lias, *Nicene Creed*, p. 3; and especially Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, p. 80, where the enthusiastic reception of the Creed of Nicaea at Chalcedon is contrasted with the colder welcome accorded to the creed of the hundred and fifty Fathers of Constantinople. Hahn, *Symbols*, p. 81.

offered to stand aside, and his offer was eagerly accepted by the bishops.¹ The man chosen was a court official named Nectarius, a layman who was not even baptized.² Though he made a respectable bishop, his appointment was a fatal blunder. Constantinople, as the New Rome, had been given a presidency of honour but no metropolitan jurisdiction. The see had never yet had an orthodox prelate of the first rank. It needed that a man of world-wide reputation should be appointed as the first bishop after the establishment of the Nicene Faith, and the confirmation of the new dignity of the see. Gregory, if not pre-eminent as an administrator, was by far the greatest theologian and orator in the Eastern Church, and would have given immense prestige to the see of New Rome. Under Nectarius the influence of the bishop of Constantinople was so slight, that when a really great man succeeded to the episcopal throne in the person of St. Chrysostom, he was worsted and driven into exile by a frivolous empress. To the election of Nectarius may perhaps be partly attributed the fact that no bishop of Constantinople in later days ever became a great power in Christendom.

Equally unfortunate was the Council in the matter of the schism at Antioch. It had been agreed between the partisans of Meletius and Paulinus that the survivor should be generally acknowledged bishop. No doubt it was expected that Paulinus would die first; but when Meletius passed away during the sitting of the Council, the bishops disregarded the compact and elected Flavian. The Westerns were naturally disgusted at this breach of faith, and the Roman see long refused to acknowledge the acts of the Council.³

Though the Council of Constantinople was not conspicuous for the number of bishops present, the eminence of its individual members, nor the wisdom of its acts, and though by it Gregory of Nazianzus was forced to

1. Gregory Naz., *Carmen*, XI. 1591 foll.
2. Nectarius was the praetor of Constantinople. He was selected for the see by Theodosius. He kept up a friendly correspondence with Gregory of Nazianzus. Socrates (v. 8), Sozomen (III. 8), and Theodoret (v. 8), all agree in praising his high character and amiability.
3. Bright, *Canons of the First Four General Councils*, p. 110.

retire into private life resolved never to attend another assembly of bishops, its work was in a sense more permanent than that of any other council. After two other assemblies in 382 and 383, which have been sometimes confounded with that of 381, Arianism was declared to be contrary to Roman law, and the Nicene Faith became the acknowledged creed of the empire.¹

With Theodosius's edicts in favour of orthodoxy we pass into a new period. Under Constantine Christianity and the Roman empire were allied. Under Theodosius they were united. Arianism long lingered among the barbarians, and orthodoxy became the badge of a Roman citizen. From henceforth the idea grew apace that the State was responsible for the maintenance of the true Faith among its subjects. With this we pass into a new sphere, and for centuries a theory of government began to prevail, that has not yet been entirely relegated to oblivion.

1. As early as 380 Theodosius had ordered all to receive the Faith as taught by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria.

A very important question has been raised by Dr. Harnack in his *History of Dogma* (vol. II., p. 262; Eng. Tr. vol. IV., p. 94), that the Council of Constantinople accepted the word *ὁμοούσιος*, but in a different sense to that in which Athanasius had used it. The same writer points out in another passage (vol. II., p. 266; E. Tr. vol. IV., p. 99) that the omission of the words from the Nicene formula *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς* in the Constantinopolitan creed as well as the anathemas is a proof of this. He means that the Fathers of the Council of 381, following Basil of Ancyra, Meletius, and the Cappadocians, adopted the word *ὁμοούσιος* in the sense of *ὁμοιοούσιος* (of like substance). Of course this would mean that all the work of Nicaea was stultified by the neo-orthodoxy of Constantinople. This position has been assailed with much theological skill and learning by the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, B.D., in the Cambridge Texts and Studies, *The Meaning of Homousios*, 1901. In the *Christian Letter*, addressed to Hooker after the publication of the Fifth Book of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, the Puritan asks "Here we crave of you, Master Hoo., to explain your own meaning where you say, 'The Father alone is originally that Deity which Christ originally is not': how the Godhead of the Father and of the Son be all one, and yet originally not the same Deity!" The marginal note of Hooker's copy preserved in the Library of C.C.C., Oxford, is "The Godhead of the Father and the Son is in no way denied but granted to be the same. The only thing denied is that the Person of the Son hath Deity or Godhead in such sort as the Father hath it." It would seem that Hooker's position is much the same as that of the Cappadocians. His point, which the Puritan has missed, being that the Father is the *πηγή Θεότητος*.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE REIGN OF THEODOSIUS AND THE FALL OF PAGANISM.

Theodosius
pronounces in
favour of
Orthodoxy.

THEODOSIUS had anticipated the work of the Second General Council in an edict published at Thessalonica on February 28, A.D. 380, addressed to the people of Constantinople, in which he ordered that the Faith taught to the Romans by St. Peter, and still held by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria, should be accepted by all nations. From henceforward the title of Catholic was to be reserved for those who adored the Father, Son and Holy Ghost with equal reverence.¹ The entire religious policy of this emperor was directed to this end, and resulted in the Catholic Faith becoming the one legal religion of the Romans.² If Arianism, banished from the Empire, found a home among its barbarian conquerors, it lost the prestige of being recognised by the laws of the civilised world. It did not, however, succumb without a struggle; for, though suppressed by edicts of ever-increasing severity, it made its stronghold among the barbarian soldiers in the Roman armies, whom no emperor could offend

1. Cod. Theod., lib. xvi., tit. 1, 2. Sozomen, vii. 4.

2. Though Theodosius did not directly endow the Catholic Church, he conferred several valuable privileges, and gave legal recognition to many Church customs. Allard summarises as follows: "He forbade the summoning of a bishop as a witness: allowed neither criminal trial nor corporal punishment during Lent: placed Easter and Sunday among public holidays: allowed no amphitheatrical games on Sundays: forbade Jews to buy Christian slaves; and many other similar regulations are recorded." (See Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, p. 264.)

with impunity; but even these rude mercenaries were awed by the majesty of the Catholic Church, when confronted by a bishop of the commanding personality of St. Ambrose. Despite the severity of the edicts which appeared under the name of Theodosius, we have the express testimony of the historian Socrates that this emperor was no persecutor;¹ and we may perhaps explain this discrepancy by supposing that his busy and laborious reign left him no time to enforce with minute rigour the laws enacted by him.² If, however, we acquit him of the actual guilt of persecution, it is impossible to deny that he inaugurated a policy which his successors did not shrink from carrying into practice.

Arianism was not, however, completely suppressed in Constantinople by the so-called Second General Council. There had never been a Catholic bishop in the city since the deposition of Paulus (*circa* A.D. 338); and the forcible installation of Gregory of Nazianzus,

Strength of
Arianism in
Constantinople.

1. Socr., v. 20. Τοῦτο δὲ ἰστέον, ὡς ὁ βασιλεὺς Θεοδόσιος οὐδένα τούτων ἐδίωκε, πλὴν ὅτι τὸν Εὐνόμιον ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπὶ οἰκίᾳ συνάγοντα, καὶ τοὺς συγγραφέντας αὐτῷ λόγους ἐπιδεικνύμενον, ὡς ταῖς διδασκαλίαις πολλοὺς λυμαινόμενον εἰς ἔξορίαν πεμφθῆναι ἐκέλευσε. In an earlier chapter (vii.) Socrates relates the banishment of Demophilus from Constantinople; and (c. x.) says that only the sect of the Novatians were allowed churches within the city. There are fifteen edicts of Theodosius in the Code, and these are of increasing severity. It is not certain that the law was always enforced. Dr. Hodgkin (*Italy and her Invaders*, bk. i., ch. 6) thinks that it was some time before they could be universally acted upon. "But none the less" he adds "was the Theodosian legislation ultimately successful in the suppression of all teaching opposed to the Creed of Nicaea, and the victory thus won exercised an immense and, in my view, a disastrous influence on the fortunes of the Empire, of Christianity, and even of Modern Europe." Gregory Nazianzen (*Carmen de Vita sua*, vv. 1279—1395) speaks slightly of Theodosius and finds fault with his toleration. "The fact is that during Theodosius's reign, intolerance towards the cult was combined with the greatest tolerance towards persons." Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, p. 274.

2. "There follow in 381, 382, 384, 388, 389, 394, laws against the heretics—Eunomians, Arians, Apollinarians, Macedonians, Manichaeans—confiscating their churches and handing them over to the Catholics, forbidding their assemblies, exiling their bishops and priests, confiscating all the places where their rites were celebrated. *The great number of these laws, several of which are repeated, prove that they were not everywhere carried out.*" P. Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, p. 263.

followed by his speedy retirement during the Council, was not calculated to strengthen the party now in the ascendant. Demophilus, who was still a leader of the Arian party, and had influential supporters, was able to assemble his followers outside the walls. In fact, Catholicism in the capital of the Eastern Empire was in a somewhat precarious condition, which its dissensions, as revealed by the Council in A.D. 381, did not render more secure. Though the Western bishops seem to have desired a Council at Alexandria, Theodosius felt it incumbent upon him to settle the Arian dispute at Constantinople, and for this reason a second assembly was held in A.D. 382 consisting chiefly of the bishops who had been present in the preceding year. To emphasise his adherence to Catholicism and the triumph of the Creed of Nicaea the Emperor ordered the body of Bishop Paulus to be brought to Constantinople from Cucusum in Armenia, and interred it with much pomp in the church "which" (says Socrates) "beareth his name unto this day".¹

**Nectarius and
the Novatians.**

Nectarius felt scarcely competent to deal with doctrinal questions; and when Theodosius, in A.D. 383, ordered the different religious sects to assemble for a conference, the bishop of Constantinople felt considerable trepidation as to its result. Having been all his life engaged in secular affairs, Nectarius could not hope to meet the Arian theologians on equal terms, and apparently he had no orthodox doctor at hand with whom he could confer. Accordingly he sought advice of the Novatian bishop, Agelius, who referred him to a Reader of his church, by name Sisinnius. The Novatians were as staunch supporters of the *Homöousian* Faith as the Catholics; but even Sisinnius, though he bore the reputation of being mighty in the Scriptures, had no desire for a contest with such skilled dialecticians as Demophilus, Eleusius and Eunomius, the Arian champions. He accordingly advised Nectarius to suggest that the Emperor should simply ask the Arian leaders if they were in agreement with the

ancient Fathers of the Church. By this means the enemies of the Nicene Faith would be placed in a dilemma; since if they refused to accept the Fathers they could be anathematized without further discussion, and if they acknowledged their authority they could be proved to be heretics. Theodosius, finding that the question suggested had caused division amongst the various Arian factions, ordered each leader to state his views in writing. Having prayed earnestly before perusing the different Creeds, the Emperor destroyed all such as "derogated from the unity which is in the Blessed Trinity".¹ For their services at this crisis the Novatianist schismatics were from this time forward the only non-Catholic body permitted to worship publicly in Constantinople.

Edicts against
heresy.

Heresy had now become a crime against the state; and imperial edicts against it began to fill the statute book. In A.D. 381, the year of the Council, Arians, Photinians and Eunomians were forbidden to build churches in place of those taken from them. In the following year the Manichaeans were ordered to be sought out by *inquisitors*. In July 383, heretical worship was prohibited; and in the following September building of churches and holding of ordinations were forbidden to those outside the pale of the Church Catholic. Gregory of Nazianzus found the Apollinarians active in establishing bishops, and, perhaps at his instigation, a further edict appeared against the Macedonian, Arian, and Apollinarian clergy. A still more stringent edict was issued by Theodosius and the younger Valentinian against the Apollinarians. Eunomius and his followers were put outside the pale of the law in 389.² The principle of persecution was in fact fully admitted by the legislation of Theodosius; but it is doubtful if he was able to put his laws into practice. The power of the Empire was on the wane, and it was easier to issue edicts than to enforce them. The Arians had ardent supporters among the barbarian

1. Socrates, v. 10.

2. *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, art. 'Theodosius the Great', vol. IV., p. 962 a.

soldiery, who had embraced this form of Christianity, and no emperor had the hardihood to offend the best troops in the Roman armies. But, as far as the empire was concerned, the Arian controversy was virtually at an end. No really strong supporters of the once popular heresy appeared after the reign of Theodosius, and it had always been inferior to Catholicism in religious force. We turn from it to the even more embittered theological disputes of the fifth century.

Death and
character of
Gregory of
Nazianzus.
A.D. 390†

Before, however, completely abandoning this subject it is necessary to speak of the deaths of the last Eastern champions of the *Homöousion*. Gregory of Nazianzus and his name-sake of Nyssa long survived their friend and brother the great St. Basil. The two surviving Cappadocian Fathers lacked that genius for command which made St. Basil one of the leading spirits of his age; but intellectually they were both his equals, if not his superiors. Gregory returned, not a little disgusted with the ways of Councils and the intrigues of the bishops, to his home at Nazianzus, where he administered the see as he had done in his father's life-time. He was not a little troubled by the difficulty of finding a suitable bishop for the place, and by the progress of Apollinarianism in the district. At last Eulalius, a kinsman of Gregory's, was chosen bishop of Nazianzus, and Gregory himself retired to a little estate of his own at Arianus. He occupied himself with his poetry and in corresponding with his friends; but his health was never vigorous, and his bodily strength had been impaired by asceticism. He died in 389 or 390.

Of all Greek Fathers Gregory alone, like St. John, is honoured with the title of 'the Divine', being known to posterity as the *Theologus*. In his writings, and especially in his five great discourses against the Arians at Constantinople, Gregory may be said to have pronounced the last word in the controversy, at least with regard to the Divinity and consubstantiality of the Son; for in the matter of the Holy Spirit his

language, though orthodox, is more ambiguous.¹ As a practical ruler Gregory was not successful; he was essentially a thinker and a student, besides being a poet of some merit. As a preacher he may perhaps be pronounced as the first great orator the Church produced, and the conversion of Constantinople to orthodoxy is no mean tribute to the persuasiveness of his eloquence.

The name of Gregory of Nyssa figures so little in ecclesiastical history, that we are liable to forget that he ranks among the greatest of the Fathers of the Eastern Church. He survived his friend several years, and died about A.D. 395. At the Council of Constantinople he pronounced the funeral oration over Meletius, for whom all the three Cappadocian Fathers had the highest reverence. He was apparently not at the Council of 382; but in 383 he delivered his discourses on the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity at Constantinople. Gregory is the most philosophical of the Fathers, and had the courage to follow Origen even in his boldest speculations.² His teaching as to the purpose of the Incarnation and the nature of the Atonement was long accepted as the doctrine of the Church at large: but he was too original to escape entirely the reproach of wandering beyond the limits of strict orthodoxy, and his language respecting the two-fold nature of our Lord would scarcely have passed without criticism when that controversy was at its height.³

The three Cappadocians, Basil and the two Gregorics, belong to the period when the Church seemed to be most disposed to adopt all that was best in Greek culture. The unquestionably Christian and ascetic

1. Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, p. 105.

2. This is seen notably in his doctrine of the *ἀνοκατάστασις*. Man's power of choice between good and evil cannot ultimately defeat God's purpose. God must finally be all in all. Even Satan will be purified and restored. v. Srawley, *Catechetical Oration of Gregory of Nyssa*, in the *Cambridge Patristic Texts*, p. xxiii.

3. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. iv., pp. 84—105. The Rev. J. R. Srawley's 'Cappadocian Theology', in *Hastings' Dictionary of Religions*.

character of the three great Fathers renders all suspicion of temporising with Hellenism superfluous; yet undoubtedly they displayed a culture and liberality of thought which would not have been so acceptable in the following centuries as it was in their less bigoted age.

The fourth century, which opened with Hellenism in the ascendant as a persecuting religion, closed with the downfall of the official cultus of the Roman empire. The position of Constantine and his immediate successors was not unlike that of the English monarch who, though officially head of the state religion, was privately attached to a different form of worship. As has been shewn in the account of his reign, Constantine was above all things politic in his attitude towards the old religion. As Pontifex Maximus he was its official head, temples were erected in his honour, and he was deified after his death. His enactments, if actually hostile to the ancient cultus, were professedly directed against immoral practices or illegal magic. Constantius, though he issued decrees prohibiting sacrifices and closing the temples, was in other respects careful to avoid hurting the religious susceptibilities of those who were probably the majority of his subjects.¹ Julian acted strictly within his legal rights when he made his celebrated attempt to restore Hellenism as the cultus of the Empire. Valentinian's policy was that of absolute impartiality, and his brother Valens seems not to have shewn the bias against heathenism which he displayed towards the Nicene Christians. In Rome, at least, temples and priesthoods enjoyed their ancient revenues and official position, and in the administration of the Empire it could not have been easy to recognise how great a change in conviction had taken place.

The education and literature of the age shewed no traces of the influence of Christianity. Youths whose family had been Christians for generations passed through the same course of study as those of heathen

1. For the position of Constantine and Constantius see Beugnot, *Chute du Paganisme*, passim.

parentage, and attended the lectures of professors openly hostile to the new Faith. Then as now the classics formed the basis of a sound education, and no act of Julian was so resented as the edict forbidding Christians to expound them. So much a matter of course was it for Christian youths to be educated on the ancient lines, that their religion did not interfere with the social amenities of life, and very real friendships existed between them and their Hellenist masters and companions.¹ The secular life of an educated man was necessarily under the ancient influences; Christianity affected but little the course of administration of the Empire; and its spirit was unable to penetrate the vast structure of the Roman law. The foundations of a civilization, which had been laid centuries earlier, were still the same, and the Roman empire never became a Christian institution in the sense that its Teutonic successor did. It adopted Christianity, it never incorporated it.

Yet the organization of the old cultus collapsed with remarkable celerity. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that in A.D. 380 it seemed to be almost unimpaired, and by A.D. 400 it was gone. In the reign of Theodosius a series of crushing blows was inflicted.

The question of what was to be done with the temples was a difficult one, as the government was naturally desirous to preserve the buildings for public uses. But the spirit of destruction was more powerful than any imperial edict. The monks were zealous and intrepid assailants of the monuments of idolatry; and the bishops exercised influence in support of their actions. Probably the towns suffered least; for there the old beliefs had least vitality, and the sight of the monuments of the old religion did not revive it; but in the country districts the ancestral worship was still vigorous, and the Christians began to call the ancient creed *Paganism*, as the religion of the *pagani* or

The Heathen
Temples.

1. Dill, *The Last Century of the Western Empire*.

rustics.¹ As long as the temples stood in rural districts, strongholds of idolatry remained, and the zeal shewn in levelling them to the ground was prompted by a conviction that till they were destroyed the old cults could not be rooted out.

The Serapeum. Two examples of the iconoclasm of the age are worthy of notice; one in the capital of Egypt, and the other in the country districts of Gaul. The fall of the Serapeum and the career of St. Martin of Tours are alike illustrative of the times.

The Serapis worship was characteristic of a city so cosmopolitan as Alexandria. To many the god represented the embodiment of all divinity. Though comparatively modern, in the fourth century his temple was the centre of Egyptian worship; and the rise of the Nile was considered by all, including even the Christian inhabitants of Alexandria, to depend upon the will of the god.

Religious bitterness was stronger at Alexandria than elsewhere. The turbulent city was distracted by the three rival mobs of Jews, heathen, and Christians, each animated by implacable hostility against the two others, and capable of any crime when its passions were once aroused. The power of the Christian 'pope' rivalled, nay at times surpassed, that of the Roman governor, and this great office was, for over half a century perhaps, held by members of a single family. Theophilus (385—412) and Cyril (412—444) were uncle and nephew, and Dioscorus (444—452) was Cyril's archdeacon; these able if not always scrupulous men maintained a tradition of vigorous policy in the Church. Since the days of George of Cappadocia, the usurping bishop in the time of Athanasius, there had been forebodings of a determined attempt to overthrow idolatry in the city, and within five-and-twenty years of the death of

1. The original Christian use of the word *paganus* seems to have been in contrast with *miles* (the soldier of the Cross). In Tertullian *fides pagana* means 'civic duty', *De Corona*, xi. Non-Christians are people who have not taken the oath of service to God or Christ. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, vol. II., p. 22, Eng. Trans. Ulphilas, Prudentius, and Orosius maintain the ordinary explanation of the term as given in the text.

George at the hands of the heathen mob, the Christians felt strong enough to carry out their purpose. According to the historian Socrates, who himself had conversed with eye-witnesses of the great riot, Theophilus had obtained leave to destroy the temples in Alexandria. The work of demolition was carried on in such a way as to give the greatest possible offence to the Hellenic party. The Mithraeum was laid in ruins, and the rites practised exposed to ridicule. Foul or indecent symbols, taken from thence or from the Temple of Dionysus (Osiris), were paraded through the streets. The heathen took refuge in the Serapeum,¹ a vast temple which stood on an eminence outside the city. In grandeur it was said to be rivalled by the Capitol of Rome alone, and here the enemies of Christianity made their last stand. Not only did they defend themselves with all the fury of despair, but they made numerous sallies and took many prisoners, putting them to cruel deaths. Helladius, a priest of Zeus, who afterwards lectured in Constantinople, told Socrates that he had slain nine Christians with his own hand. Olympius, a philosopher, defended the Serapeum and refused to surrender till the Emperor's pleasure was known. At last the edict arrived ordering the destruction of all the temples; once more the Christian mob ascended to the Serapeum, and attacked with such fury that its defenders abandoned it. Theophilus entered the sanctuary and saw the sacred image. Serapis was depicted as a venerable man seated, with hands outstretched from wall to wall. Even the Christians were dismayed at the idea of demolishing an emblem of such power and majesty. But Theophilus did not share their fears. He bade the soldier at his side strike hard, and the head of the image was lopped off; within it was a nest of mice; and Serapis was laid low amid the jeers of the triumphant followers of the bishop.² Yet a fear was felt that the Nile would not rise, and Theophilus shared therein enough

1. Allard (*op. cit.*, p. 272) says, "The insults of the bishop roused the heathen to revolt, and they made the Serapeum their headquarters."

2. Sozomen, VII. 15. Socrates (v. 16) gives a more confused account: he says that he had himself conversed with heathen philosophers who had taken part in the riot.

to say "Better Egypt should remain unwatered than that the Nile should rise by enchantments." But that year, it is said, the river rose higher than ever, till men feared a flood.¹ The gods of Egypt were no more, and monks assailed their prostrate forms with impunity.

St. Martin of
Tours.

In the West the same work of destruction went on. The most popular Saint of Gaul, to whom one of the earliest churches in England is dedicated,² was both the evangelist of the country and the demolisher of its former objects of worship. St. Martin, who was made bishop of Tours in A.D. 371, made an extraordinary impression on his age, not only by the innumerable miracles attributed to him, but also by the affection he inspired by his ready charity and intrepid zeal. The founder of Monasticism in Gaul, Martin had the support of his monks in his contest with Paganism. If he deserves the blame of a ruthless iconoclast,³ a destroyer of priceless works of art, Martin was not a fanatic of so dangerous a type as Theophilus. The ruin of images, not of men, marked the progress of the Saint, and Paganism did not in Gaul, as at Alexandria, furnish its martyrs.⁴

The case of
Priscillianism.

That the imperial legislation against error was beginning to bear its fatal fruit is seen in the enforcement of the letter of the law against heresy in the province of Gaul, the scene of St. Martin's labours. The case of Priscillian and his companions revealed to the Christian world what the legislation of Theodosius and his pious advisers really meant; and the horror which the execution of these heretics inspired shewed that public feeling in

1. Theodoret, v. 22. Sozomen, VII. 20.

2. That of St. Martin at Canterbury.

3. Even in his iconoclasm, so distasteful to modern feeling, St. Martin rendered a great service. "If St. Martin and his followers had not a thousand times braved death to pull down rustic chapels and sacred trees, the countries of the West would have remained through the ages the refuge of the gravest superstition." Allard, p. 285.

4. M. Gaston Boissier remarks that St. Martin was a typical Frenchman, "La France n'existait pas encore, et pourtant Martin est un saint français." *La Fin du Paganisme*, vol. I., p. 62; see also p. 66. Sulpicius Severus is the biographer of St. Martin. See also his *Dialogues* with Postumianus, and his *Historia Sacra*.

the Church was not yet ripe for such ruthlessness. At the risk of somewhat anticipating matters we propose to consider this instance of the severity of the law.

Valentinian died in 375, and was succeeded by his sons Gratian and Valentinian II. Gratian, a worthy and amiable youth, allowed his infant brother and stepmother to reign at Milan whilst he himself undertook the active administration of Gaul. In 383 he was put to death by Maximus, who had been proclaimed emperor in Britain. Magnus Maximus, like Theodosius a Spaniard, had been a dependent of that emperor's family. Heresy, which had always prevailed in southern Gaul in Gnostic and Manichaean forms, had permeated the adjacent countries, and had made its appearance in Spain in a new aspect known as Priscillianism. In the suppression of these opinions the laws enacted by the Spaniard Theodosius were first put into active operation by his countryman Maximus.

Marcus, a native of Memphis in Egypt, suddenly appeared in Spain, and taught the opinions which he had adopted to a lady named Agape, and to Helpidius a rhetorician. The fascination of the new doctrine seems to have consisted chiefly in its uncompromising asceticism, which suited the ever increasing desire of the time for monastic austerities. The doctrines of Marcus were Gnostic, or perhaps Manichaean, in character, and many of these were kept secret by the sectaries, who regarded the letter of Scripture sufficient for the vulgar. Dissimulation as to their true opinions seems to have been with them a matter of principle, and was not regarded as blame-worthy. A sect so attractive in its austerity and so secret as to its methods, was sure to spread its influence rapidly in a country like Spain, which has always been remarkable for the fiery energy of its religious zeal.

Synod of
Saragossa.

A leader was found in a young and wealthy layman named Priscillian, full of zeal for a mystical and ascetic doctrine so much in consonance with the spirit of the age. Neither time nor money were spared in organizing a party, and the new opinions pervaded the Peninsula. The clergy began to be numbered among the converts,

and two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus, became devoted followers of the ardent Priscillian. The orthodox prelates took alarm, and Adyginus, bishop of Cordova, took counsel with Idatius, bishop of Merida, as to the proper course to be pursued with regard to the new opinions. A synod was held at Saragossa (Caesar Augusta), and Priscillian, Helpidius, and the two bishops Instantius and Salvianus, were excommunicated. (A.D. 380.) The Catholics themselves were evidently disunited by this action. The most prominent opponents of Priscillian were Idatius and another bishop with almost the same name, Ithacius.

Adyginus was considered to be too lenient towards the heretics, and his conduct was condemned at the synod. When we consider the growing strength of the ascetic spirit in the Church we can understand that the Catholics, even if they reprobated the heresy of Priscillian, had no small sympathy with the extreme severity of life practised by his followers. Ithacius, their bitterest opponent, was a man whose life did not commend itself to the orthodoxy of the age:¹ and it may be reasonably inferred that his zeal was aroused quite as much by the austerities of Priscillian as by his erroneous views.²

The opposition to the movement only increased its strength, and Priscillian was advanced by his admirers to the bishopric of Abila. Idatius and Ithacius asked for an imperial confirmation of the proceedings of the synod of Saragossa, which was given by Gratian in A.D. 381. The Priscillianists appealed to Rome, and their leader and a company of his followers, including several women, went by way of Gaul to the Imperial City. Euchrocia and her daughter Procula ministered of their substance to the heresiarch, just as

**Gratian
first condemns
Priscillian and
then reverses
his decision.**

1. Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* II., c. 50. "I certainly hold that Ithacius had no worth or holiness about him. For he was a bold, loquacious, impudent, and extravagant man; excessively devoted to the pleasures of sensuality."

2. *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Priscillianus'. Hodgkin (*Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 444) gives an account of the opinions of the sect. See also Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* II., c. 46 foll.

Paula and her daughters were doing to St. Jerome. Neither at Rome nor at Milan did the enthusiasts find support. Repulsed alike by Pope Damasus and St. Ambrose, the Priscillianists turned, as their adversaries had done, to the secular power. Having no lack of money, they had no difficulty in winning the powerful support of Macedonius, the *Magister Officiorum*. At his instigation Gratian reversed his decision against the sect, and Instantius and Priscillian returned to Spain and obtained possession of their churches. Ithacius had to leave the province, and took refuge at the Imperial Court at Trèves. The money of Priscillian had, however, secured the officials, and Ithacius failed to obtain their support.

The usurper
Maximus.
Priscillian
condemned to
death.

But in 383 Gratian was murdered, and in the following year Maximus came to Trèves. The usurper acted with more vigour than his predecessor, whose weakness is incidentally revealed by the fact that the matter of Priscillian had depended on the decision of venal officials. Maximus on his own account ordered a synod to assemble at Burdegala (Bordeaux). Instantius was deprived of his see; but Priscillian appealed to the Emperor and the synod dare not disallow his appeal.¹ At this juncture St. Martin began to intervene. In one respect the bishop of Tours is the forerunner of the high-minded prelates of the Middle Ages. Nothing would induce him to allow the superiority of any secular power to the clergy of the Church. It was extremely necessary for Maximus to win the support of the Saint, on whose recognition his imperial title seemed to depend. Maximus invited Martin to a banquet, but the bishop, by passing the cup from which he drank to a priest rather than to the Emperor, shewed his contempt for the civil as compared with the ecclesiastical authority. He went so far, however, as to intercede on behalf of Priscillian, and obtained a promise from Maximus that blood should not be shed. But Ithacius urged the policy of severity, and, after a trial before the praefect Evodius, Priscillian was con-

1. Hefele, *Hist. Conc.*, vol. II., p. 384, Eng. Transl.

demned to death. Maximus himself pronounced the sentence.¹ Priscillian, Latronianus a poet, Euchrocia, two presbyters, and two deacons, were put to death. Instantius was banished to the Scilly Isles.

It was resolved to extirpate the heresy by force; military tribunes were to be sent to Spain with full powers to examine those accused of Priscillianism and to deprive them of life and property. Maximus had inaugurated such a policy as would have befitted the fifteenth or sixteenth century. Perhaps it is fortunate that the first persecution on behalf of Christianity should have been due to a ruler of such doubtful character and legitimacy as Maximus; for what might in the case of a Constantine or a Theodosius have appeared as a proof of godly zeal, in the present instance was rightly regarded as an atrocious crime.

A Gallican bishop named Theognostes has the credit of being the first to protest by withdrawing from communion with the Spanish prelates. Soon, however, St. Martin appeared on the scene, horrified at the cruelty and duplicity of the whole proceedings. He was only induced to hold any communication with the Emperor in hopes of procuring pardon for some of the adherents of Gratian. He succeeded in dissuading Maximus from indulging in a general persecution in Spain, only on condition

Indignation of
St. Martin.

1. Dr. Hodgkin remarks, "Already the punishment of death had been denounced against heretical leaders, at least as a threat." *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., ch. 6. The edict in the Theodosian code is directed against the Manichaeans, but involves the Eucratites and other heretics in a similar sentence: *Proditos crimine vel in mediocri vestigio facinoris hujus inventos summo supplicio et inextinguibili poena jubemus affligi.*" Inquisitors are ordered to be appointed. One of the charges brought against Priscillian was that of Manichaeism. St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 26, *ad Irenaeum*) condemns the action of the bishops. St. Augustine (*Ep.* 134, to Apringius the Proconsul) advocates the lenient treatment even of the African Circumcellions, and refuses to draw the mediaeval distinction between the secular and spiritual arm in punishing heresy with death: "Cum enim tu facis, ecclesia facit, propter quam facis et cujus filius facis." Eleven tractates by Priscillian have been discovered and are printed by Schepps in the *Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.*, vol. XVIII., together with the Canons by him prefixed to St. Paul's Epistles. Priscillian is the earliest author to quote 1 John v. 7 (the three heavenly witnesses). See also Künstle, *Anti-priscilliana* (1905). This author discusses whether the Athanasian Creed is not an anti-Priscillian work.

that the Saint would hold communion with the bishops who had sanctioned the death of Priscillian. For his compliance in this respect St. Martin believed that his power of working miracles was seriously diminished.¹ Pope Siricius, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, were agreed in condemning the death sentence pronounced on the Priscillianists.

The whole affair throws a light on the deplorable condition of the Church of Gaul. The worldliness of the prelates, the readiness shewn on both sides to call in the civil power, the unscrupulous bribery of the court officials, the shameless appeal to a worldly tribunal to settle a matter of faith, and the indifference to shedding human blood, shocked the conscience of the most Christian men of the fourth century. Alien, however, as were the proceedings to the spirit of the Christianity of the age, they were the logical outcome of a policy which all parties were agreed in furthering. The laws of Theodosius were only enforced by Idatius, Ithacius, and Maximus.

St. Martin died before the close of the fourth century. His feast, once so popular in England and still known as Martinmas, is celebrated on November 11. He is the forerunner of a new era; the wonder-working monastic saint of Western Europe.

St. Ambrose. We turn from St. Martin to one whose faults as well as his conspicuous virtues are eminently characteristic of the period; but before giving an account of St. Ambrose, it is desirable to say somewhat of the social system in which he moved before his elevation to the bishopric of Milan.

Prestige of Rome. Ambrose was connected with the great Roman aristocracy which played so prominent a part in Italy during the fourth century. The prestige of the city and its ancient families seems to have increased instead of diminished with the loss of political power. When Milan became the governmental head of Italy, Rome began to be regarded with veneration as the holy city of the Empire. The magnificence of the city impressed every visitor, and

1. Sulpicius Severus, *Dialog.* III. 13.

the poet Claudian thus describes the prospect from the palace of the Caesars in A.D. 403:—

The lofty palace towering to the sky
Beholds below the courts of justice lie;
The num'rous temples round the ramparts strong,
That to the immortal deities belong;
The Thund'rer's domes; suspended giant race
Upon the summits of Tarpeian space;
The sculptured doors; in air the banners spread;
The num'rous towers that hide in brass their head;
The columns girt with naval prows of brass;
The various buildings raised on terreous mass;
The works of nature joining human toils;
And arcs of triumph decked with splendid spoils;
The glare of metal strikes upon the sight,
And sparkling gold o'erpowers the dazzling light.¹

The great nobles of Rome remained almost as wealthy as they had been in the days of the Republic and early Empire. Ammianus, the historian, gives a description of them in the middle of the fourth century. Their palaces were cities in miniature, each with its temple, hippodrome, forum, and baths. When they travelled their retinues were worthy of Alexander the Great. They attended the public baths in their chariots in order to exhibit their power and affability. They assumed whimsical names like Reburus and Tarrasius. They gave audience to strangers to impress them with their importance and grandeur.² Their wealth was such that it only can be appreciated by modern standards. Four thousand pounds of gold (£180,000) was the annual revenue of several of the great Roman families. Symmachus, who was only moderately wealthy, spent two thousand pounds of gold (£90,000) in the celebration of his son's praetorship. Nor were the Christian nobility

1. *De Vita Cons. Hon.* v. 42, Hawkins's Transl. Claudian, *In II. cons. Stilichonis*, 130 ff. Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, vol. II., p. 160; Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, bk. I., ch. 2. Dr. Hodgkin (*Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 560) remarks, "The heathenism of the Mediterranean countries was all concentrated in the city on the Tiber." Rome is called "First among cities, the home of the gods (*divum domus*)."

2. Ammianus Marcellinus, XIV. 6. 26; XVIII. 4. 29—32.

less luxurious than their pagan brethren. Ammianus, the heathen soldier, describes exactly the same aristocracy as St. Jerome when he speaks of the devout ladies of Rome, and the dignified clergy. The clerical fop who drives such horses as the King of Thrace might envy, and visits the palaces of the matrons, and the noble lady, borne in her litter to St. Peter's that she may distribute alms in public, are just the same as the patricians in Ammianus' scathing description. The society was evidently wealthy, brilliant, and frivolous, but neither altogether illiterate nor uncultivated. Indeed, both in Christian and heathen Rome there were men and women not unworthy of being members of the great houses of a world-wide empire.

The conservatism of the Roman nobility made it as a body naturally more favourable to the old than to the new religion, especially as their own credit was at stake. The priesthoods and offices connected with the temples were in some families hereditary, and the associations of many generations had endeared the ancient cults to the members of the great houses of Rome.

During the reign of Gratian and Theodosius the leaders of the heathen nobility were Praetextatus and Symmachus, men of blameless lives and distinguished attainments, whilst the Christians had the support of the great Anician family, and of Probus, who was at the head of the Roman aristocracy. Under Valentinian, Probus had held the highest offices a subject could hold, and when praetorian praefect of Italy he appointed St. Ambrose governor of the provinces of Liguria and Aemilia. Ammianus, the historian, charges him with being incapable and oppressive in his administration, but the poets Claudian and Ausonius praise the liberal use he made of his fortune.¹ Theodosius, when in Italy, gave proof of the political importance of the family of Probus by making his two sons Probinus and Olybrius consuls in the same year, A.D. 395. It is remarkable

1. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxx. 5. 4—7. Claudian, *Consulatus Olybrii et Probini*, 42—44. Dr. Hodgkin (*Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 583) calls Probus "That successful place-hunter, but most unsuccessful ruler."

that, despite their difference in religion, Symmachus and Probus were intimate friends, and social intercourse generally seems to have been little disturbed at Rome by questions of belief. This pleasing tolerance was characteristic of the closing days of the fourth century.¹

The struggle between the two faiths was waged over the rejection of the title of Pontifex Maximus by the Emperor, and the retention of the statue and altar of Victory in the Roman Senate-house. The great influence of St. Ambrose ensured the triumph of the Christians in both cases.

This remarkable man was the son of
 Ambrose
 made Bishop of
 Milan. a *Praefectus Galliarum*, one of the highest officers in the Empire. He was educated in Rome, studied as a lawyer, and was appointed 'consular', or provincial governor of secondary rank, over Liguria and Aemilia, Milan being situated in the first-named district. Probus, who gave him the office, dismissed him with the words "Vade age non ut iudex, sed ut Episcopus". Evidently Ambrose obeyed this injunction; for when Auxentius the Arian bishop died, the people of Milan clamoured for Ambrose as his successor.² This in itself shews the growing influence of the Church. That the Milanese should desire a just and upright governor to be transformed into a bishop proves that they considered that he would be more use to them in an ecclesiastical than in a civil office. In fact, the bishop was the popular representative of the city or province against the oppressive or inefficient Roman government, and his power could be made far more effective than that of any imperial officer. Milan was the governmental head of Italy and the frequent home of the emperor, and an able bishop had almost unlimited power of influencing the rulers of the Roman world. Never was an office of such responsibility filled by a man more fitted to wield it for what he considered to be the good of others than was the see of Milan by Ambrose.

1. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, Book II. (Sketches of Western Society).

2. "Raptus a tribunalibus ad sacerdotium," says St. Ambrose of himself. *De Officiis*, i. 4. The life of Ambrose was written by his secretary (*notarius*) Paulinus.

Ambrose and
Gratian.

As a man well versed in civil business, and at the same time full of spiritual fervour, Ambrose was fortunate in having as emperors two youths who, if not particularly able, were thoroughly sincere and well-intentioned. Gratian (375—383), a young man of genuine piety, succeeded his father Valentinian at the age of sixteen. Two years later, when he was preparing to go to the assistance of his uncle Valens, the youthful emperor asked the bishop to write a treatise for him in support of orthodoxy; and in answer to this request, Ambrose composed his earliest work, *De Fide*. It was owing, doubtless, to the influence of Ambrose that Gratian refused to assume the title of Pontifex Maximus. When this was done is not quite certain. Ausonius, who had been the tutor of Gratian, was made Consul in A.D. 379, and addressed a panegyric to the Emperor on the occasion. The religion of this writer is a matter of dispute, but on the whole it seems probable that he was a Christian. Yet he uses language which would hardly be possible had Gratian formally refused to be called Pontifex Maximus at this time. The title also is seen in inscriptions and coins of the period. Zosimus,¹ however, declares that Gratian refused the *insignia* of the office; and he probably did so when he left Trèves for Italy. It was a bold step to take. The Emperor had always been head of the state religion, and the title of Pontifex was not an empty one. To abdicate it was to surrender some of the imperial pretensions. But Gratian went further than this. He resolved to strike at the roots of Roman Paganism.

The Altar of
Victory.

In the Senate-house stood an altar and statue of Victory, placed there by the Great Caesar. The statue came from Tarentum and represented the figure of a winged maiden, surmounting the globe, with a laurel wreath in her hand. Constantius had removed the altar, but Julian had ordered it to be restored. The senators were accustomed to offer incense on it, and to touch it when taking oaths. In 381 Gratian suppressed these observ-

1. Zosimus, IV. 36.

ances, and removed the altar, and perhaps the statue, from the Senate. Embassies were sent from Rome, headed by Symmachus, to implore the Emperors to restore the altar, but in vain.¹ Gratian confiscated the revenues of the Temple of Victory and abolished the privileges belonging to the pontiffs and vestals. The rebellion of Maximus gave the party of Symmachus fresh hopes, and on Gratian's death it was resolved to send a request to the child-Emperor Valentinian II., who with his mother Justina ruled Italy at Milan.² Symmachus addressed the Emperor in the name of Rome. "It appears to me," says the illustrious Roman, "as if Rome herself stood before you and spoke in this wise—Most excellent Princes, Fathers of your country, respect, I beseech you, the years to which holy religion has allowed me to attain. Let me be permitted to follow the faith of my fathers, and you will not repent it. Let me enjoy the right of freedom and live in conformity with my customs and traditions. This faith has placed the universe in subjection to my laws, these mysteries have repulsed Hannibal from my walls and the Senones from the Capitol. Have I achieved all this, only to be turned adrift in my old age? Preserve me, I implore you, from so humiliating a fate."

Ambrose answered the petition of Symmachus in language betraying the intolerant spirit of the new Faith, which under imperial patronage was triumphing over the old. He warns Valentinian not to presume to act till he had authority from Theodosius to do so. He also sneers at the notion that the old religion needs money to support seven Vestals, when thousands of Christian women offer themselves freely to a life of virginity.³ When, after the fall of Maximus,

1. An excellent summary of the arguments of Symmachus is given in Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, vol. II., p. 317 ff. They are curiously like the modern defence of an established religion. Gregorovius (*Rome in the Middle Ages*, bk. I., c. 2) refers to Gerhard, *Der Streit um den Altar der Victoria*, and to Beugnot, *Chute du Paganisme*, VIII. 6. See also Gibbon, ch. xxviii.

2. Gregorovius (*op. cit.*, bk. I., c. 2, p. 67) says that it was Gratian who was addressed, but he was murdered on Aug. 25, 383.

3. Ambrose, *Ep.* xviii.

Theodosius visited Italy in 388, the appeals were renewed with no better success, the heathen party resolved upon making an effort for their dishonoured goddess. In 392 Valentinian II. was murdered by Arbogast, his Frankish general, and the rhetorician Eugenius was raised to the imperial office. Though a Christian himself, the new emperor supported the heathen faction and allowed the senator Nicomachus Flavianus to restore the ancient religion in the City. The altar of Victory was replaced: the old rites were again celebrated, and the property of the temples was restored, not to the priesthood but to Flavian himself. But this triumph was only short-lived. Theodosius gained the battle of the Frigidus and entered Italy. The temples were again closed and the priests banished. The official religion was suppressed as far as it was in the power of the government to do so. We are not told what happened to the altar of Victory; but her image still appeared on the coins of the Emperor. In the pillage of the temples, Serena, wife of the celebrated general Stilicho, robbed the statue of Rhea of a costly necklace; and the last of the Vestals, who witnessed the sacrilege, foretold that the family of the spoiler would perish for her crime.

Thus the old religion fell before its young and powerful rival the Christian Church, and legislative acts which marked its downfall are to be found in the Theodosian code under the head of *De Paganis Sacrificiis et Templis*.

Rapid as the fall of the state religion of the Romans appears to have been at the last, it had really been the work of centuries. Scepticism, nurtured in Greece, had found a congenial soil in Rome in the latter days of the Republic. Under Augustus a revival of the ancient faith, prudently fostered by that astute ruler, had taken place; and under the Empire society had restored its religious convictions by adopting new rites, Oriental in origin and mystic in character. The Neo-Platonists had given Hellenism renewed vigour; and in the third century the practical infidelity of Epicureanism was reprobated by devout men of all

persuasions. But the attempt of Julian in the fourth century to give eclectic Hellenism a new lease of life shewed that its hold on mankind was too far relaxed to be restored.

The surprising fact is that in Rome at the close of the fourth century there was a real revival of the old faith. Praetextatus, Symmachus, and Flavianus were thoroughly in earnest, and if the high-minded zeal of men of noble birth, cultured intellect, and blameless lives, could have influenced the course of affairs Rome would have remained a Pagan city. But a Spanish emperor, backed by the public opinion of the East, and supported by men like St. Ambrose, was able to deal the ancient creed so severe a blow that it never recovered. It needed only the successive captures of Rome by Alaric and Gaiseric to complete its overthrow.

Yet it cannot be denied that the **Influence of the old cults on Christianity.** Christianity which took the place of the official cultus was not the pure faith of the Gospel; and that, if dogmatically it was the legitimate outcome of the teaching of the New Testament, it was often in practice a continuation of the ancient state of things under Christian forms. The life of St. Paulinus of Nola shews how gradual was the transition from faith to faith. This eminent man, the friend of St. Jerome and St. Augustine, established himself at Nola, where he erected a church in honour of the martyr Felix, for whom he felt a peculiar veneration. He spent his time in the exercise of devotion and asceticism, and in literary pursuits. His cult of St. Felix was in many ways similar to that of a local god. The poor were weaned from their paganism by being instructed to give their hereditary customs a Christian significance. The old paganism of Italy was but thinly veiled by the policy or superstition of the Christian Saint. And so it was in most places; disendowment and legislation had not killed the spirit of antiquity.¹

1. Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, bk. iv., ch. ii. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History*.

**Christianity
and Classical
Education.**

Nor did the Christian faith gain in every respect by its victory. It was too incomplete to allow the conquerors to take a generous estimate of the merits of the fallen foe. After nearly fifteen centuries of domination the Church has never been able to devise a system of education to supplant the old classical one. No books have ever been written to take the place of Homer and Virgil, of Thucydides and Livy, of Plato and Cicero, in the educational system; and Christian zealots in declaring war against heathenism were in danger of including education in their defiance. For the first four centuries the good sense of the Church had prevented this: but the dream of St. Jerome "Thou art not a Christian but a Ciceronian," heralded a new state of things. Classicalism was too ingrained in that Father to permit him to degenerate into the state of ignorance into which his successors allowed themselves to sink, but he cannot be acquitted of giving an impulse in this direction. That the inscription on the Cross of Christ was in Hebrew, Greek and Latin is not without a profound significance. Christianity, which sprang from a Hebrew source, has never been truly progressive save in company with the spirit of the two great races from which modern civilization has derived its inspiration. The attempt to dispense with the Classics in education was, as the story of the early middle ages shews, well-nigh fatal to Christianity itself.

Prudentius with true prophetic insight foretold the rise of a new glory for Rome;¹ and shortly before his time a bishop of the Imperial City laid the foundation of that cultus, which made her the magnet which attracted all the piety of Western Christendom for many centuries.

**Rome as a
Christian city.**

1. *Contra Symmachum* II. 655 ff., esp. 660—664:

Nunc nunc justa meis reverentia competit annis.
Nunc merito dicor venerabilis, et caput orbis,
Cum galeam sub fronde oleae cristasque rubentes
Concutio, viridi velans fera singula serpto,
Atque armata Deum sine crimine caedis adoro.

Damasus, whose long pontificate lasted from A.D. 366—384, made it a labour of love to restore the catacombs, which bands of pilgrims had already begun to visit. He removed the earth, widened the passages, and employed the artist Furius Dionysius Filocalus to engrave on marble slabs inscriptions to the honour of the martyrs, composed by the Pope himself. It was this pontiff who built the Font or Baptistry of St. Peter's, and placed in it the Chair which ancient tradition said had been used by the great Apostle.¹ Thus Damasus gave an impetus to the growing feeling that Rome was specially favoured by the presence of the relics of primitive Christianity, and under the protection of the most holy of the martyrs. A time was not far distant when these, and not the monuments of imperial greatness, were destined to attract men back to the ruined and devastated city.

But not only had the Church triumphed over Paganism; the time had come when she was strong enough to shew to the world that she was prepared to tolerate no form of Christianity but that sanctioned by her authority; even though an emperor demanded its recognition. To this the history of the dispute between St. Ambrose and Justina fully testifies.

Valentinian, who died in A.D. 375, had, as we have already seen, left two sons, Gratian and the infant Valentinian II.; the latter the child of his second wife, the beautiful and wayward Justina. Gratian, with characteristic amiability, allowed his brother a share in the empire; and the child Valentinian and Justina were established at Milan. St. Ambrose, who had succeeded Auxentius in A.D. 374, was a strong supporter of the Creed of Nicaea, but Justina was attached to Arian views, which had been predominant in the city previous to the election of St. Ambrose. In 385 the Empress demanded that one of the churches in Milan should be given up for the use of the Arians.

1. Gregorovius, *History of Rome in the Middle Ages*, bk. I., ch. ii., sec. 4.

**Justina demands
a church
for the Arians
in Milan.**

Strictly speaking, this was prohibited by a law recently published by Theodosius; but an imperial command was not easily withstood, although Ambrose had rendered no small service to Justina two years before, at the critical moment when Maximus, having slain Gratian, threatened to invade Italy. The bishop, at the entreaty of the Empress, had crossed the Alps, and had persuaded Maximus to remain for the present content with the government of Gaul, Britain, and Spain.¹ Still Justina had some show of right in demanding a church for the Arians. They were numerous in Milan, and the majority of the troops, being barbarians, were adherents of the sect. The chances of the Catholics in resisting a demand made by imperial authority and backed by the soldiery would have been small indeed, had it not been for the resolute spirit shewn by the great bishop of Milan, who, like Cyprian, had gained influence over his flock by repeatedly taking them into his confidence and explaining his policy.

**Resistance by
Ambrose.**

There were apparently two, or at most three, churches in Milan; one, the Portian Basilica, being outside the walls of the city.² This Justina claimed either for the entire, or perhaps only partial, use of the Arians. Ambrose refused to yield, and the troops were sent to take possession of the church. The people stood by their bishop, whereupon Justina imprisoned some of the richer inhabitants for contumacy. A riot occurred, in which an Arian presbyter was seized by the mob and rescued by Ambrose, who besought the people not to stain the cause of the Church by acts of violence. The soldiers who were sent were withdrawn at the request made to their officers by the bishop. The affair threatened to become serious as endangering the authority of the Emperor, and pressure was put upon Ambrose to give way; but Ambrose

1. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* xxiv. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 412.

2. There seem to have been two churches in Milan, the Portian and the New Basilica. The former was outside the walls: the latter had, apparently, not yet been consecrated. There are, however, other churches mentioned in connexion with St. Ambrose, Fausta's Basilica, the Roman, and that of St. Felix and St. Nabor.

declared that the Emperor had no rights over the churches—they belonged to God. Troops surrounded the Portian Basilica, but on Ambrose's appearance they professed they had come not to molest him but to pray. As the people feared that Ambrose would be removed from Milan they guarded him in the basilica, and were taught by the bishop to occupy the time by antiphonal chanting of hymns, many of which he composed himself. A tradition, which however cannot be accepted, relates that the *Te Deum* was the joint work of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine at this time.¹ For at Milan St. Augustine was sojourning during Ambrose's period of trial, and it was the bishop's eloquent exposition of Scripture that drew him irresistibly into the bosom of the Christian Church.² The most celebrated hymns of St. Ambrose which St. Augustine especially admired are known from their opening words, *Aeternæ verum Conditor, Deus Creator omnium, Veni Redemptor Gentium, and O Lux beata Trinitas.*

An attempt was next made to induce Ambrose to dispute before the Emperor with an Arian bishop called Auxentius, which Ambrose, after due discussion with his presbyters, declined; and indeed a miracle was about to occur which would render all further discussion unnecessary. The long period of anxious vigil in the basilica had excited the feelings alike of the pastor and his flock, and Ambrose's prayer that he might dedicate a new church with suitable relics was soon to be answered.

Discovery of Relics. A presage, perhaps a vision, warned him to seek in the church consecrated to St. Felix and St. Nabor. Martyrs were scarce in Milan, and the increasing reverence with which their relics were regarded rendered a discovery especially opportune. As they opened the ground of the church at the spot indicated, two bodies were discovered, huge in size, such as antiquity alone produced (*ut prisca ætas ferebat*), with dissevered heads, and the tomb stained

1. This tradition has now been thoroughly discredited by Dr. A. E. Burn, who has recently discovered the author of the *Te Deum* to be Nicetas of Remesiana.

2. St. Augustine, *Confessions* VI. 3, IX. 7.

with the martyrs' blood. The enthusiasm at this fortunate discovery knew no bounds. Miracles occurred spontaneously. Devils were cast out; a blind man received his sight. The Arians tried to discredit the miracles, but in vain. The bones of the holy martyrs Gervasius and Protasius were borne in triumph to the basilica of Ambrose, now known in Milan as the church of San Ambrogio.

Discussion of the miracle. We are in the age of miracles, but none present such difficulties as this. We have to remember that St. Ambrose was no ignorant enthusiast, no uneducated saint, but the leading man of his age. He was not only a bishop, but a cultured gentleman of the best type. His youth had been spent not in the cloister but in the business of the empire. He remained to the end of his days a statesman as well as a bishop. He was, moreover, a singularly high-minded man, distinguished as a ruler by wisdom and common sense. Yet here we find him profiting by a miracle which would prove a strain to the most credulous.¹

The story of the finding of the bodies of the martyrs may be read in a letter written by Ambrose himself to his sister Marcellina. Is it credible that the bishop could have believed men who perished not a century before under Diocletian to be giant remains of an ancient race? Yet Ambrose must either have been credulous beyond all measure, or else have played on the credulity of a people worked up to a pitch of unreasoning fanaticism, and ready to believe anything. Either the understanding or the character of St. Ambrose must suffer in our estimation. Yet it is impossible to understand his age without taking into account both possibilities, that of excessive credulity, and that of a

1. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* xxii., also St. Augustine, *Confess.* ix. 7 and *De Civitate Dei*, xxii. 8. Gibbon says in a note to ch. xxvii., "I should recommend this miracle to our divines, if it did not prove the worship of relics as well as the Nicene Creed." Dr. Hodgkin thinks that great as St. Ambrose was, he was not altogether exempt from the faults of his age, and that "In the strife with principalities and powers, in which he was engaged, his mind was so entirely engrossed with the nobility and holiness of his ends, that he may have been—I will not venture to say that he was—something less than scrupulous as to his means." Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 440.

want of scruple when a laudable object was to be attained. In the last days of the Roman empire we find a childish readiness to accept the miraculous side by side with virile understanding, and unscrupulous acts combined with real exhibitions of Christian virtue. A historian like Socrates, who has all a lawyer's capacity for discerning the shortcomings of the ecclesiastics of his age, finds no monastic story impossible to believe; and Synesius speaks with unfeigned rapture of the goodness of Theophilus, who is chiefly known to us by the discreditable attempt he made to involve St. John Chrysostom in a charge of heresy. In a case like the finding of the relics of Gervasius and Protasius it is best to accept the story as an illustration of the spirit of the age. The old spirit of Paganism was strong in the populace of Milan, and was perhaps not altogether extinct in the breast of its saintly bishop.

Rebellion of Maximus. The success of the discovery of the relics was undoubted. Arianism was beaten down, and Justina was powerless to resist Ambrose. Soon indeed the Empress had to entreat his assistance. Maximus in A.D. 387 prepared to advance into Italy, and Ambrose again crossed the Alps to intercede for Valentinian. This time, however, he was unsuccessful. Maximus turned a deaf ear to the arguments of Ambrose, and prepared to invade the dominions of the boy emperor, who with his mother and sisters escaped to the court of Theodosius. The misfortunes of the family and the beauty of the Emperor's sister Galla induced Theodosius to take the field in defence of the rights of Valentinian II., and to lead his forces against Maximus in person. Maximus was abandoned by his army, and the victorious emperor reinstated his young colleague in A.D. 389. It was now that Theodosius came face to face with St. Ambrose, the first real bishop, as he admitted, he had ever known.

Ambrose and Theodosius. We have already seen how unflinching was the attitude assumed by Ambrose on the question of restoring to the heathen party at Rome any of its lost privileges; and the same spirit was displayed in maintaining the dignity of the Church. Hitherto the triumphs of Ambrose had

been over a woman and a boy ; but he was now to shew the world that he could be equally firm in dealing with the great emperor who had restored peace to the shattered empire by subduing both the Gothic hordes who had gained the day at Adrianople and the usurper Maximus. Theodosius at the height of his glory had to acknowledge the moral ascendancy of Ambrose.

After his victory over Maximus, Theodosius was strongly urged by Ambrose to shew clemency to the fallen ; and the Emperor's disposition induced him to listen favourably to the bishop's appeal. Unfortunately, however, a Christian prelate of this age, though always ready to use his eloquence in favour of political offenders, felt in honour bound to support the action of other bishops, even when it did not accord with the principles of justice. The bishop at Callinicum, an obscure town in the East, had not restrained a Christian mob led by fanatical monks from destroying a Jewish synagogue and a Gnostic church. The Jews, at any rate, were under the protection of the law of the empire, and no ruler could pass over such an outrage. Theodosius ordered the bishop to rebuild the synagogue, and the rioters to be punished. It was however considered unlawful under any circumstances for a Christian to contribute to the erection of a building for false religion, a belief which had been the cause of many persecutions in the days of Julian. Monks also were regarded with superstitious reverence ; and it was deemed an outrage to punish acts inspired by zeal for God. Ambrose was not above the sentiments of his age, and though naturally just and a lover of order, his eyes were on this occasion blinded by prejudice. Theodosius was present in the church, and the bishop of Milan directed his sermon to the Emperor, who seeing that he had been publicly attacked, enquired the cause, and Ambrose admitted that he had intentionally addressed his remarks to him. The bishop declared that he could not proceed to offer the sacrifice till the Emperor had rescinded his order. With this demand Theodosius at once complied.¹

1. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* XL., to *Theodosius* ; XII., to *his sister*. The arguments in favour of pardoning the bishop whose flock had burned the

The best-known story concerning Ambrose and Theodosius is one redounding highly to the credit of the former, as it shews him in the light of a bishop rebuking sin and a statesman hating acts of cruelty and violence perpetrated under pretext of justice.

Though as a rule inclined to justice and humanity, Theodosius was liable to furious outbursts of rage in which he gave orders more befitting an oriental despot than the head of the Roman state. In A.D. 390 he was greatly provoked by the outrageous conduct of the people of Thessalonica. The commander of the imperial troops, who bore the Gothic name of Botheric, had put to death a popular charioteer, for a crime which has always been justly reprobated by the northern nations of Europe, but was regarded as almost trivial among a southern people, accustomed for generations to heathen immorality. The mob rose and murdered Botheric, and Theodosius gave orders for a general massacre of the guilty people. Seven thousand persons perished at the hands of the soldiery, and the whole circumstances of the butchery were exceptionally dreadful.

There are two accounts of what ensued. Ambrose himself and his biographer Paulinus say that the Emperor, after receiving a letter of rebuke, did public penance and grieved for his sin for the rest of his life. Theodoret relates how Theodosius, after keeping away from church for eight months, attempted to enter it on Christmas Day, but was met by Ambrose, who reproved him, and would not allow him to be present at the Eucharist till he had done penance and enacted a law that no criminal should be put to death till thirty days had elapsed after the sentence had been pronounced. No trace of such a law remains, and this latter version of the story is scarcely credible.¹

synagogue are extraordinary. Even if the bishop collected the mob and attacked the synagogue, he will be a martyr if he is punished for refusing to contribute to its reconstruction! The letter contains a true tribute to the natural clemency of the Emperor Theodosius.

1. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* li. Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 18. Of St. Ambrose's Epistle, Gibbon (ch. xxvii.) says, "His epistle is a miserable rhapsody on a noble subject. Ambrose could act better than he could write."

The Statues at Antioch. Three years earlier an event had occurred in the East illustrative both of the impetuosity and of the clemency of Theodosius. Antioch, the capital of the East, was the scene of a formidable riot. The demand for money for a donative to the soldiers had roused the populace to fury; and in their rage they stormed the praetorium and proclaimed themselves the enemies of the Emperor by casting down his statues and those of his family. No insults were spared, the portraits of the Emperor and of his deceased wife Flacilla were defaced with mud and torn to shreds, and the statues dragged through the streets. When the people realised what had been done they were panic-stricken at the fate which probably awaited the guilty city. By the mad folly of the mob the inhabitants of the wealthiest and most populous city of the East were placed at the mercy of the Emperor. The outrage took place on February 26, 387; and Flavian, the bishop of Antioch, leaving the death-bed of his sister, hastened to Constantinople to implore the clemency of Theodosius. The entire season of Lent was consequently one of dreadful anticipation. At last the imperial commissioners arrived with the sentence of the Emperor. Considering the extreme gravity of the offence, it was unexpectedly lenient. The baths and theatres of the city were to be closed; the public distribution of corn was to cease; and the city was reduced from her proud position as the capital of the East to that of dependence on the neighbouring town of Laodicea. An enquiry was also held as to the circumstances of the riot, and many of the principal inhabitants were arrested and imprisoned; nor were they spared those tortures which then accompanied judicial examinations. The crime of the leading citizens was that of not having foreseen and prevented the riot.

John Chrysostom's Sermons on the Statues. The terrified people betook themselves to the churches. The whole city became a scene of prayer and supplication. From the mountains swarms of solitaries, in strange attire and of squalid appearance, came into Antioch to be welcomed as very angels of mercy. Secure of public reverence, and undismayed at the

authority of the commissioners, the monks boldly protested against ill-using men for the sake of stone images. Never did the power of the new religion manifest itself more brightly than at this dreadful time. But the eyes of all were fixed on one figure, that of the great preacher, John of the Golden-Mouth, the presbyter, known to us as St. John Chrysostom. Every day he spoke words of comfort and exhortation to the terrified people, reminding them that the present expectation of a worldly judgment was but a type of a more dreadful sentence awaiting sinners. Never were sermons preached under more dramatic circumstances, and with more effect, than the twenty-one discourses of Chrysostom 'on the Statues'. At last Flavian returned just before Easter with the glad tidings that Antioch was pardoned, and on Easter Day John preached the last of his series, describing the interview between the aged bishop and the Emperor. Many heathen were converted by the experiences of that fearful Lent, and Chrysostom had no light task in instructing those he had won from idolatry by his eloquence, in the principles of the true Faith.

Theodosius was in Italy from 388—
Second expedition 391; but no sooner had he returned to the
and death East, leaving Valentinian II. as Emperor
of Theodosius of the West, than the latter's incapacity
in Italy. became manifest. Arbogast, a powerful
 Frankish general, supported by the heathen party in Rome, put the Emperor to death, and set up the rhetorician Eugenius in his place. Once more Theodosius had to visit Italy; and it was only after a severe engagement by the river Frigidus, in A.D. 394, that Arbogast was overthrown. Eugenius suffered the fate of all pretenders; and Theodosius and his infant son Honorius visited Rome in triumph. But the career of the Emperor was run. He died at Milan A.D. 395. Ambrose survived him two years, passing away in A.D. 397. Jews, heretics, and pagans joined with the Christians in mourning the loss of the great bishop.

Theodosius and St. Ambrose represent the Christianity of their age. Judged by almost any standard they were great men, yet it cannot be denied that they both unintentionally left behind a heritage of evil.

It was Theodosius who formulated a policy of intolerance, and St. Ambrose who set the example of sacerdotal arrogance. The edicts of the Emperor paved the way for the establishment of the Inquisition, whilst Ambrose's example was really followed by those pontiffs who placed their foot on the necks of emperors. But it is not always just to judge individuals by the remote results of their lives. Ambrose and Theodosius were but typical of the spirit of their age. The fourth century was the parent of what we term mediævalism.

Character of Theodosius. Theodosius was a true Spaniard, a born soldier, capable of great deeds, but needing the stimulus of necessity to arouse his energies. A certain indolence seems to have come over him when no crisis threatened, rendering him a negligent ruler save in times of emergency.¹ His religious disposition was that of his native country, easily impressed by sacerdotal pretensions, and perhaps inclined to fanaticism. Ambrose obtained his influence over Theodosius by insisting on the sacred dignity of his office, much in the same way as her confessor won the respect of Isabella the Catholic.² The cruelty of Theodosius was characteristically Spanish. By nature a clement and merciful sovereign, he was capable of giving ferocious commands and issuing severe edicts, especially against religious errors. For Theodosius, as we have seen, inaugurated a deliberate system of persecution, departing from the impartial attitude of Valentinian I. towards the religious opinions of his subjects. He undoubtedly possessed great qualities. During his reign the Roman empire maintained its place in the world, and the disintegration threatened in the days of Valens was arrested for nearly twenty years. The rapid collapse which followed the death of Theodosius is a testimony to his administrative powers. His dynasty lasted longer than that of any of his predecessors, and his descendants ruled both in

1. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 587.

2. Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, ch. vii. Fray Fernando de Talavera, when Queen Isabella made her confession to him, refused to kneel beside her as was the custom, saying that he was acting as God's minister and should sit. Isabella, with her usual good sense, declared that he was the confessor she desired.

the Eastern and Western Empires. None of the men of the family inherited his abilities; but two of his female descendants, his daughter Galla Placidia and his granddaughter Pulcheria, were not altogether unworthy having sprung from Theodosius the Great.

St. Ambrose was a great churchman in a period of transition. The Roman virtues which were disappearing in the State were transferring their energies to the Church. And Ambrose was a typical Roman. If Probus told him to govern his province as if he were a bishop, he ruled his diocese with the firmness of a secular governor of the best type. He might divest himself of this world's offices and goods; but he remained at heart a Roman noble. It was to him that Justina looked when an embassy of the highest political importance, like that to Maximus, had to be undertaken. It is difficult to acquit Ambrose of shewing a political dexterity characteristic of an Italian priest in his contest with the Arians, especially in the matter of the discovery of the relics. He shared in the religious prejudices of his age, in the almost unreasoning admiration for a celibate life, which characterises all the great Fathers both Latin and Greek. He may not have been superior to the credulity of his time, he cannot certainly be acquitted of displaying in his acts a hierarchical spirit. But in a time when the State was daily failing to preserve its citizens or to influence their morals, it may be questioned whether what we term 'priestly arrogance' was not the necessary assertion of the claim of Christ's religion on man's allegiance. Like those of most men of action, the writings of Ambrose display more industry than originality; but his style is pure and his thought robust. His recorded acts and sayings reveal excellent common sense. The man who could sell the consecrated plate of his church to redeem captives, who in a matter of religious custom 'did at Rome as the Romans do', and who told the minister of Valentinian, who threatened him, that he would die as a bishop whilst the minister would act as a eunuch, must have had largeness of heart, breadth of mind, and calm courage. After making every allowance we may un-

Character
of Ambrose.

hesitatingly pronounce St. Ambrose to have been a truly great man. The force of character that could have so impressed Theodosius, and above all the eloquence and spiritual power which won St. Augustine to Christianity, are sufficient proofs of this. Ambrose is worthy to close the century which saw the work of Athanasius and the three Cappadocians.

**Importance
of the Fourth
Century.**

For good and evil the fourth century is most important to the Christian Church. The incidents are so crowded and various that it is in itself an epitome of Church history. Its results are among the most permanent in the story of mankind. Hardly a feature of mediaeval life is not traceable to this age. A century which witnessed the triumph of the martyrs, the settlement of the creed of Christendom, the beginnings of monasticism, the discovery of the Holy Places at Jerusalem, the fall of Paganism, and the first establishment of the Papal power, can hardly be second in importance to any save to that in which the Founder of Christianity appeared on earth.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE EASTERN CHURCH AND THE THIRD AND FOURTH GENERAL COUNCILS.

**Virtual partition
of the
Empire.** WITH the death of Theodosius the Empire, if united in theory, became for all practical purposes divided into two separate and even rival monarchies, the Eastern and the Western. Arcadius, the elder son of the late emperor, ruled at Constantinople; his younger brother, Honorius, at Rome, or rather at Ravenna. But neither emperor possessed sufficient character to be other than a tool in the hands of powerful court or military officials. That they were suffered to live is the greatest proof of their inability to reign, since it was easier for the politician whose star happened to be in the ascendant to rule in their name. The two courts, however, were distrustful of each other; and for the first time in Roman history it is convenient, if not strictly accurate, to speak of one part of the Empire as Eastern and of the other as Western. In the present chapter it is our purpose to confine our attention to the Eastern provinces.

Synesius. The reign of Arcadius was a reign of court favourites and barbarian military chieftains. Before, however, recounting their rise and fall it may be well to trace the career of the most original of the bishops of the period—Synesius of Cyrene. His transition from a Neo-Platonic philosopher to a Christian ruler is as characteristic of the age, as is the story of the calamities which his native province of Cyrene endured in his life-time.

His connexion with Arcadius in having delivered an address in the presence of that emperor, the tone of which is so bold as to render it difficult to believe that any man could have dared to pronounce it before the ruler of half the Roman world. Synesius visited Constantinople in A.D. 397, and by the influence of Aurelian, the leader of the anti-German party in Constantinople,¹ he was allowed to pronounce an oration before the Emperor on the 'Kingly Office'. A king, he says, must be above all things pious. Next to this he must be a soldier, war being as much his trade as that of a shoemaker is making shoes. A king to know his business must live among men experienced in war. But the orator, speaking of Arcadius and his brother Honorius, says: "You see nothing, you hear nothing which can give you any practical wisdom. Your only pleasures are the most sensual pleasures of the body. Your life is the life of a sea-anemone." The chief danger of the Roman state was the habitual employment of barbarians as soldiers in the place of free citizens of the empire; Synesius exhorts the Emperor to dismiss the Scythians, and to draw his troops from the inhabitants of his provinces who were engaged in agriculture. Then he goes on to speak of the duties of the king in peace, warning the Emperor against unworthy and venal favourites, and exhorting him to the study of philosophy.² The whole speech is an attack on the system of the court and government of Arcadius, and we shall soon see how just the strictures of Synesius were.

In this speech there is not the slightest allusion to Christianity, though the duty of piety is earnestly insisted upon. The same silence is observable in all the pre-Christian writings of Synesius. His creed

Oration of
Synesius on the
Kingly Office.

Synesius silent
about
Christianity.

1. Synesius gives a description of the strife between Aurelian, under the name of Osiris, and his 'brother' Typhos, in the allegory entitled *Concerning Providence or the Egyptians*; see Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, bk. II., chap. ii. Miss Gardner, *Synesius of Cyrene*, p. 42.

2. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, vol. IV., art. 'Synesius'. This article, by the late Mr. T. R. Halcombe, extending over nearly fifty columns, is almost in itself a complete biography. Prof. Bury (*loc. cit.*) says the oration is the anti-German manifesto of the Roman party of Aurelian.

was at this time a sort of eclectic philosophy, yet in his hymn to God written on his return from Constantinople he speaks of praying in the "temples" there, by which he must mean the churches. Well has it been said of him, "The picture of a pagan philosopher praying in a Christian church to the saints and angels of Christianity, while investing them with the attributes of the daemons of Neo-Platonism, is no bad illustration of the almost unconscious manner in which the pagan world in becoming Christian was then paganizing Christianity. As thoroughly eclectic in religion as in philosophy, Synesius took from Christianity whatever harmonized with the rest of his creed, often varying the meaning of the tenets he borrowed to bring them into accordance with his philosophical ideas."¹

The province of
Cyrene. Interesting as the study of the philosophical views of Synesius is, an account of them scarcely belongs to Church history; but his description of his life in the rural districts of the province of Cyrene, where he lived on his estates, is too illustrative of the age to be passed over in silence. The people, he remarks, though completely ignorant of public affairs, all seem to have known the stories in the *Odyssey*. "The good herdsmen speak of Ulysses as a bald-headed man, but clever in finding his way out of difficulties. They roar with laughter when they talk of him, as if it was but last year that he blinded the Cyclops." They seem not to have had any idea who was the ruling emperor; they only knew that the tax-gatherer came annually. None of them had seen the sea, and they could not believe that fish taken from it could be good for food.² Among these simple folk Synesius lived, hunting, farming, and composing his treatises and letters to friends.

The Barbarians
invade Cyrene. But like all the provinces, Cyrene, at the beginning of the fifth century, was being overrun by marauding barbarians. The governors were incredibly weak and corrupt.

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Synesius', vol. IV., p. 772 b. Miss Gardner, *Synesius of Cyrene*, pp. 46, 71 ff.

2. In a letter to his brother Evoptius, *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Synesius', vol. IV., p. 760. Miss Gardner, *Synesius of Cyrene*, p. 49 f.

Cerealis, whom Synesius found on his return from Constantinople, was only a type of the official of the age. The troops were under no discipline. The native soldiers were allowed to go where they could get maintenance, whilst the foreign mercenaries oppressed the towns till they were bribed to quit them. The people would have fought, but the government would not arm them. Even when Synesius raised and equipped irregular troops to repel the barbarians with some success, he exposed himself to a charge of treason. The clergy armed their flocks; and Synesius relates how on one occasion after a church service they made an attack on the barbarians at the instigation of the valiant Faustus, a deacon, who, though himself unharmed, slew several men with his own hand. After the recall of Cerealis, a more vigorous administration soon cleared the country of barbarians; but the government was too corrupt to continue a salutary policy long, and in opposition to law and custom a native of the province, named Andronicus, was made governor. Andronicus was a man of low origin, who was believed to have obtained his office by bribery.¹ Great indignation was felt at the appointment, and Synesius in the name of the inhabitants of Cyrene protested in a letter to a friend at Constantinople.

Since the introduction of the Christian
 Synesius elected Bishop. A.D. 409. faith the people of an oppressed province had one resource. They could not prevent the Emperor appointing whom he would over them, but they could choose for themselves a protector in the person of a bishop. The independence of the clergy and their resolute assertion of their position was due to no selfish desire for class privileges. The Christian bishop had become the people's Tribune, the spokesman of a city or province in the face of an oppressive ruler.

To defend them from Andronicus, the inhabitants of Ptolemais, the capital of Cyrene, chose Synesius as

1. Cyrene received as governor "a man from the tunny fisheries", Andronicus by name, an extortionate, rapacious and vicious man. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, p. 357.

their bishop. He remonstrated vigorously at their selection; but left the case in the hands of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, whom he regarded with the highest reverence. He feared that he would be unacceptable because his views on the Resurrection were not such as the multitude held, and nothing would induce him to surrender what he believed to be truth; for to Synesius "to be almost or altogether truthful is to be almost or altogether divine".¹ He also declined to put away his wife, or to live without further hope of children.² Theophilus, though he had but little genuine sympathy with the Origenistic views of Synesius, overcame his scruples and induced him to accept the bishopric. This was in A.D. 410; and when the new bishop returned to Ptolemais he found Andronicus had justified the apprehension of the provincials by acting as a ruthless tyrant. The prisons were full, and the torturers kept in constant requisition. At first Synesius remonstrated; but finding his words had no effect, he proceeded to excommunicate the governor. The mere threat of such a proceeding, even at this early date, had begun to be too terrible to be resisted; and before the letter of the church of Ptolemais had been sent to the other churches, Andronicus professed penitence. For a time the sentence was withheld; but when Andronicus relapsed into his former cruelty it was promulgated. Soon afterwards the governor was deprived of his office. Synesius, however, lived to see even worse times, as the barbarians poured once more into the defenceless province. His children died; and there was nothing but desolation and misery

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Synesius', vol. IV., p. 775a.

2. Synesius thus states his position. "I am married. God and the law and the sacred hand of Theophilus gave me my wife, and I do not wish to part from her at all. Further, philosophy is opposed to many current dogmata. (a) I do not think the soul is made after the body, (b) nor that the world and all its parts will be destroyed. (c) The Resurrection as preached I count as sacred mystery, and am far from accepting the general idea. (d) To conceal the truth is philosophically sound, . . . but I cannot obscure these opinions now. . . I shall be sorry to give up sports. (My poor dogs!) But I will: and I will endure business, as a means of doing service to God. But my mind and my tongue must not be at variance." See Glover, *op. cit.*, p. 350. Miss Gardner, *Synesius of Cyrene*, pp. 91 ff.

on all sides. The bishop retained his love of philosophy to the end, his last letter being addressed to the famous Neo-Platonist Hypatia, herself now of mature years,¹ and destined to perish miserably. His last poem was a hymn to Christ. Thus Synesius truly represents his age; an impossible character in any other century, he stands at the parting of the ways.

Reign of
Arcadius.
A.D. 395—408.

If the life of Synesius shews the deplorable condition of the provinces of the Eastern Empire, the rule of Arcadius illustrates the condition of Constantinople. This emperor reigned from A.D. 395—408, during which period he passed from the influence of one favourite to that of another. The first was Rufinus, the instigator of Theodosius in the infamous massacre of Thessalonica (A.D. 390).² He was an opponent of Stilicho, the powerful general of Honorius; but his influence over Arcadius was interrupted by the return of the army of Theodosius from Italy, when Gaïnas the Goth, a supporter of the military faction, put him to death. The eunuch Eutropius managed to occupy the place of the fallen favourite till A.D. 399, when, owing to the accusations of Gaïnas and of the Empress Eudoxia, he was first disgraced and banished, and afterwards, on further charges of treason being made against him, was recalled from his place of exile and put to death. After the fall of Eutropius, Gaïnas attempted to make himself master of Constantinople; but he was driven out of the city, and finally defeated and slain in January, 401. In the following year we find Alaric, the Gothic general, invading Italy at the instigation of the court of Arcadius: but he was defeated by Stilicho at the battle of Pollentia (A.D. 403).³ Disorder, incapacity and treachery are the unenviable characteristics of the first

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Synesius', vol. iv., p. 780b. In his early days Synesius had been her pupil at Alexandria. See also Kingsley's *Hypatia*. In this romance the author has, perhaps necessarily, represented his heroine as young and beautiful.

2. Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 18. Ambrose, *Ep.* 1111.

3. Claudian, *De Bello Getico*, 555 ff. An oracle told Alaric, *penetrabis ad Urbem*; he reached a river named 'Urbis', near Pollentia. But before ten years had elapsed the oracle had been fulfilled! Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 719.

years of the reign of Arcadius; and these help to explain the cruel persecution of St. John Chrysostom, whom the eunuch Eutropius had brought to the capital as its bishop.

We have met with this celebrated Christian preacher at Antioch in A.D. 387, during the days following the destruction of the imperial statues. He was born about A.D. 347, the son of an "illustrious" general called Secundus and Anthusa. His father died when John was still a child, and his mother refused all offers of marriage that she might educate her son and administer his property.

Like many other famous men of his time, the emperor Julian and St. Basil for example, John was a pupil of Libanius, the celebrated Sophist, who, according to Sozomen, declared on his death-bed (A.D. 395) that of all his disciples John was most worthy to succeed him, "if the Christians had not stolen him from us."¹ John began by practising as an advocate; but the example of his friend Basil (not St. Basil of Caesarea) led him to withdraw from worldly pursuits, and he was baptized by Meletius when about twenty-four years of age. Owing to the entreaties of his mother, John did not forsake his home to practise austerities with his friends, Basil, Theodore (afterwards bishop of Mopsuestia) and Diodore (bishop of Tarsus); but he began to lead a strictly ascetic life in his own house.² In A.D. 374, however, his life was endangered by a strange accident, and he resolved to embrace monastic practices.

At the time when the laws against magic (owing to the suspicions of the emperor Valens) were most zealously enforced, Chrysostom and a friend were walking near Antioch by the Orontes. Seeing a book floating on the water he picked it up and began to examine its contents. To his horror it was a work on magic, and a soldier was observed to be approaching. Detection meant death; and there was nothing for it but to throw away the volume into the river. Happily the soldier did not see what the friends had done, and they were saved.

1. Sozomen, *H. E.* VIII. 2.

2. Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, I., c. 5.

But the incident made a profound impression on John's mind.¹ He abandoned himself to solitude and severe ascetic discipline for six years. When failing health compelled him to return to Antioch, he was ordained deacon by Meletius, and priest by Flavian. For sixteen years, A.D. 381—397, he was the great preacher of the church of his native city.

On the death of Nectarius in A.D. 397 **Chrysostom** Bishop of Constantinople. Eutropius resolved to make Chrysostom bishop of the Imperial city. There were two obstacles to his plan. The people of Antioch were as determined to retain their great orator as he was unwilling to leave them; and Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who was apparently at Constantinople at this time, had a candidate of his own, a certain Isidore, whose election, owing to his being privy to some compromising transactions, it was his interest to promote.² But Eutropius was not easily foiled. John was decoyed outside Antioch, placed in a public conveyance and hurried away as a prisoner to the capital. Theophilus had to submit to necessity; and on February 26, A.D. 398, he consecrated John bishop of Constantinople.³ But a bishop of Alexandria was not to be thwarted with impunity, and Chrysostom had now for his enemy the most powerful prelate in the Eastern world. The new Patriarch presented a strange contrast to the people around him. He was a small delicate man, wasted in body by asceticism, with a lofty forehead furrowed with wrinkles, pale cheeks, and limbs so long in proportion

1. *Hom. in Act. Apost.* 38, *in fine*. Dean Stephens, *Life of Chrysostom*, p. 57.

2. Socrates, VI. 2. Soz., VIII. 2. Isidore had been on a very delicate mission to Rome on behalf of Theophilus. He had congratulatory letters to both Theodosius and Maximus, with instructions to present the one addressed to the victor. He gave Theodosius the letter addressed to him, and told Theophilus that he had 'lost' the one written to Maximus. Chrysostom was duly elected by the clergy and people of Constantinople.

3. Sozomen, *H. E.* VIII. 2. Socrates, VI. 2. The chief authority for the life of St. John Chrysostom is a Dialogue between a bishop and a deacon, by Palladius. It is a strongly partisan work composed by an adherent of Chrysostom in exile at Rome for his opinions. Whether this Palladius is also the author of the *Lausiac History of Egyptian Monasticism* is uncertain. See *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, and *The Lausiac History of Palladius* by Dom Butler (*Texts and Studies*), p. 175.

to his body that he compares himself to "a spider".¹ He was an indefatigable student, cared little for society, and his weak digestion and ascetic habits forbade his indulging in any approach to conviviality.² Simple in his habits, and hating display, Chrysostom was not disposed to associate with the great officials of the empire with whom his position brought him in contact. He habitually withdrew from intercourse with the world, and perhaps displayed excessive petulance in his dealings with those outside his own circle. The luxurious clergy of the city felt the simple life of the new bishop a reproach to themselves, and hated him accordingly.³

But at first his superb eloquence carried all before it. Eudoxia was his most ardent disciple. At the translation of some relics, she took part in the procession clad in her royal purple.⁴ The simple-minded bishop was delighted with such piety and condescension on the part of the Empress. But Chrysostom was not content to bask in the sunshine either of imperial or of popular favour. Constantinople was full of Goths attached to the army, and the bishop determined that these should not be without Christian privileges. A church was set apart for them, and services conducted in the Gothic tongue.⁵ Chrysostom preached to them himself, through an interpreter, and sent missionaries to convert their heathen brethren who still lived the life of nomads by the Danube. His zeal for missions was conspicuous;

1. Sozomen, VIII. 2. Socr., VI. 3. In personal appearance Chrysostom, as described by contemporary writers, though dignified was not imposing. His stature was diminutive (*σώματιον*), his limbs long, and he was so much emaciated by early austerities and habitual self-denial that he compares himself to a spider (*ἀραχνώδης*), *Ep.* IV., § 4). *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, vol I., p. 531b.

2. Socrates, VI. 4. Palladius, pp. 101-102.

3. Sozomen (VIII. 7) says: *ὅτι μηδεὶ συνήσθιεν οὐδὲ ἐπ' ἐστίασιν καλούμενος ὀπήκουε*—his early asceticism having made him subject to headaches and disorders of the stomach.

4. Sozomen, VIII. 8. Socr. VI. 8. Socrates says that the effect was not altogether good, as riots took place between the Arians and Orthodox.

5. Theodoret, V. 30. *αὐτὸς τε γὰρ τὰ πλείστα ἐκέισε φοιτῶν διελέγετο ἱερμηνευτῇ χρώμενος τῷ ἑκατέραν γλώσσαν ἐπισταμένῳ τινὶ καὶ τοὺς λέγειν ἐπισταμένους τοῦτο παρεσκεύαζε δρᾶν.* Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 697. Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 30, 31. Stephens, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

for he encouraged Leontius, bishop of Ancyra, to unite with him in the task of converting the Goths; and even during his exile he shewed his anxiety for the work he had inaugurated. He was assisted by the noble ladies of Constantinople in the demolition of the idol temples in Phoenicia, large funds being required for workmen to complete the destruction of these massive structures. Chrysostom had also the courage to oppose the powerful Gothic chieftain Gainas, who demanded the use of a place of worship for the Arians, a request seconded by the timid Arcadius.¹

But all the time John was raising up **Causes of his unpopularity.** for himself powerful enemies. The clergy were corrupt, luxurious, and sensual. Few of the priests of Constantinople were free from the vices of a great city, many of them being guilty of serious offences against moral purity. The practice of introducing spiritual sisters into their houses gave rise to no small scandal: some clergy had even resorted to crimes of violence.² John had no compunction in waging war against this clerical immorality: some were deposed, others excommunicated, by him. The chief odium fell on the archdeacon Serapion, who had great influence over the bishop, and is reported to have told him in an assembly of the clergy, "You will never be able, Bishop, to master these mutinous priests unless you drive them before you with a single rod."³ The position of bishop of Constantinople was, moreover, an exceedingly difficult one. The Second General Council, in giving the see the precedence of all Churches save that of Rome, had assigned to it no jurisdiction over other bishops; and the second prelate in the empire was placed in the anomalous position of being ecclesiastically a suffragan of the bishop of Heraclea, as Exarch of Thrace.⁴ Chrysostom consequently made many enemies by acting as if he had authority over

1. Sozomen, VIII. 4. Theodoret, v. 32.

2. Chrysostom's treatise *Contra eos qui subintroductas habent*. Stephens, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

3. Socrates, VI. 4.

4. Council Const., *Canon 3*. Metropolitan authority over Thrace and Pontus was given to Constantinople by the Council of Chalcedon, *Canon 28*. Bingham, *Antiq.*, IX., c. 4, sec. 2.

the bishops of Asia Minor, and by deposing several of them during a visitation he made in the winter of 401. While Chrysostom was away from Constantinople, he left his affairs in the hands of Severian, bishop of Gabala, who used the opportunity to form a party against him in his absence.

The great ladies of Constantinople were soon destined to be offended by the candour of the bishop; for Chrysostom was no popular orator, but a stern preacher of righteousness. He had no sympathy with luxury, and very little with wealth. He regarded useless profusion as an insult to poverty, and he once declared publicly, on the occasion of an earthquake, that "the vices of the rich had caused it, and the prayers of the poor had averted its worst consequences." But Chrysostom did not confine himself to generalities. He attacked the fashionable vices of the age. His unsparing eloquence lashed alike the men who insisted on having boot-laces of silk,¹ and the ladies who repaired their faded charms with rouge and white lead. The gluttony of the rich filled him with disgust, nor had he any mercy on the extravagant employment of gold and silver for personal adornment and for almost every vessel used in the houses of the opulent. He advocated liberality to the poor, dwelling perhaps too little on the duty of giving with discretion. Three gay widows, the friends of Eudoxia, were specially incensed against the preacher. Marsa, Castricia and Eugraphia (the latter being not inaptly named since she used rouge and cosmetics to increase her beauty) were the leaders of society, and could not fail to be offended by the bold language of the bishop. Eudoxia espoused the side of her friends and became the enemy of Chrysostom.²

The waning popularity of the Archbishop gave his bitter and watchful enemy, Theophilus, an opportunity of which he was not slow to avail himself; and a pretext

**Enmity
of Theophilus.**

1. *In Matt.*, Hom. xlix., quoted by Stephens, p. 227

2. Stephens, p. 383. Palladius, *Dialog.*, p. 74.

for interfering with the Church of Constantinople soon presented itself.

The Origenists. Origen's teaching had commanded the admiration of most of the great divines of the fourth century. The boldness and originality of the master's thoughts had not deterred Christian doctors trained in the universities of the Empire from the study of his works. Basil and the two Gregorys had openly expressed their admiration for his genius, and almost every theologian of note at the close of the century was an Origenist.¹ But the temper of the fifth century was not so liberal, owing to the rising influence of the uneducated monks. Already the antagonism between Christianity and culture, both of which Origen represented, began to be manifested. Theophilus, the friend and spiritual adviser of Synesius, was not exempt from the fascination which Origen had exercised over all educated men; nor was St. Jerome, the greatest scholar of the Western Church, at this time in learned retirement at Bethlehem. But the majority of the monks heard with horror that God must not be thought of as possessing anything like a human form, regarding as blasphemous all attempts to explain away such passages of Scripture as alluded to the hands or eyes of God. Origen's dread of anthropomorphism caused him to be looked upon by the monks as the chief teacher of heresy, whilst the speculations hazarded in his *De Principiis* led many others to distrust his system.² As a consequence the Origenistic controversy soon began to convulse the East. St. Jerome, forgetting his previous admiration of Origen, plunged into the thick of the fray as the opponent of his doctrines in Palestine; and his undignified abuse of his former friend Rufinus testifies

1. Especially the Cappadocians, Basil and the two Gregorys. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. IV., pp. 84 ff.

2. Epiphanius includes Origen among the heretics, and charges him with (a) allegorising the accounts of Creation and Paradise; (b) denying the resurrection of the natural body; (c) teaching that the Son was created, and that He does not see the Father; (d) teaching that Christ's kingdom will have an end; (e) affirming that the devil will repent and be restored to his former glory, and be made equal with Christ. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Origenistic Controversies', vol. IV., p. 146a.

to the intense bitterness of feeling engendered by the dispute.¹

Epiphanius. The anti-Origenists secured the support of one bishop whose reputation for learning and sanctity assisted their cause, whilst his prejudices and ignorance of the world made him the tool of unscrupulous intriguers. St. Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia and metropolitan of Cyprus, author of the *Ancoratus*, and of that monument of erudition, the *Panarion*, a description of all the heresies up to his day, fanned the flame of discord in Palestine, and became the agent of Theophilus in his contest with Chrysostom.

The Monks and Origenism. The zeal of the monks of Egypt against Origen had alarmed Theophilus. To them a God without human attributes was inconceivable, and the words of Serapion, one of the most aged and respected among them, when he heard of such an idea, "They have taken away my God, and I know not what to worship," expressed the sentiments of many.² The monks, formidable for their reputation for sanctity and their number, over-awed Theophilus, and at last he consented to anathematize the writings of Origen.

The Tall Brothers. But the monks of Egypt were not all of them ignorant fanatics. The Nitrian desert in the neighbourhood of Alexandria was full of admirers of Origen, among whom were four aged brethren, Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius and Euthymius. They were popularly known, from their lofty stature, as the 'Tall Brothers', and had enjoyed the friendship of Theophilus. Dioscorus had actually been raised to the episcopate, and compelled, much against his will, to accept the see of Hermopolis: Eusebius and Euthymius were presbyters of Alexandria. In the persecution which Theophilus did not scruple to raise against the Origenists in the Nitrian desert, the four 'Tall Brothers' suffered severely; and finally they and other monks took refuge

1. *Vide infra*, Chap. XIX.

2. Socrates, VI. 7. Sozomen, VIII. 11, 12.

in Constantinople,¹ where they were received with kindness by Chrysostom, who, however, was careful to do nothing to weaken the authority of Theophilus. As men excommunicated by their own metropolitan, he refused to admit them to the Eucharist at Constantinople; though he had but little doubt that, when he had explained matters to the bishop of Alexandria, the ban would be removed.

Theophilus in-
flames
Epiphanius
against
Chrysostom.

He little knew Theophilus. The pope of Alexandria was not the man to lose the chance of humbling the upstart see of the New Rome. In bygone days Theophilus had been opposed to Epiphanius on the Origenistic question; but a bishop of such learning, piety, and simplicity of mind was too useful a tool to be cast aside. Theophilus wrote a courteous letter to Epiphanius, explaining how convinced he was that Origenism was a danger to the Church. The vain old man was flattered at the idea of having won over Theophilus to his own opinion; so, after holding a council in Cyprus to condemn the doctrines of Origen, he started for Constantinople, and, on his arrival, treated the Patriarch as though he were already an excommunicated person.²

Though Chrysostom belonged to the school of Antioch, which under his friends Diodore and Theodore favoured the study of Origen, he was not a pronounced Origenist. His aims were practical rather than theological, and the controversy does not appear to have interested him greatly. Directly the four brothers appealed to the Emperor for protection against the pope of Alexandria, they lost Chrysostom's support.³ But nothing mollified Theophilus, whose sole object was to ensure the ruin of his rival. Assisted by St.

1. Socrates, vi. 9. Palladius, pp. 51—62. In the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, the 'Tall Brethren', especially Ammonius, are mentioned with the greatest respect. Of Origenism, Dom Butler rightly remarks, "It appears to have been a question of ecclesiastical politics quite as much as of doctrine." *Lausiac History* (No. 1), p. 174.

2. Socrates, vi. 12. Sozomen, VIII. 14. Epiphanius was rebuked by the Gothic bishop Theotimus. Sozomen, VIII. 14 and 26.

3. Stephens, *op. cit.*, p. 300, on the authority of Palladius.

Epiphanius, and applauded by St. Jerome, he continued his campaign against St. John Chrysostom.¹

Before he left Constantinople, however, Epiphanius found out how thoroughly he had been misled. If he was not reconciled to Chrysostom, he at least had learned that ecclesiastical politics in the capital could not be touched with clean hands.²

**The Synod
of the oak.**

Theophilus arrived in Constantinople after the departure of Epiphanius, and was received with acclamations by the sailors of the Alexandrian corn-ships. Supported by about forty bishops he held a synod at the Oak, a villa near Constantinople. A strange medley of monstrous and incredible accusations was advanced against Chrysostom, who declined to appear, and was deposed.³

But the support of the people of Constantinople was too strong for the Imperial Court to proceed directly against Chrysostom; and an earthquake occurring at the time terrified the Empress Eudoxia into submission. Chrysostom had already retired from the city, but the populace compelled him to return. The Circensian games were in progress; but the theatre was deserted for the church when the Archbishop addressed the people. Theophilus was driven from the capital; the proceedings of the Synod of the Oak were reversed, and Chrysostom was confirmed in the resumption of his see by an assembly of sixty bishops.

Thus the Church as a popular institution had been proved to be a match for the imperial authority in the capital of the East. But John's enemies were too numerous and too influential to acquiesce in his triumph, nor was Eudoxia a sovereign to be thwarted with impunity.

**Chrysostom's
banishment.**

In September, A.D. 403, Chrysostom's outspoken utterances gave his enemies their opportunity. Eudoxia's statue, placed on a porphyry column in front of the church of St.

1. Stephens, p. 302.

2. The story told by Socrates (vi. 14) of the way Chrysostom and Epiphanius parted may be fairly discredited. For the interview between Epiphanius and Ammonius see Sozomen, viii. 15.

3. Hefele, *History of the Church Councils*, § 115. Soz., vi. 15. Soz., viii. 17.

Sophia, was dedicated with ceremonies recalling the times in which imperial personages were objects of worship. The noise interrupted the ceremonies of the church, and the Archbishop sternly denounced the proceedings. It was reported to Eudoxia that he had exclaimed, "Herodias is once more maddening; Herodias is once more dancing; once more Herodias demands the head of John on a charger."¹ He had been charged at the Synod of the Oak with calling the Empress Jezebel; and this was the culminating insult. The following Christmas, Arcadius declined to enter the cathedral while Chrysostom was there. Confident that the Patriarch had now forfeited the imperial favour, his enemies assembled in the capital, and by the advice of Theophilus, who was too prudent to risk discomfiture by appearing again on the scene, they charged him with violating the 12th Canon of the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), forbidding a bishop deprived of his see by a synod to seek restoration from the temporal power.² On Easter Eve, Chrysostom was, as was his wont, presiding at the great baptismal service in the church of St. Sophia, which was celebrated at this season. There were three thousand candidates. Soldiers were sent to interrupt the ceremony and to drag the bishop from the church. Wild scenes of disorder followed; and for years the 'Joannites', as the followers of John Chrysostom were called, were subject to a fierce persecution.³ In the following June, Arcadius was induced to sign a decree banishing Chrysostom, and the Patriarch was sent to Cucusus, a lonely village on the borders of Cilicia and Lesser Armenia. The treatment of the aged saint during his exile was such as might be expected of an arbitrary government in the hands of

1. These words are reported by Socrates (vi. 18) and Sozomen (viii. 20); but the extant sermon containing them is said to be spurious. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 699. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1., p. 100.

2. Hefele, *Councils*, § 115.

3. The church of St. Sophia was set on fire on the night of Chrysostom's departure; see Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 101. This gave an excuse for the persecution of the Joannites.

a weak emperor swayed by favourites. He was hurried from place to place; and when at Cucusus his health was seen to improve, he was ordered to be transferred to Pityus on the Euxine. He was compelled to make the long journey on foot, and his guards were led to expect promotion should it prove fatal. At Comana his strength failed; and he died, in the sixtieth year of his age, and the tenth of his episcopate, having spent three and a quarter years in exile. His place at Constantinople was filled by Arsacius, the brother of his predecessor Nectarius, a man eighty years of age. Arsacius died the following year, and was succeeded by Atticus, who lived till 426 A.D.¹ Thirty-one years after his death, the body of Chrysostom was brought to Constantinople with great honour, and buried in the church of the Holy Apostles.²

State of the
Church in
Constantinople.

The story of St. John Chrysostom gives us an instructive picture of the Church of Constantinople in the fifth century. It reveals the corruption of the court, the upper classes, and above all of the clergy. It shews the impotence of a righteous patriarch, supported by the people of the city, to contend with the imperial power. For the point at issue in the case of Chrysostom was really whether the Patriarch of Constantinople should be allowed to take the position of a denouncer of wrong-doing wherever found.

Chrysostom
and Ambrose
compared.

The see of Constantinople had already been filled by two great saints, St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. John Chrysostom; and both had been driven away from the New Rome. The failure of Chrysostom to hold his position powerfully affected the destinies

1. Sozomen, VIII. 27. Socrates, VII. 2, 25. It is curious how these two historians differ in their estimate of Atticus. Both agree that he was a most engaging personality and an excellent man of business; but while Socrates says he was very learned, Sozomen says he was no scholar and a poor preacher, and that he was fully aware of the fact. Atticus liked to read and talk about clever books, but avoided discussing them with people who knew too much; a true proof of wisdom. The charity of Atticus knew no distinction of sect, but only considered the needs of its recipients.

2. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. I., p. 701. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. I., p. 104.

of the Eastern Church. A weak emperor, urged on by a frivolous wife, had proved that the imperial power was irresistible against a bishop of undoubted sanctity and genius, supported by the love and respect of the inhabitants of the city. Another bishop had to succumb to prove finally that at Constantinople the emperor was the real governor of the Church, and that Caesaro-papalism was destined to prevail, first in the Church of the Eastern Empire, and afterwards in its great offspring, the Church of Russia. Before, however, considering the less honourable downfall of Nestorius, it may be well to compare and contrast the fate of St. Ambrose at Milan with that of St. John Chrysostom at Constantinople. In some respects they were alike; both were preachers of righteousness, both upholders of the authority of the Church against the unjust demands of the State, both having to deal with the fury of an enraged empress, both supported by their people. But Ambrose had not to contend with Chrysostom's difficulties. He had not to face the malignant jealousy of the see of Alexandria, nor the hostility of a debased clergy; the citizens of Milan were no doubt more faithful supporters than the rabble of Constantinople: and Ambrose, when he came in conflict with Theodosius, had a great and generous man and soldier to deal with; whereas in Arcadius Chrysostom had a feeble creature under the government of court chamberlains and women. Still in character Ambrose shews that superiority which a Western trained to deal with men has over an Oriental brought up in the school and disciplined in the monastery. Though Chrysostom was his equal in purity of heart and integrity of purpose, and his superior as a theologian and scholar, Ambrose knew how to rule, and was possessed of that virility of character which gave the Church in the West a power which Oriental Christianity never possessed.

We have now arrived at the period at which the controversy concerning the Godhead and Manhood of our Lord reached its acute form in the dispute concerning the orthodoxy of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople.

Controversy
about the
'Two Natures'.

Before, however, relating the events connected with this, it is necessary to go back to the closing years of the fourth century, when the teaching of Apollinarius raised the point at issue, without however arousing the same violent passions as those which agitated the Church of the fifth century.

The difficulty of understanding how our Lord could be at once God and Man had presented itself from the first. The Gnostics attempted to solve the question by denying His Humanity. Christ, said they, was only man in appearance (*δοκῆσει*). The Fathers combated this view by insisting on the reality of the flesh of Christ. But the problem was not to be solved so easily. For Christ to be man it was necessary for Him to do more than to take flesh upon Him, since man may be said to consist of Body and Soul, or of Body, Soul, and Spirit. If the "Word became Flesh" He must have taken all man's nature upon Himself.¹ The Arians, however, declared that if this were the case there would be two Sons, the God and the Man, as two distinct natures could not make one Person.² They therefore taught that whilst Christ had a body and an animal soul (*ψυχὴ ἄλογος*), the highest part of His nature was supplied by the Logos. At the same time, by teaching that the Logos was not perfectly Divine they maintained that Christ was a half-Divine Nature, capable of falling into sin and therefore capable of change (*τρεπτός*).³

1. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 139. Origen had admitted the presence of a human soul in our Lord: but long before this Clement of Rome, and later Irenaeus, had spoken of Christ giving "His soul for our souls, and His body for our bodies".

2. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 147. The consequence was that they said that our Lord had become incarnate, but had not been made man. So Eudoxius affirms in his creed that He was "the first of creatures, *σαρκωθέντα οὐκ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, οὐτε γὰρ ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀνέληφεν ἀλλὰ σὰρξ γέγονεν, ἵνα διὰ σαρκὸς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὡς διὰ παραπέτασματος θεὸς ἡμῖν χρηματίσῃ.*"

3. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. IV., p. 27. The question of the freedom of the will of our Lord raised by the Arians was only partly answered by the anathema affixed to the creed of Nicaea. In saying that Christ was not truly God the Arians affirmed that He was capable of moral change and alteration of character. The Creed, in maintaining His Divinity, denied this. "It was content" says Dr. Bethune-Baker "to repudiate the Arian teaching, which was inconsistent with His being God." *Introduction to Christian Doctrine*, p. 170 (note).

Apollinarius. This latter proposition Apollinarius of Laodicea set himself to refute. As a friend of both Athanasius and Basil, and one of the leading opponents of Arianism, his zeal for the full true Divinity and perfect sinlessness of Christ was naturally strong. Bearing ever in mind that the keynote of the Athanasian doctrine of the Incarnation was that "God took flesh for our sakes" (θεός σαρκωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς), Apollinarius, deeming it impossible that God and man could have coexisted in our Person in their full sense, asserted that the Logos occupied the place of the human rational soul in Christ, taking to Himself a human body and an animal soul. He taught that the Humanity of our Lord, not being moved by anything but the Logos, is incapable of sin, and the result of the Logos taking the place of the higher Soul in Christ is that in Him there is only one Nature—that of the Logos become Flesh. "O new creation and wondrous mingling," he exclaims, "God and Flesh produced one Nature." (ὦ καινὴ κτίσις καὶ μίξις θεοπεσία, θεός καὶ σὰρξ μίαν ἀπετέλεσαν φύσιν.) In this way he hoped to silence for ever the Arian heresy that Christ was capable of change.¹

Where Apollinarius was right. Apollinarius was in many respects a theologian. In working out his theory he recognises truths which the Church rightly regards as fundamental. He sees clearly, for example, that if Christ was no more than an inspired man, the effect of His death would not have been the abolition of death for all humanity.²

1. Apollinarius was opposed to the Arian notion of a Χριστὸς τρεπτός. According to his view, however, perfect God and perfect man in one being was inconceivable. It seemed to him that a complete 'nature' was the same thing as a 'person'. See also the brief but suggestive article in Hastings' *Dict. of Rel. and Ethics* by Dr. Adrian Fortescue. Apollinarius lays stress on the statement that the Word became not man but Flesh (σὰρξ). The latest writer on Apollinarianism is Leitzmann, *Apollinarius von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Texte u. U. (Tübingen, 1904.) Εἰ ἀνθρώπῳ τελείῳ συνήφθη Θεὸς τέλειος, δύο ἂν ἦσαν, εἰς μὲν φύσει υἱὸς Θεοῦ, εἰς δὲ θεός. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. 151. Dorner, i., p. 999 ff. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 242.

2. Apollinarius taught that the acknowledgement of a human *Ego* in Christ would be destructive of the Christian doctrine of redemption, for ἀνθρώπου θάνατος οὐ καταργεῖ τὸν θάνατον. Our Lord must have assumed humanity as the perfect organ of the Godhead; and consequently the Godhead must have taken the place of the νοῦς in man.

He appears further to have emphasised the doctrine, afterwards admitted on all hands, that our Lord assumed not the nature of an individual man, but human nature in its entirety. He clearly saw that the purpose of the Incarnation had continued in being from all eternity; and that consequently the historical manifestation of the Logos in Christ is entirely different from the accidental Inspiration of any man. In a word, Apollinarius carried to its logical conclusion the Greek conception of Christianity, which was in his day almost confined to the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Logos.¹

Where he erred. His theory, however, was open to a serious objection. In ignoring the complete Humanity of Christ, Apollinarius emptied the doctrine of the Incarnation of its real significance. His Christ was not the Christ of the Gospels, the Man who felt sorrow, who hungered, who suffered, who died, but the Logos performing His part in human form. But that which proved the greatest shock to the sensibilities of many prominent Christian teachers of the fifth century was that Apollinarius not only denied the reality of our Lord's Humanity, but attributed His sufferings to His Divine Nature. "God suffered," "God died." Against such expressions as these the school of Antioch, under Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, directed its energies.²

The Western doctrine of the incarnation. The Western Church had also its doctrine of the Incarnation, derived from Tertullian's memorable treatise *Against Praxeas*. Tertullian had been unable to see any difficulty in the idea of two substances being united in One Person, nor in the fact that after this union each substance retained its own peculiarities. By this writer *substantia* was used to represent the Greek *φύσις*: but he appears to have employed the word in its legal rather than in its philosophical sense. A *persona* is in technical language anyone capable of entering into a contract or legal obligation. As one

1. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., pp. 154, 155.

2. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

person can hold several *substances* (*i.e.* properties), so Christ is conceived of as One Person possessed of two Natures, the Divine and the Human.¹

This theory is, however, not above criticism. As Apollinarius pointed out, a perfect God and a perfect Man can never make a uniform being. There is an apparently irreconcilable contradiction, a gulf between the two Natures which it is hard to bridge over. Nevertheless the Christian conscience and the testimony of the Gospels alike demand that Christ should be perfect God and perfect Man. At this point, therefore, it seems advisable to enumerate the three parties:—

1. The Apollinarian, which recognised in Christ only one Person, *i.e.*, that of the Logos Incarnate.
2. The Antiochene, which laid special stress on the human Ego in Christ and on the maintenance of the impassibility of the Divine Nature of our Lord as distinct from the Human.
3. The Western, which saw in Christ two natures, the Divine and the Human, each retaining its own attributes.

The complete Humanity of Christ was first asserted at the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, where opinions similar to those of Apollinarius were reprobated.² About A.D. 370 the Cappadocians joined in the attack on these doctrines, and sought, but in vain, to shew that they included the assertion that the flesh of Christ was created in Heaven and existed before He became incarnate.³ Neither Gregory of Nazianzus nor his name-sake of Nyssa were very sure of their ground in this controversy; and the latter uses a famous simile, which would in later times

1. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., pp. 122 (note), 144—146. Tertullian (*Adv. Praxeam*) says: "Videmus duplicem statum, non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona, deum et hominem, Jesum."

2. Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, § 7.

3. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. IV., pp. 154—5 (note). Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, pp. 245 ff.

have been condemned as Eutychian. "The first-fruits of human nature assumed by the almighty Godhead, as one might say—using a simile—like some drop of vinegar commingled with the infinite ocean, are in the Godhead, but not in their own peculiar properties. For if it were so, then it would follow that a duality of Sons might be conceived—if, that is, in the ineffable Godhead of the Son some nature of another kind existing in its own special characteristics were recognised—in such wise that one part was weak or little or corruptible or temporary, and the other powerful and great and incorruptible and eternal."¹ In theory the Cappadocians were less opposed to Apollinarius than they were in practice; for though, as Origenists, they clung to the belief in the Free Will of our Lord, they thought of Him in reality only as Divine.²

The Roman theologians were more decided. They, as we have seen, had been taught by Tertullian to think of two natures (*substantiae*) in one Person, and they had little hesitation in condemning Apollinarianism at a synod at Rome held under Damasus in A.D. 377 or 378. This condemnation is reiterated in the seventh anathema of the so-called 'Tome of Damasus', belonging probably to A.D. 381: "We anathematize those who say that the Word of God had His conversation in human flesh instead of the reasonable and intelligent soul of a man, since the Son Himself is the Word of God, and not in His own body in place of a reasonable and intelligent soul; but He has taken upon Him and preserved our soul, that is a reasonable and intelligent soul, (but) without sin."³ A synod held at Antioch in A.D. 379, and the Second General Council also, pronounced it heresy to say with Apollinarius that the Logos took the place of the human soul in Christ; but the question of the two Natures was left open.⁴

1. *Ep. adv. Apoll.* (Migne, vol. 45, p. 1276), quoted by Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

2. Harnack, *op. cit.*, IV., p. 160.

3. Harnack, *op. cit.*, IV., p. 158. Hahn, *Symbole*, p. 199. Hefele, *Councils*, § 91. Sozomen, VI. 25. Theodoret, V. 11. The date seems very uncertain. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

4. Hefele, *Councils*, § 91. Gregory of Nyssa, *ad Olymp.*

The School of Antioch. The school of Antioch under Diodore (394) and his more famous pupil, Theodore of Mopsuestia (*d.* 428), now rose to the height of its fame. It had produced John Chrysostom, the great preacher and sufferer for righteousness, and now enjoyed the fame of Theodore, the greatest commentator of antiquity. The general tone of its theologians was scholarly and critical, attaching great importance alike to the grammatical sense of Holy Scripture and to the Humanity and historical character of our Lord.

As the Christological controversy turned on the rival views of the Antiochian school as expounded by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and those of St. Cyril as mouthpiece of the Alexandrians, it is desirable that the opinions of these theologians should be set forth in turn.

Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, in his work on the Incarnation shews how God dwells in man. To say that this is an indwelling of the 'Being' of God is absurd, because the essence of that Being is omnipresence. Equally unreasonable is it to define the indwelling of God as no more than His presence in all His creatures. Those in whom God is pleased to dwell are objects of His choice (*εὐδοκία*). Such in a sense is the indwelling of the Logos in the Man Jesus. But it is the height of madness to say that this is similar in degree to the presence of God in a believer. The indwelling of the Logos in the Christ began with His conception in the Virgin's womb. The closeness of this union was continually increasing; and at His Baptism our Lord became united not only with the Logos but with the Holy Ghost. Though Theodore does not shrink from employing the word 'union' (*ἔνωσις*) to express the way in which the Manhood and Godhead are joined together, he prefers to say the natures were held together by conjunction (*συνάφεια*).¹

1. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 257. The passage in which these views are expressed is from a lost work *On the Incarnation*. See Dr. Swete's *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Minor Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. I., pp. lxxxii ff. See Dr. Srawley in Hastings' *Dict. of Religion and Ethics*, art. 'Antiochene Theology', and Loofs *Nestoriana*.

This system laid the utmost stress on the Human Nature of Christ—in other words, on the historical Jesus of the Gospels, as well as on the Freedom of His Will. Theodore held that, as Grace does not transform nature, but only elevates it, so even the Manhood of Christ remained manhood when conjoined with His Divinity.¹ It is not a little significant that in the contemporary Western controversy on Grace and Free Will the Pelagians had the support of the Antiochene divines.

Such were the opinions promulgated by Theodore, who died in full communion with the Church in A.D. 428, the year in which the Antiochene presbyter Nestorius was elected Patriarch of Constantinople. It was the expression of the same views by the eloquent preacher, who, like St. John Chrysostom, had been transferred from Antioch to the capital, which caused the outbreak of the almost endless Christological controversy. The title *Theotokos* (Θεοτόκος, she who gave birth to God), which had become increasingly popular with the growing importance of the Virgin Mary in the Christian system, was disputed in a sermon preached by the chaplain of the Patriarch, the presbyter Anastasius. "Let no one" he exclaimed "call Mary *Theotokos*; for Mary was but a woman, and it was impossible that God should be born of a woman."² This sentence

1. "The Antiochians" says Dr. Harnack "fully accepted the perfect humanity of Christ. The most important characteristic of this perfect humanity is its freedom. The thought that Christ possessed a free will was the lode-star of their Christology." *Hist. of Dogma*, iv., p. 165.

2. Socrates, vii. 32. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. iv., p. 168. See further Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, pp. 55 ff.: "The term had been in vogue, in some circles at least, for many years. Responsible theological teachers like Origen, Athanasius, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Cyril of Jerusalem, had used it incidentally, while Julian's taunt 'You never stop calling Mary *Theotokos*' would seem to point to a wider popular use." Theodore of Mopsuestia was apparently the first to take exception to the title. The state of affairs which led Nestorius to protest against the use of the term may be well illustrated from his first letter to Celestine. "There are even some of our own clergymen" he writes "who openly blaspheme God the Word consubstantial with the Father, representing Him as having received His first origin from the Virgin Mother of Christ." Quoted by Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

was accepted as a challenge by St. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria.

Cyril of
Alexandria.
A. D. 412-444.

When we reach the facts of the controversy, the conduct of St. Cyril will merit censure; but as a theologian the position of the bishop is less easy to assail. In ability and in insight into the merits of the question he is superior to all who attempted to grapple with it, and the dexterity with which he avoided pitfalls on either side is really admirable. To refute the Antiochian theology, and at the same time to avoid falling under the condemnation of Apollinarius, was a truly surprising feat.

Cyril started with one great advantage. Antiquity was on his side. His theology was that of Irenaeus, Athanasius, and the Cappadocians, whilst that of the Antiochian school was open to the charge of innovating.¹ The need of the Humanity of Christ had not been so strongly perceived in the early Church as that of His Divinity: consequently the Fathers had been content with asserting the reality of the flesh assumed by the Logos. The somewhat crude way in which Apollinarius had explained the relation of the Humanity to the Divinity of the Saviour had startled his contemporaries, just as the Arian theology had offended men of an earlier generation; but in their hearts the theologians of the time were agreed that Cyril, in propounding his doctrine, was rather refuting an error than putting forward a theory. This helps to explain the fact that this Father is not always consistent in his language.

Cyril sets forward as the view of the Catholic Church that the Logos took human nature to Himself in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and that therefore the title of *Theotokos* properly belongs to her. By so doing, he maintained that Godhead and Manhood were

1. "The view adopted by Cyril is undoubtedly the ancient view, that namely of Irenaeus, etc. . . . The interest they had in seeing in Christ the most perfect unity of the divine and the human, and therefore their interest in the reality of our redemption, determined the character of the development of the doctrine." Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 174.

united in the Incarnate Logos in one Person (*εἰς ἓξ ἀμφοτέρων Χριστὸς καὶ υἱός.*) Before the Incarnation there were Two Natures, but being united these can only be distinguished 'in theory'. The Godhead is not, of course, able to suffer; but, as the Logos was united to the flesh, we may say that His flesh tasted death. Thus we have the doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum* (*ἀντίδοσις ἰδιωμάτων*),¹ namely that here on earth our Lord was one Person, but He underwent different experiences in virtue of His two different Natures.

What Cyril is most anxious to shew is (a) the unchangeableness of Christ—it was impossible for Him to sin, and (b) the fact that the Incarnation was not the taking of a human personality by the Logos, but the assumption of humanity itself. The Logos took all human nature into Himself, and thus in Christ became the Second Adam. In this way man is redeemed from sin by participating in the flesh which the Saviour has glorified. This flesh, with its life-giving properties received from the Logos, is a means of bestowing Divine life on man in the Eucharistic Sacrament.²

Such was the relative position of the two great Schools when the controversy broke out; and it will be clearly seen that, even though the weapons of the warfare of both were carnal in the extreme, and mutual jealousy embittered the Alexandrian prelate and his brother of Constantinople, there were great principles at stake. In many respects the dispute has lasted down to the present time; only now it does not ostensibly take its rise in the use of the term *Theotokos*, but in the belief in the Virgin Birth.³

The Roman See.

The great determining factor was the Roman See. Not because its theologians were better equipped for doctrinal questions than those of the East; but on account of its detachment

1. Cyril's *Dogmatic Letter to Nestorius*. Hahn, p. 310. Bethune-Baker, *Introduction to Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 267. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 176 ff.

2. *Anathematisms against Nestorius*, XI., XII. Hahn, p. 315. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. IV., p. 299. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 294 (Christ's Human Nature Impersonal).

3. Additional Note at end of Chapter.

from the rivalries which distracted the Oriental patriarchates. Hitherto the doctrine of the Latins had been somewhat in sympathy with that of Antioch; but Rome and Alexandria were ancient allies, and possibly the Pelagian controversy may also have prejudiced the question. At any rate, the result of the dispute between Cyril and Nestorius seemed to depend on which of the two handled Rome most diplomatically.

Nestorius, qualified by eloquence alone for the high position to which he had been summoned, was neither as a theologian nor as a man of affairs a match for a powerful rival like Cyril. He appears to have been an honest but narrow-minded man, unversed in the ways of the world, and filled with zeal against heretics. Socrates, the historian, reports his foolish utterance in a sermon before the Emperor: "Restore unto me, O Emperor, the world weeded and purged of hereticks, and I will render heaven unto thee: aid thou me in foiling of the hereticks, and I will assist thee in the overthrowing of the Persians."¹ But for Socrates' known dislike of intolerance we might suspect that the zeal of Nestorius would have been commended, had not his subsequent opinions been condemned; but the historian, who was living in Constantinople at the time, may have only recorded the public estimation of the Patriarch whose determination to put down heresy by force had led even orthodox Christians to term him a firebrand. He appears to have been not unlike Chrysostom in his eloquence, earnestness, and ignorance of the world: though inferior to his great predecessor in genius, learning, and probably in genuine piety. Yet it is impossible not to feel that, even if the opinions of Nestorius were erroneous, his deposition was due to cabals and intrigues as unprincipled as those which led to the exile of John Chrysostom. He bore the sufferings of his exile with patience, and the opinions which have covered his name with such infamy were neither originated nor even strongly held by him. It is by the irony of fate that Nestorius is branded with

1. Socrates, VII. 29. Meredith Hanmer's Translation, 1631. His view of the Nestorian controversy is given VII. 32. He has but a low opinion of the Patriarch's learning and intelligence.

the name of a heresiarch, whilst those who held almost the same views have died in the odour of sanctity. He was a victim to the ecclesiastical politics of his age.¹

The part taken by Innocent in the affair of St. John Chrysostom had shewn how superior in moral elevation the tone of the Roman Church was to that of the Eastern patriarchates. In all his troubles Chrysostom had received support from Rome, and Nestorius naturally looked to the great Western see for help. Celestine, who had been Pope since A.D. 422, might well have stood by Nestorius; since his own doctrine of the Two Natures was practically the same as that of the Antiochian School. But Nestorius had incurred his displeasure, firstly by refusing to condemn some Pelagians who had fled to Constantinople from the anger of the Pope, and subsequently by writing a letter in which he appeared to assume that, as bishop of New Rome, he was the equal of Celestine. Cyril adopted a more prudent course by addressing Celestine in a tone of greater subserviency.² The Pope determined to put down Nes-

1. It must be remembered that until quite recently we have been compelled to form our ideas of the teaching of Nestorius almost entirely from the statements of his opponents. Lately, however, fresh evidence has come to light, notably a work known as the *Bazaar of Heracleides*. This proves to be the work of Nestorius himself, written during his exile in Egypt, and has long been known and valued among the Nestorian Christians. Its nature may be learnt from the statement of its contents prefixed by the Syriac translator:

BOOK I.

PART I. 'Of all the heresies opposed to the Church and of all the differences with regard to the faith of the 318.'

PART II. 'Against Cyril . . . of the exactions (or examination) of the judges and the charges of (or against) Cyril.'

PART III. 'His own apology, and a copy (or comparison) of their letters.'

BOOK II.

PART I. 'An apology, and a refutation of the charges (against him), dealing with those matters for which he was excommunicated.'

PART II. 'From his excommunication till the close of his life.'

A fresh examination of the evidence has accordingly been undertaken by Dr. Bethune-Baker, and published under the title of *Nestorius and his Teaching*. He has shewn that the views of Nestorius have been greatly misrepresented and his language distorted by his enemies. The conclusion to which he has come is that "it is impossible to believe that Nestorius was 'Nestorian'."

2. Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. IV., p. 183.

torius, and at a synod at Rome in A.D. 430 he ordered the Patriarch to recant on pain of excommunication.¹ Cyril had in the meantime offered to Nestorius twelve propositions to anathematize, and Nestorius had retorted by twelve counter anathematisms.² At the instigation of Nestorius, Theodosius II., who at first supported him in his dispute with Cyril, decided to call a general council to meet at Ephesus at Whitsuntide, A.D. 431.

Council of
Ephesus.
A.D. 431.

The third General Council is a proof that such assemblies, if infallible, are certainly not impeccable; for the condemnation of Nestorius was procured by a series of intrigues begun by Cyril and highly discreditable to all concerned.

Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, like Cyril, was an opponent of Nestorius; and the two resolved to begin the Council before the arrival of the Syrian bishops, headed by John of Antioch. John had sent messengers to Cyril promising that he would arrive within six days; but Cyril, either suspecting his friendship with Nestorius, or else divining that John desired delay in order that he might intervene as arbitrator in the dispute, began the Council on June 22, when Nestorius was at once deposed and excommunicated. The Syrian bishops arrived on June 26 or 27; and, in disgust at Cyril's conduct, held a rival council and excommunicated the bishops of Alexandria and Ephesus.³

Nestorius
condemned and
banished.

The unfortunate Nestorius found himself deserted on all sides. The imperial power which had supported him was no longer exercised in his favour; his friends fell off, and he was banished to the monastery of St. Euprepus at Antioch, from whence he had been summoned to the patriarchate of Constantinople. When John of Antioch and Cyril were reconciled, the former procured the removal of Nestorius to a more distant

1. After a council had been held in Rome, A.D. 430.

2. Hahn, *Symbole*, pp. 312—318. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, pp. 263 ff.

3. Bright, *Canons of the First Four General Councils*, pp. 125 ff. Candidian, the Imperial Commissioner, begged Cyril to wait for John, but he refused, displaying thereby "a want of faith". Neale, *Hist. Patr. alexand.*, 1., p. 59.

place of exile. He was sent to the Oasis of Ptolemais, captured by Blemmyes, and liberated in the Thebaid. He was again arrested, and dragged, by order of the Emperor, as Chrysostom had been, from place to place. Nothing is known of his end; but the recently discovered *Bazaar of Heraclides* proves that he must have survived the Council of Chalcedon in 451.¹ But with the Council of Ephesus he disappears from history. He did not even adhere obstinately to the doctrines for which he was condemned. "Let Mary be called *Theotokos* and let disputing cease," he cried.² Dangerous as were the opinions attributed to him, Nestorius was rather a victim to unscrupulous intrigues than a formidable heresiarch.

But the disappearance of Nestorius did not mean that the controversy was at an end: on the contrary, it raged with renewed vigour when the half-unwitting cause of the trouble was out of the way. With Cyril at war with the bishop of Antioch, there seemed little prospect of peace; for though Nestorius had been unaccountably deserted by all his former supporters, the School of Antioch was bitterly aggrieved, feeling that the Alexandrian teaching had gained a victory by a snatch vote of a council packed with the supporters of Cyril. As early as 431 the Antiochenes drew up a formula of their belief, which they sent to the Emperor. It was a document which Nestorius himself could have signed, for the word 'Theotokos' was explained by saying "There was a union (*ἔνωσις*) of the two Natures, and therefore we confess that the holy Virgin is Mother of God." This creed is said to have been the work of Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, who played so prominent a part in later controversy.³ Theodosius II., who was far from being pleased with Cyril's conduct at Ephesus, encouraged the reconciliation of the two rival prelates of

1. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, pp. 36 ff., and an article by the same writer, 'Date of the Death of Nestorius,' in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. IX., No. 36.

2. Socrates, *H. E.* VII. 33. "But no man thought that he spoke this and repented in his heart."

3. Hahn, *Symbole*, p. 215. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, IV., p. 189.

Alexandria and Antioch; and Paul, bishop of Emesa, was sent to Alexandria to arrange matters. He shewed much tact in soothing Cyril's susceptibilities; and in a sermon he declared, to the joy of the people, that "Mary brought forth Emmanuel", *i.e.* the Godhead as well as the Manhood of the Saviour. In 433 the reconciliation between John of Antioch and Cyril was finally arranged; and though neither prelate pleased the extreme members of his party by the concessions he had made, peace lasted till Cyril's death in A.D. 444, and Nestorianism was by the aid of the Imperial authorities thrust beyond the frontiers of the Empire.¹

Character of
Cyril.

Cyril of Alexandria is one of those great characters in Church History to whom it is scarcely possible to do justice. We are naturally prejudiced against him, for the unscrupulous exercise of his position at the head of the Alexandrian Church to further those ambitious projects which had long been the tradition of his see. We are inclined to pronounce him an excellent theologian but a bad man, and to regard this divorce of practice from theory as a specially odious trait in his character. In addition to his behaviour at Ephesus, the murder of Hypatia will always leave a stain on his memory, though it is impossible to prove his complicity.² Yet it is possible that the faults exhibited by Cyril were the failings of a system rather than of an individual. The two Churches with a distinct policy in the fourth and fifth centuries were Rome and Alexandria. Their circumstances were not unlike, since the two cities were at this period remarkable for their independence of imperial control, and their jealousy of the upstart pretensions of Constantinople. The difference between

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Cyril', vol. I., p. 771a.

2. Socrates, VII. 15. "No trustworthy account connects Cyril directly with her murder; but of course he must bear the blame of participation in the temper which led to it." *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Hypatia'. Socrates, who is very hostile to Cyril, does not directly lay the blame of the murder upon him; and Stanley (*Eastern Church*, Lect. VII.) is hardly justified in saying that even the orthodox suspected Cyril of complicity in the murder. But Newman is right when he says "I don't think Cyril himself would like his historical acts to be taken as the measure of his inward sanctity": quoted by Dom Butler, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*.

them lay in the fact that, whilst Rome's ambition was to legislate, Alexandria desired to direct the theology of the rest of the Church. The two sees had been natural allies since the days of Athanasius; though to the credit of Rome it must be said that Theophilus forfeited the friendship of the Apostolic See by his conduct towards Chrysostom.

At Ephesus Cyril appears in a better light than Nestorius. He shewed no subservience to the secular power: but fearlessly upheld the right of the Church to manage her own affairs. If unscrupulous, Cyril was at least no time-server. In his dealings with John of Antioch, the bishop of Alexandria shewed that he was not altogether destitute of the wise and statesmanlike qualities of his great predecessor, Athanasius. He knew how to give way in minor points, provided main principles were preserved. In his later days he had to bear the reproach of having temporised in order to secure the unity of the Church. But in clearness of insight into the exact merits of the complicated controversy about the Two Natures, Cyril was unrivalled.¹

The controversy was to Cyril no mere question of words and names. It was in his eyes of as vital importance as the Arian dispute had been to Athanasius. It may be that the relation of the Two Natures of Christ may again be the subject of discussion, and that the theology of Cyril may be of service in bringing men to a clear view of the merits of the case. To Cyril, Nestorianism—the sharp separation of the Manhood from the Godhead—meant neither more nor less than the denial of the Incarnation of the Word of God, and this was the pivot round which the whole theology of Alexandria had revolved.²

Nestorianism, unlike Arianism, caused a breach in the Eastern Church which was never healed. At Edessa, despite the efforts of Rabbulas the bishop, a strong supporter of Cyril, the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia were widely

1. Harnack says of Cyril: "In a question which was to him a matter of faith Cyril had agreed to a compromise, in proof of the fact that all hierarchs are open to conviction when they are in danger of losing power and influence." *Hist. Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 189.

2. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 174—175.

disseminated, thanks to the efforts of Ibas, who succeeded Rabbulas. Barsumas, an enthusiastic Nestorian who had been driven out of Edessa by Rabbulas, established himself at Nisibis, which now became the centre of the movement. The Persian kings tolerated no form of Christianity but Nestorianism, which is accused of having shewn undue compliance towards the opinions of the Zoroastrian priests. From Persia the Nestorian missionaries went to the Far East, perhaps even to China.¹

Dioscorus. Cyril died in A.D. 444, and was succeeded by Dioscorus, who had been his archdeacon. Though he was doubtless the subject of much calumny, there seems little reason to question the general opinion that the new bishop was an arrogant and violent man. If we may believe one of his accusers at Chalcedon, Dioscorus inaugurated his episcopate by a persecution of the friends and relatives of Cyril. He was further accused of saying that Egypt belonged to him rather than to the Emperors, a charge which reminds us of the one made against Athanasius a century earlier, that he had threatened to use his influence as bishop to stop the corn ships sailing to Constantinople.² Dioscorus seems to have upheld all the high pretensions of his position; and he very nearly succeeded in imposing the creed of Alexandria on the Christian world, nor was his failure due solely to his defects of character.

The imperial Court at Constantinople was controlled by the religious grandchildren of the great Theodosius. The Emperor Theodosius II. was a prototype of the sort of

1. Bethune-Baker, *Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 279, 'The Nestorian (East-Syrian) Church.'—"In the eleventh and twelfth centuries," Dr. Baker says, "the Nestorian Church had become the largest Christian body in the world—the Christian Church of the Far East." Dorner, *Doct. of Person of Christ*, Div. II., vol. I., Eng. Transl.—The Nestorian "was the first party which the Church shewed itself incapable of overcoming—an incapability arising from its neglecting either to appropriate or to evolve from itself the element of truths of which the party was the representative".

2. Vide *supra*, p. 317. For the charges brought against Dioscorus at the Council of Chalcedon, see the *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Dioscorus'.

pious sovereign occasionally produced by mediæval Christianity. Pope Leo describes him as "having not only the heart of an emperor, but also of a priest". He was a good and merciful man; and he is honourably distinguished among Christian rulers for his regard for human life. When asked why he did not inflict capital punishment, his answer was, "It is neither a great nor a difficult thing to put a mortal to death, but it is God only who can resuscitate by repentance a man who has once died."¹ But his virtues were almost nullified by his superstitious devotion to the clergy, and especially to the monks. Such a preposterous ascetic as Symeon the Stylite had only to command to be obeyed.²

The palace at Constantinople was said to resemble a monastery, the daily round of services being observed by the Emperor and his four sisters: but the whole administration of the Empire was characterised by imbecility; and Attila, the king of the Huns, who had invaded Europe, was allowed to be a constant menace as long as Theodosius lived.³ The Emperor's chief interest was theology; and he intervened in all the disputes of his time without discretion. He supported Nestorius, and then abandoned him, ordering his works to be burned, and his followers to be called Simonians, after Simon Magus, the father of heresy. In the Eutychian controversy he favoured the Alexandrian party, which suffered defeat directly his power to protect it ceased at his death in A.D. 450. For the last seven years of his reign, Theodosius was under the sway of his minister, the eunuch Chrysaphius.

Pulcheria. His second sister, Pulcheria, was in some respects a worthy daughter of the House of Theodosius the Great. At the age of fifteen,

1. S. Leo Magn., *Ep.* vii. "Ut nobis non solum regium sed etiam sacerdotalem animum inesse gaudeamus." Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 22 f.

2. Symeon the Stylite, after practising many austerities, erected his pillar at Antioch in A.D. 423. In A.D. 430 it had reached the height of 40 cubits. He made Theodosius revoke an edict restoring to the Jews the synagogues at Antioch from which the Christians had expelled them. Evagrius, i. 13. Nöldeke, *Sketches from Eastern History*, vii.

3. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. ii., p. 97.

when her brother the Emperor was thirteen years old, she was declared Augusta; and she instructed him in all the etiquette of an oriental court, teaching him the art of bearing himself with dignity, and of shewing affability or condescension where desirable.¹ She also had the lad trained in manly exercises; but above all things she instilled into her brother's mind piety and reverence to those in authority in the Church. After her brother's death, July 28, 450, for the sake of the Empire, she married Marcian, a soldier and senator of experience; and her choice was justified by the way in which he dispelled the fear of Attila, who had been a danger to the Empire so long as Theodosius was ready to buy him off, but ceased to be formidable when the government was in the hands of a soldier and a man of courage. It was Pulcheria and Marcian who brought about the settlement of the Eutychian controversy at Chalcedon.

Policy
of Dioscorus.

Cyril, it will be remembered, had pacified the Church by his compromise with the Antiochian school in A.D. 433. The terms *Θεοτόκος* and *ἕνωσις*—the latter as applied to the Two Natures—were accepted, and the bishop of Alexandria had acknowledged that the Two Natures at the Incarnation were united into one. But the School of Antioch still clung to the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia; whilst the Alexandrians persisted that Christ's Nature after the Incarnation was One Nature made flesh (*μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη*).

Since the victory of Cyril over Nestorius, Theodosius II. had been entirely under the guidance of the Alexandrian party, and Dioscorus saw the opportunity of bringing the whole of the Eastern Church under the dominion of Alexandria, as the Rome of Eastern Christendom. But to raise his see to this position it was necessary to declare the upholders of the Two Natures, especially Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, to be heretics, and to bring upon Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, the fate of St. John Chrysostom and Nestorius.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus. Theodoret is one of the most interesting characters in the fifth century. He was bishop of Cyrus or Cyrhus, a town in the province of Euphratensis adjoining Coele-Syria, and subject to the authority of the bishop of Antioch. Cyrus, though an unimportant town, was the seat of a bishop who had the charge of no less than eight hundred parishes, most of them with churches of their own, and a vast number of religious houses. The episcopal revenues were in themselves sufficient to enable the bishop to execute works of public utility, and to embellish the city. The diocese of Cyrus was about forty miles in length and breadth.¹

Theodoret, though he had materially assisted in the union of 433, had been a personal enemy of Cyril, and had never assented to the excommunication of Nestorius. Dioscorus therefore singled him out as a special object of vengeance, and the Emperor was persuaded to order Domnus, who had in A.D. 441 succeeded his uncle John as bishop of Antioch, to proceed against Theodoret in his capacity of Patriarch. But Domnus, though he shewed much weakness afterwards, on this occasion stood by his friend; and Theodoret was at least allowed to retain his diocese.

It seemed as though the ruin of Flavian, the Patriarch of Constantinople, would be more easy to accomplish. Flavian had already incurred the ill-will of Theodosius, and he was embroiled in a dispute with Eutyches, the archimandrite of a great monastery in the neighbourhood of the capital, and a violent anti-Nestorian. At a synod at Constantinople on November 8, A.D. 448, Eusebius of Dorylaeum accused Eutyches to Flavian of denying the Two Natures of Jesus Christ. What made the charge more weighty lay in the fact that the accuser had been an enemy of Nestorius. Eutyches was deposed "amid tears" for teaching "a blending" (*σύνκρασις*) and a confusion (*σύγχυσις*) of the Godhead and Manhood after the Incarnation.²

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Theodoret', vol. IV., p. 906 b. Letter of Theodoret to Leo, *Ep.* LII. in collection of Leo the Great's Letters.

2. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 200.

A commission was appointed by the Emperor to investigate the proceedings of the synod, which Eutyches declared had been falsely reported; but apparently there was nothing in the charge, so the acts were confirmed. Dioscorus declined to acknowledge the legality of the synod, and entered into communion with Eutyches. At this juncture, on May 30, 449, Theodosius II. and the Western Emperor Valentinian III., his kinsman, ordered a general council to assemble at Ephesus to decide the dispute; for, as usual, both sides had placed their case before Leo I., the Roman pontiff, the most remarkable man who had hitherto filled that great position. Leo on this occasion took a step opposed to the general practice of the Roman see. In a letter to Flavian he pronounced judgment on an intricate theological question, giving the reasons for his decision.

The Tome of Leo. Leo's *Tome*, as it is usually called, is the Western doctrine of the Two Natures. It is based on Tertullian's treatise against Praxeas, and embodies phrases of Ambrose and Augustine. The Eutychian or Monophysite view is that before the Incarnation there were Two Natures; but that, when Christ assumed humanity, but One Nature, the Divine, was the result. The *Tome* adheres to the Western formula, 'Two Natures in One Person.'¹ Leo declared that a council was not needed, as the question had been decided.

The Latrocinium. A council, however, assembled at Ephesus in August, 449. Dioscorus presided, supported by the imperial police and by the still more formidable monks of Barsumas. Eutyches was acquitted, and Flavian and his supporters deposed. It is said that Flavian died of the rough treatment he received. Even Domnus of Antioch, though he had supported Dioscorus during the early sessions of the council, was condemned. Theodoret and Ibas² were

1. The word *Tome*, τόμος, means a concise statement, and is applied to synodical letters. An excellent summary is given by Dr. Bethune-Baker, *Introduction*, p. 288. For a severe criticism, see Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. IV., pp. 202 ff. See also *infra*, Chap. XIX., pp. 531—2.

2. Ibas, bishop of Edessa, was the friend and supporter of Theodoret and the great opponent of the party of Cyril in the East.

deprived of their sees and excommunicated. It was a complete victory for Alexandria. The decision of Rome had been set aside by a general council, and the Church of Athanasius had again defined the faith of the world. Leo indignantly declared that the assembly at Ephesus was not a council, but a *Latrocinium* (a gathering of robbers), and by this name it is generally known.¹ Strong in the decision of the council and the support of the Emperor, Dioscorus raised the power of the Egyptian see to its zenith. In vain the imperial family of the West protested: Theodosius II. refused to listen to his relatives. The sole hope of the anti-Alexandrian party lay in Pulcheria, who had been kept from the Court by the influence of the minister, Chrysaphius.

But on July 28, 450, Theodosius died, and the whole situation was changed. Pulcheria became Empress, and immediately made her position stronger by espousing Marcian. The new sovereigns were not disposed to submit to the dictation of Dioscorus, nor to have their dominions ruled spiritually from Alexandria. Constantinople must be reinstated as the first see in the East; and as this could only be done with the aid of Rome, Leo's star was again in the ascendant.

Marcian and Pulcheria decided to call a council at Nicaea; and to this decision Leo, though, like all popes, he dreaded the possible results of such an assembly, and would have preferred to have the matter settled by a synod in Italy, had perforce to agree. The Pope resolved not to attend in person, but to send four legates with precise instructions to see that nothing was done to the detriment of the Apostolic See. As the legates insisted on the presence of Marcian at the Council, the meeting of the bishops was, at the last moment

Pulcheria
and Marcian.

Council
of Chalcedon.
A.D. 451.

1. Leo, *Fpp.* 44 § 1, 45 § 2, 95 § 2 (*ad Pulcheriam*: it is in this letter that the word *Latrocinium* occurs), 85 § 1. The character of this council is much disputed: most writers naturally condemn it; but Harnack considers that the proceedings were at least as dignified as those of the orthodox Council of Chalcedon. (*History of Dogma*, iv., p. 210.) See Martin, *Le Brigandage d'Ephèse*, and Perry, *Second Council of Ephesus*. Even allowing for exaggeration the proceedings were sufficiently disgraceful. Bethune-Baker, *Introduction*, p. 284. Gore, *Leo the Great*, pp. 74 ff.

ordered to take place at Chalcedon. The proceedings were opened on October 8, 451, under the presidency of Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum, the papal legate, and Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople.

The Council of Chalcedon was the largest which had hitherto assembled, five hundred and twenty bishops having been present.¹ Dioscorus seems to have shewn himself firm and dignified; but his condemnation was a foregone conclusion. The *Tome* of Leo was accepted with acclamation. The one difficulty was the restoration of Theodoret and Ibas. The appearance of the former was the occasion of a furious scene, the factions of "the most reverend the bishops", as they are called, trying to howl one another down with great vigour. Marcian was greeted as the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David: Pulcheria as the new Helena. As at the *Latrocinium*, the great question of the Two Natures seems to have been settled by clamour.²

In effect the Chalcedonian definition of the relation of the Godhead and Manhood of Christ was a compromise between Nestorianism and the Monophysite teaching of Eutyches. Nestorianism kept the Godhead distinct from the Manhood in the Person of Christ. Eutychianism fused them into a single Nature. The Council decided that Jesus Christ was "consubstantial with the Father as touching His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as touching His Manhood", and that He must be acknowledged in Two Natures "without confusion, without change, without division, without separation" (*ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως γυνωριζόμενον*); the difference of the Natures being in no way destroyed on account of the union, but rather the peculiar property of each Nature being preserved and concurring in one Person and one *hypostasis*.³

1. Or, counting those that were absent, but voted through their metropolitans, six hundred and thirty.

2. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. II.

3. Bright, *Canons of the First Four General Councils*, p. xxxv. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 287. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book v., cap. 54, § 10.

Effects of
the Council of
Chalcedon.

The Chalcedonian definition was a Roman formula forced on the Oriental Church by imperial authority. As such it could not be universally acceptable, the fact being that the East was at heart unanimous in favour of the doctrine of St. Cyril. The interest of the Greeks in Christianity was, as we have said, at this time mainly theological: to them Christ was the Word of God revealing the Father.¹ In the controversy the Alexandrians were repelled by Nestorianism because it seemed to deny that the 'Word was made Flesh', while the Antiochians felt that the Cyrillian teaching implied that 'God suffered'. In the West the important aspect of Christianity was its soteriology. The controversy on Pelagianism, the only one that interested the West, turned on the means whereby man was saved. Leo's explanation of the Two Natures satisfies the need of the Latins for a Saviour who is God and man. But it could not be expected to close the question for the subtle-minded Greeks. So great a controversy was not to be silenced by a single council; and it continued in various forms for at least two centuries.

The exercise of the imperial authority at Chalcedon made Constantinople the chief see in the East, and placed the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the hands of the Emperor. Alexandria, on the other hand, lost her importance. Only a small minority accepted the formula of the council, the majority adhered to Dioscorus and remained Monophysite. The great city was no longer attached to the Empire by sentiment; and when the Mohammedan invasion came it submitted to the Muslims at once. The loss of Egypt to the Empire was one remote result of the Council of Chalcedon. To this day the Coptic Church is Monophysite.

The Controversies of the Fifth Century. The three great controversies of the first half of the fifth century, the Origenistic, the Nestorian, and the Monophysite, are remarkably alike in the intellectual activity displayed, and in the passions they aroused. They all shewed a vitality lasting for generations: that

they were no mere *logomachies* is proved by the fact that in one form or another they seem to be reviving in our day. Despite the many difficulties he presents, Origen is perhaps the Christian writer who appeals most to modern ideas; and in recent controversies as to the Nature of our Lord we are perforce driven to seek what Cyril, Theodore, and Theodoret thought on the subject.

But despite the intellectual activity of the fifth century, it is so unlike our own as to be almost incomprehensible to us. After regarding with astonishment the acuteness of the mind of Cyril, the extent of the erudition of Theodoret, or the singular moderation of the historian Socrates, we are amazed to find a credulity worthy of a totally uncivilized age, and an unreasoning superstition hardly reconcilable with the thought that the men who were swayed by it could have been the products of an educated age.

Equally remarkable are its moral inconsistencies. Of the reality of men's piety there is no doubt. Chrysostom and Theodoret, for example, were in many respects men of beautiful Christian character. Yet Chrysostom can assure his friend Olympias that she will find joy in heaven, the joy of seeing her enemies "fast bound, tormented in flames, gnashing their teeth", etc.,¹ whilst Theodoret exults over the death of St. Cyril with what our age would perforce term indecent joy. Can we wonder then at the excesses attributed to violent and unscrupulous partisans in the fierce ecclesiastical conflicts which made the streets of the great cities of the Empire scenes of bloodshed?

Yet the Church of Eastern Christendom did a work of which we of the West have reaped the benefit; nor were we capable of performing it. It needed the acute Greek brain, trained by centuries of metaphysical thought, to express the meaning of that which Occidentals can feel, but cannot put into words. The Greek Fathers thought out for us the problem raised by Arius, and the still more complex one concerning the Two

Importance
of the Eastern
controversies.

1. Stephens, *Life of St. Chrysostom*, p. 372.

Natures; and we now are turning from the great men whose writings made the Christianity of the Middle Ages and of the Reformation, from St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, from Luther and Calvin, to the Greek thinkers, St. Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Cyril, to help the religious difficulties of a scientific age.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY AND MODERN THOUGHT.

ONE of the strongest modern objections to the doctrinal (not the historical) aspect of the Virgin Birth of our Lord is that, if our Lord's Birth was unnatural (*i.e.* different from that of other men) He was not a real man. Thus the doctrine taught by St. Cyril, that the flesh of Christ was transformed by the indwelling of the Logos into something supernatural, capable of producing Divine life in the Sacraments, has been declared to be destructive of the doctrine of the Incarnation and really to tend in the direction of Docetism. (*Hibbert Journal*, October, 1903.)

But a more practical difficulty is raised by the teaching that Christ is *ἀρπεντος*, *i.e.* incapable of change, and not possessed of any freedom of will or choice of good and evil. St. Cyril, we are told, like Apollinarius, regarded with the deepest abhorrence the thought that Christ possessed a free will. (Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 179, *note*.) In this case, however, the fact of our Lord's sinlessness seems to lose its value, at any rate to the men of our day. I venture to suggest that this insistence on the unchangeable nature of our Lord was caused (*a*) by the Arian doctrine that the Logos was *τρειτάτος*, and (*b*) by the indifference on the part of the Alexandrian teachers to the human element in the Gospel story. (*a*) If the Logos of God were, as the Arians maintained, a creature called into being before Time in order that God might create the Universe, then He might be, like Satan, able to choose between good and evil, and have been accepted as Son of God because He chose the good. To acknowledge therefore that our Lord was capable of sin would have been to admit that He was *τρειτάτος*, and consequently to

have conceded the whole of the Arian position. To have maintained, on the other hand, that our Lord as the Word of God was unchangeable, but that He could have sinned in His human manifestation, seemed to justify the view of Apollinarius, that those who give a human soul (*i. e.* one capable of temptation) to our Lord really acknowledge a *tetrad* instead of a Trinity in the Godhead. (*b*) But Harnack truly says of the teaching of Apollinarius, that "estimated by the presuppositions and aims of the Greek conception of Christianity it is complete" (*Hist. of Dogma*, vol. IV., p. 155); further on (p. 161) he remarks, "None of the religious thought at that time led to the idea of a 'perfect man' with free will"; and on p. 175 he says of St. Cyril, "Faith does not in his case start from the historical Christ, but from the Θεὸς λόγος, and is occupied only with Him." It was, in fact, mainly due to the School of Antioch that the Christology of the Church "did not entirely become the development of an idea of Christ which swallowed up the historical Christ". (*ib.*, p. 171.)

This being the case, it is not surprising that the modern desire for the historic Jesus of the Gospels finds the attitude of St. Cyril and many of his contemporaries difficult to understand. But it must not be supposed that the question of the reality of our Lord's temptation was completely disregarded. Gregory of Nyssa discusses the sinlessness of Christ in his *Antirrheticus adv. Apollinarium, contra Eunomium*, and his *Epist. ad Eustathium*. He dwells on (*a*) the reality of our Lord's Humanity, and (*b*) the completeness of the Union of the Two Natures in Christ. He fully admits those passages in the New Testament which refer to our Lord's human will, human ignorance, growth in knowledge, submission to temptation, shrinking from death, as proofs that our Lord underwent a human development. But at the same time he draws a distinction between the πάθη natural to humanity and the πάθη which result from sin. Christ shared in the former, but not in the latter. This participation in the weaknesses of human nature involved the possibility of temptation. Thus in the story of Gethsemane he distinguishes the two wills—the human will which shrank from death and the Divine will which enabled Him to endure. This language is not really affected by the almost Monophysite terms in which Gregory speaks elsewhere of the

union of the Divine and Human natures. When Gregory speaks of the human nature being absorbed in the Divine, he is really thinking of the condition of our Lord's Humanity after the Ascension. His language on the whole lends no countenance to the view that his conception of our Lord's Humanity was Docetic. (Ottley, *Incarnation*, p. 60, n. 4.) The emphasis on the reality of our Lord's human development received a new impulse from Theodore and the Antiochene theologians.

[I owe these ideas to the Rev. J. H. Srawley, D.D., who has kindly allowed me the use of notes he has made. For the arguments in *Athanasius contra Apollinarium*, see Bethune-Baker, *Introduction to Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 252.]

I believe no better summary of the Christological controversy can be found than the following:—

“It is easy on the one hand to regard our Lord as mere man, differing in no essential particular from Moses, or Socrates, or Confucius. It is easy, on the other hand, to regard Him as possessing a divine mind in a human body, and therefore entirely free from human infirmities, incapable of doubt, ignorance, and temptation. It is difficult to accept the Scriptural view that He possessed a human mind with its essential limitations united with the fulness of the Godhead. This paradox, this dualism, transcends human thought, but satisfies human need. We maintain it as a mystery not to be measured by human intelligence, but necessary for human salvation.”—
Dr. A. Wright, Preface to *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. vi.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE WESTERN CHURCH.

Greek and Latin Christianity. As the philosophical genius of Greek Christianity was in the fifth century devoted to the study of doctrines and the formation of the orthodox dogmas of the Church, so the Latin aptitude for organization and government was directed to the erection of a system of belief and practice destined to survive the destruction of the Roman empire. As the Imperial rule of Rome crumbled away, as province after province was lost to civilization, the fabric of the Catholic Church rose on firm foundations, majestic amid the surrounding ruin of the ancient world. In all history nothing is more remarkable than the way in which Latin Christianity fought and overcame the barbarism which engulfed the Empire.

From the death of Theodosius the Great (A.D. 395) to the deposition of Romulus Augustulus (A.D. 476) the Roman dominion, in Britain, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Italy, vanished like the snow at the approach of spring. As long as Theodosius lived, the frontiers of the provinces of Western Europe and Northern Africa remained practically unchanged. But within seventy years all had become merged in barbarian kingdoms. The terrible invasion of the Huns drove the Teutonic nations in increasing numbers over the boundaries of the Empire, the enfeebled population of which was powerless to resist the onslaught. The partition of his dominions by Theodosius between his sons Arcadius and Honorius was fatal, at least to Western Europe. Though nominally the Empire continued to be one, it was in reality divided into two sections, alien from one

another in language, sympathy, and genius. We have consequently reached the period at which Latin Christianity begins to become distinct from Greek.

Latin Christianity owes its chief strength to the scholarly labours of St. Jerome, the teaching of St. Augustine, and the administrative genius of the bishops of Rome from Damasus to Leo the Great. As, however, the period before us is too crowded with events to be studied briefly, it is necessary to restrict ourselves to these heads.

St. Jerome
(Hieronymus).

Jerome (Hieronymus) is a character difficult to understand unless studied with a certain sympathy. If we regard him as a great saint and read his life from the standpoint of the hagiologist, we shall be pained and shocked at the spirit displayed by him in many of his works. But if we begin by not taking him too seriously, and think of him as an exceedingly eccentric scholar with a passion for quarreling with everyone with whom he came in contact and a remarkable power of expressing his opinion in the language of vigorous invective, we shall perhaps end by acknowledging that in an age of great men St. Jerome deservedly occupies a high place. The facts of his life are briefly these. He was a native of Stridon in Pannonia, his parents being in easy but not opulent circumstances. He was born about the middle of the fourth century, and received an excellent classical education. He was at school when the death of Julian the Apostate (A.D. 363) was announced. In company with his friend and foster-brother, Bonosus, Jerome went to Rome, where he studied under Aelius Donatus, the famous grammarian, and, as was customary, frequented the law courts to hear the best pleaders. But he must soon have felt the attraction of Christianity, for he says he was accustomed to visit the tombs of the martyrs in the Catacombs.¹ He was baptized before A.D. 366, and shortly afterwards visited Gaul, finally, in A.D. 370, settling at Aquileia in the neighbourhood of his home. Here Jerome lived in the society of several friends, among whom was Rufinus, his bitter enemy in

1. *Commentary on Ezekiel*, XL. 5.

later life. All were alike devoted to the study of the sacred Scriptures and to ascetic practices, under the guidance of Evagrius, afterwards one of the rival bishops of the divided Church of Antioch. But at the end of three years Jerome had made so many enemies that he had to retire from the neighbourhood, and the pious coterie of scholars broke up. The 'Consular' of the province, possibly no less a person than the famous St. Ambrose, who became bishop of Milan in 374, may have hastened Jerome's departure. It is even conceivable that Jerome describes him as a bloodthirsty tyrant, but this phrase occurs in a very bombastic account of a miracle.¹

Jerome at Antioch. Jerome's next home was Antioch, whither he travelled with Evagrius and some friends. Here he fell ill and was supposed to be dying. In a trance he believed himself to be carried before the throne of God, and condemned as being "not a Christian but a Ciceronian."² The saints around the throne interceded for him, but he was beaten with many stripes before being permitted to return to earth. He made a vow never to study the Classics again; but it must be admitted that, though from henceforth his time was devoted to sacred studies, he interpreted the obligation in regard to the vow somewhat liberally.

Jerome a hermit. On his recovery Jerome became a monk in the desert of Chalcis, and in a letter written ten years later he describes his austerities at this time. He speaks of his skin becoming "black as an Ethiopian's", of his sleepless nights, of his bones which scarce clung together, of his companionship with wild beasts and scorpions.³ He did not, however,

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Hieronymus' by Dean Fremantle. Jerome's first letter to his friend Innocentius describes in very inflated language a miraculous deliverance of a woman accused of adultery who professed her innocence. The 'Consular' is represented in the light of a heathen persecutor, raging "like a wild beast" and threatening the executioner with punishment if he did not extort a confession from the woman by torture. If the Consular was St. Ambrose, it was before his baptism; but the whole conduct of the judge is described in such a way as to give a rhetorical effect to Jerome's description. Ambrose is praised by Jerome, *Ep.* XLVIII.

2. *Ad Eustochium*, *Ep.* XXII. 30.

3. *Ibid.*, XXII. 7.

neglect his literary labours; but wrote many letters, composed a Life of Paul the Hermit, and began the study of Hebrew.¹ Jerome, moreover, was never too busy to quarrel with his neighbours, and in A.D. 379 the ill-will of the monks drove him back again to Antioch.

Ordination. At Antioch, much against his will, he received ordination to the priesthood at the hands of Paulinus, one of the three rival bishops of that city. Jerome, however, never seems to have acted as a presbyter, and at a later time, when a priest was required for the performance of divine service at Bethlehem, he procured the ordination of his brother, Paulinian.

Jerome and Gregory of Nazianzus. The year 380 found Jerome at Constantinople as a disciple of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, devoted to the study of Greek literature, especially to the works of Origen, for whom he had at this time a great admiration. He translated and brought up to date the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, and at this period of his career he seems to have begun to realise the imperfections of the various versions of Scripture current in his day.

Jerome at Rome. By the spring of 382 Jerome was once more in Rome, where he found an appreciative patron in Pope Damasus, himself an antiquarian and friend of scholars.² At the instigation of the Pope he set himself first to prepare a revision of the Psalter, and then to collate the numerous Latin versions of the New Testament. He also began to make a special study of the Old Testament by collating the LXX and the version of Aquila with the original Hebrew. He was at this time a zealous supporter of Origen in opposition to the views generally held by the Roman clergy.

At Rome Jerome exerted great influence over the noble ladies of the capital. The house of Paula, to which he was introduced by his friend, bishop

1. *Ep.* x. The Life of Paulus the Ascetic was dedicated to the centenarian Paulus of Concordia.

2. *Ep.* CXXVII. 7. Jerome went to Rome in the company of Paulinus, the bishop of Antioch acknowledged by the Pope, and Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus.

Epiphanius, became the centre of a great ascetic movement. Paula had three daughters—Blesilla, Julia Eustochium, and Paulina; and all four ladies placed themselves in Jerome's hands to be instructed. These and several female members of the most ancient patrician houses eagerly listened to his exhortations, and by his persuasion renounced the world, in order to give themselves up to the study of the Scriptures in both Hebrew and Greek, to works of charity, and to severe ascetic observances. Julia Eustochium became a professed virgin, and Jerome addressed to her his twenty-second epistle, 'On the Preservation of Virginity.'

This letter is remarkable for its exaggerated praise of the virgin life; the only good marriage could do, in Jerome's opinion, was to cause more who might take the vows of celibacy to be born into the world.¹ It contains a most interesting description of Jerome's early experiences, and a furious attack on the Roman clergy, who, with the great ladies of the capital, are mercilessly satirised. Here is a scene that he gives us in the house of a noble lady:—

The descendant of the Decii or Maximi is in the grief of early widowhood; with rouged cheeks she reclines upon a luxurious couch, the Gospels bound in purple and gold in her hand. Her room is filled with parasites, who entertain the lady with scandal concerning worldly and spiritual things; but she is especially proud of being the patroness of priests. Clergy enter to pay the noble matron a visit, kiss her on the head, and with outstretched hands receive her gracious alms. If they pocket her bounty with, perhaps, a certain polite bashfulness, the monk, who, barefoot and in a black and dirty habit, is dismissed by the servants on the threshold, shews no such hesitation. But see, the motley eunuchs

1. So a mother who devotes her daughter to virginity becomes God's mother-in-law (*socrus Dei*), *Ep.* XXII. 20. The letter to Eustochium is altogether a strange production, considering it was addressed by a grave ascetic to a girl of seventeen. So is *Ep.* CVII. to Laeta, on the training of her little daughter Paula who was destined to be a nun. There is, however, in the latter letter more good sense and good feeling than Mr. Glover in his criticism on it (*Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, p. 178) gives credit for.

are flinging wide open the doors for the deacon, who drives up in a fashionable carriage with such fiery horses that one might suppose him to be the brother of the king of Thrace! His silken garments breathe of perfumed waters, his hair is curled by the barber with the highest skill, and with jewelled fingers foppishly raising his dress he skips into the palace, his dainty feet clad by the skill of the shoemaker in shoes of the softest and glossiest morocco leather. Anyone seeing this man would take him for a bridegroom rather than a clergyman. He is known through the whole town under the nickname of 'Town Coachman', and the street boys call after him 'Pipizo' or 'Geranopepa'. "*Ueredarius urbis . . et altilis γερανοπίππης, uulgo pipizo nominatur.*" He is everywhere and nowhere to be met with; nothing happens which he is not the first to know, and there is no gossip of the town which he has not discovered or magnified. His career is in short this: He has become a priest in order to have freer access to beautiful women; his way of life is briefly as follows: he rises early, and having planned the visits of the day sets forth on his wanderings. Where he finds anything beautiful in a house, be it a cushion or a fine cloth, or any kind of furniture, he persistently admires it until it is presented to him, for the sharp tongue of the 'Town Coachman' is feared by all women.¹

Jerome's
unpopularity.

This bitterly sarcastic description of Christian Rome matches well with Am-
 manus' picture of patrician society a few
 years earlier; but the clergy naturally detested so
 merciless a satirist of their habits as Jerome; although
 in the earlier days of his sojourn at Rome, as he himself
 informs us, many had deemed him to be the proper
 successor to Damasus.² But in a few years his enemies

1. The above is taken from Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, vol. 1., p. 143, Eng. Tr. It is a summary of the letter to Eustochium, *Ep.* xxii. 28. For a discussion of the language of Jerome see Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, pp. 135 ff.

2. *Ep.* xlv. 3, *Ad Asellam*. "Totius in me urbis studia consonabant, omnium paene iudicio dignus summo sacerdotio iudicabar. Damasus meus sermo erat."

had become at least as numerous as his friends; and when Paula's daughter Blesilla, a young widow, died of the austerities recommended to her by Jerome, a riot occurred at the funeral. The cry "The monks to the Tiber!" was raised.¹ No advice could induce the saint to modify his language on this occasion; he treated his opponents with torrents of abuse; and, finding Rome no place for him, retired, accompanied by Paula and Eustochium, to the Holy Land.

**Visit to
Jerusalem.**

Followed by a train of devout and honourable women, the saint proceeded to Jerusalem (A.D. 385), and found on his arrival that the proconsul had prepared to receive such distinguished visitors in state. But the pilgrims contented themselves with visiting the holy places, and withdrew to Alexandria, where Jerome, though already grey-haired, became the disciple of Didymus the Blind, the famous Origenist teacher. This was the third master to whom Jerome had attached himself, Apollinarius and Gregory of Nazianzus being the others. He had thus sat at the feet of the greatest theologians in the world at the close of the fourth century. Jerome was remarkably devoted to those who taught him, and his humility as a scholar contrasts strongly with the truculent arrogance he displayed in controversy with his contemporaries.

**Jerome settles at
Bethlehem.**

In the year 386, Jerome, Paula and Eustochium had established themselves at Bethlehem. A monastery was built, over which Jerome presided, whilst Paula ruled the neighbouring nunnery. A large library was collected for Jerome's use; and his time was occupied in expounding the Scriptures, and, despite the vow he had made in A.D. 374, in teaching some youths the Classics. At this period he commenced the great work of his life, the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Latin, a task which needed no small moral courage to undertake. The

1. *Ep.* xxxix. 5. Jerome reminds Paula that her grief for Blesilla contrasts unfavourably with the holy Melania, who thanked God when she lost her husband and two sons, because she could now serve Him with less distraction. Later on this holy lady's name attested the darkness of her perfidy (*Ep.* cxxxiii. 3); but then she sided with Rufinus!

LXX., the sacred version of the Church, had for centuries held its own against all rivals. It was received as an inspired translation, the result of a miracle. In addition to this it was necessary for Jerome to perfect his knowledge of Hebrew by studying with a Jew, by name Bar-Anina, who came to him by night.¹

For years Jerome prepared for his task, but all the time a stream of literature issued from his cell. Commentaries on various books of Scripture, a fresh revision of the New Testament, ascetical treatises, a work on the place-names of Palestine, a catalogue of all famous ecclesiastical personages since the days of the Apostles, translations of Didymus' works on Origen and of some of Origen's commentaries, with innumerable letters, bear witness to his ceaseless activity. By A.D. 404 his translation of the Hebrew Bible into Latin was finished.

The Vulgate. In later times this version, with Jerome's revised New Testament and the Psalter which he had corrected for the Church of Gaul, was styled the Vulgate, and was finally accepted by the Council of Trent (A.D. 1545—1563) as authoritative in the Roman Catholic Church. Jerome had worked amid a storm of disapproval; even Augustine considered it unwise for him to alter the words of Scripture to which people had been long accustomed. So conservative were the Christians in Africa, and, we may add, so familiar with the language of the Bible, that, when a bishop reading the story of Jonah changed the word *cucurbita* (a gourd) into *hedera* (ivy), the congregation protested and would not allow the Lesson to proceed till the word they were accustomed to was adopted.² In all his labours Jerome sought the advice of Paula and Eustochium; for he was not inclined to depreciate a woman's intellect, and made those who submitted to his guidance take an interest in his deepest studies.

Vigilantius and Jovinian. The arduous labours of Jerome did not prevent him from engaging in some bitter quarrels. He was roused to fury by hearing, about A.D. 393, that a certain monk named

1. *Ep.* LXXXIV. "By his fear of the Jews" says Jerome "Bar-Anina presented to me in his own person a second Nicodemus."

2. Hieron., *Ep.* CIV. Augustinus, *Ep.* I.VI.

Jovinian had presumed to question the supreme merit of a celibate life.

A few years later a Spaniard, named Vigilantius, who had stayed at Jerome's monastery at Bethlehem, provoked his ire, partly on account of the part he took in the Origenist controversy, but chiefly because he declared that the honour paid to the martyrs was excessive, that the hermit life was cowardice, that money collected "for the poor saints at Jerusalem" had better be kept at home, and that presbyters ought to be married before they were ordained.

Jerome does not condescend to argue with those who presume to oppose the views of his age. So completely had the ascetic ideal possessed men, that those who doubted whether after all it was an original part of Christianity were met with horror and contempt. But even Jerome's friends questioned the propriety of the violent language of his treatise against Jovinian, which he had published before asking their opinion.¹ When Jovinian died, he wrote of him "This man, after having been condemned by the authority of the Roman Church, amidst his feasts of pheasants and of swine's flesh, I will not say gave up, but belched forth his life" (*non tam emisit animam quam eructavit*). He calls Vigilantius Dormitantius, and hopes he may find pardon when, as Origen teaches, the devil is forgiven.²

As we have already seen, Jerome had in early life been a careful student of the writings of Origen, and at Rome he had vigorously abused those clergy who had disputed the orthodoxy of the great Egyptian teacher.³ But about A.D. 393 a man named Aterbius accused Jerome and Rufinus of Origenism; and when Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, arrived in Palestine, he interfered in the

Origenistic
disputes.

1. *Epp.* XLVIII. and XLIX., *Ad Pammachium*. *Ep.* L., *Ad Dominionem*.

2. *Adv. Vigilantium*, c. 2, written A.D. 409. Jerome is particularly hard on the style of both Jovinian and Vigilantius. He gives specimens of the turgid and insequent language of the former. *Adv. Jovinianum*, ii. 2. Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. III., p. 235.

3. *Ep.* XXXIII., *Ad Paulam*. See also *Ep.* LXXXIV., the letter to Pammachius and Oceanus, where Jerome compares his own admiration for Origen with St. Cyprian's for Tertullian.

dispute by advising Jerome to break off all communion with John, bishop of Jerusalem, as a fautor of the heresy; and went so far as to ordain Jerome's brother, Paulinian, a presbyter, in order that he might officiate in the monastic church at Bethlehem. Jerome was in a difficult position. As a man of letters he had studied under the most famous Origenist teachers of his time, and had further expressed the highest admiration for Origen, even for his *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, around which the present controversy was raging; and at Rome he had not spared the detractors of the master. It is but just, however, to admit that he had never been a blind partisan of Origen, and that he had always advocated discretion in studying his works. Yet he had taken Origen's side and was deeply committed to it. John, the bishop of Jerusalem, was an Origenist, and so was Jerome's old friend Rufinus, who had been established in a monastery on the Mount of Olives since A.D. 377.

On the other hand, Jerome as a monk regarded Epiphanius, who had known St. Antony, as the most saintly of men. He felt therefore compelled to support him in his quarrel with John, even at the cost of seeming false to his early opinions. For a time there was no communication between the Church of Jerusalem and the monks of Bethlehem; but at length Jerome, by the good offices of Theophilus of Alexandria, was reconciled to John, who had been terrified into withholding support from his former Origenist friends. Jerome was thus fully committed to the Epiphanian party on the question of Origen's orthodoxy.

Then began one of the most discreditable personal quarrels recorded in ecclesiastical history. Jerome had parted with Rufinus in peace when the latter returned from the Holy Land to Rome in A.D. 397. They had been alienated from one another during the Origenist controversy, but on parting they received the sacrament together in the church of the Resurrection, and their life-long friendship appeared to be unbroken. But when Rufinus reached Rome and found the Origenistic dispute

Jerome denounces
the Origenists.

Quarrel with
Rufinus.

was exciting interest, he translated the *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* into Latin.¹ In the preface he alluded to Jerome's having translated many works of Origen.² This stung Jerome, who, finding that Origenism was out of favour in Italy, trembled for his own reputation for orthodoxy. Recrimination followed; harsh things were said on both sides, and the quarrel became a permanent one. Even in A.D. 410, when Rufinus died in Sicily, Jerome's feelings were so bitter that he delighted in the opportunity of airing his classical knowledge in honour of the event. "The scorpion" he wrote "lies underground between Enceladus and Porphyrion, and the hydra of many heads has at last ceased to hiss against me."³

Jerome survived Rufinus ten years, dying in A.D. 420. He took part in the Pelagian controversy, and corresponded amicably with St. Augustine, for whom in his later days he had a great admiration; their zeal against Pelagianism having united them after their failure to see eye to eye in the matter of Biblical exegesis.

**Character of
Jerome.**

In character, it must be admitted, Jerome falls short of our idea of sanctity. He courted controversy, and was vindictive and implacable when engaged in it. In the Origenist disputes he is seen at his worst. His nervous solicitude for his reputation for orthodoxy made him put himself into the hands of a bigot like Epiphanius and an unscrupulous ecclesiastic like Theophilus. In the whole matter he shewed neither consistency nor generosity. His attack on his old friend Rufinus and his exultation at the fall of Chrysostom are serious blots on his memory.

On the one hand we may not forget either his real zeal for what he believed to be the highest ideal of life, or his noble diligence as a scholar. Jerome at

1. It is but just to say that Jerome in A.D. 399 wrote a friendly letter of remonstrance to Rufinus (*Ep.* LXXXI.), which however was not delivered owing to the treachery of Pammachius. Jerome considered the rendering of the *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* into Latin most injudicious, as well as unfair to Origen, *Ep.* LXXXIV.

2. Hieron., *Ep.* LXXX., *Rufinus ad Macarium.*

3. Augustine bitterly lamented the estrangement of two such men as Jerome and Rufinus, *Ep.* LXXIII.

least never played with religion. His figure in Rome, stern and unbending, compelled the great ladies of the most frivolous aristocracy of the world to recognise a nobler form of Christianity than that of the worldly priests of the capital and 'the town coachman'. That he infused into those who were under the spell of his influence no mere sentimental piety, but a genuine love of sacred study, is a further reason for our appreciating his efforts.

But it is as the greatest of early Christian scholars that Jerome deserves a high place among the worthies of the Church. He had a real enthusiasm for learning. Wherever he went he sought out the best teachers, and shewed himself a humble and appreciative scholar. He laboured indefatigably, and kept clear of ecclesiastical office in order that he might pursue the work of his life without distraction; and his translation of the Bible has had an enduring influence, greater even than the heroic labours of Origen on the text of the Septuagint. Jerome was emphatically a man of his age; he shared in its prejudices, in its credulity, in its harshness, as well as in its genuine devotion. But his natural genius left its impress on all that he did, and he became the typical monastic leader for many generations. He had the faults and the virtues of the cloister. But, narrow as were his views, abusive as his writings often are, coarse and unscrupulous as he shewed himself when thwarted or opposed, he always had devoted friends and admirers, some of whom deplored his extravagances, but admired his erudition, his industry, and his burning zeal.

Inferior to Jerome in scholarship, St. Augustine. Augustine is in every other respect a greater man. He is, indeed, the most important figure in Church history since St. Paul, and his influence on Western Christendom still endures. Four great events in his long life are of special interest to us: (1) his conversion, with the story of his early opinions; (2) his conflict with Donatism, which throws light on his view of the Church; (3) the Pelagian heresy, revealing his opinion on the subject of grace and salvation; (4) the publication of the *City of God*. His

career closed in the troublous times of the Vandal invasion of Africa.

The Confessions. (1) The *Confessions* is, perhaps, the most remarkable piece of self-revelation in literature. It gives, as honestly as is possible under the circumstances, an exact picture of Augustine's life from his earliest childhood till his conversion in his thirty-second year. He tells us that his father, Patricius, was a poor burgess of Thagaste, who appears to have been a man of somewhat limited intelligence, though with sense enough to see that his son was a child of no ordinary ability, and to stint himself in order to give him the best education his means would afford.¹ Augustine confesses that he was an idle boy, fond of play and disliking the drudgery of studying a strange language like Greek.² At Carthage he seems to have frequented the society of a set of disreputable students who called themselves 'Wreckers' (*Euersores*), though he took no part in the outrages they committed.³ It must be remembered that, though Augustine was not baptized, his mother, Monnica, was an earnest Christian, and he never felt really happy in the wild life he lived. The first serious thoughts, however, came to Augustine on reading the *Hortensius*, a work of Cicero which has not come down to us. The praise of philosophy in it changed the young man's mind, he longed for the immortality of wisdom. "From henceforth began" he says "my upward way."⁴

It is surprising that Augustine was attracted at first, not by the Church but by the Manichaeans. There was, however, a fascination to a young and inexperienced man in a mystical sect, forbidden by law, yet maintaining a

1. *Confess.* II. 3. He was sent to study at Carthage "animositate magis quam opibus patris municipis Thagastensis admodum tenuis". In *Confess.* IX. 9, Augustine describes his father as "sicut benevolentia praecipuus ita ira feruidus". Cf. Horace, *Sat.* I. vi. 71.

2. *Confess.* I. 14. "Uidelicet difficultas, difficultas omnino ediscendae peregrinae linguae, quasi felle aspergebat omnes suauitates graecas fabularum narrationum."

3. *Confess.* III. 3.

4. *Confess.* III. 4. "Surgere ceperam ut ad Te redirem." The *Confessions*, be it remembered, are addressed to God.

secret existence, instructing the elect only in what it styled 'the Truth'. Augustine tells us that the Names of the Holy Trinity were always on the lips of the Manichaeans, and that they were constantly talking about 'the Truth', whilst their heart was void of truth.¹ For nine years he continued to be a Manichaean, but it was evident that he was being gradually alienated from the sect. The physician Vindicianus, who as proconsul awarded Augustine a crown for a victory won in a theatrical competition, took an interest in him, and warned him against astrology.² Serious thoughts were further aroused in him by the death of a friend who had been baptized when ill and unconscious, and when temporarily better had rebuked Augustine for jesting on the subject.³ His studies were also taking a more scientific form. He surprised himself by being able to understand the *Categories* of Aristotle without a master, and this is the first indication he gives of the natural bent of his genius for mathematical and scientific subjects.⁴ But he was still living an immoral life, and had taken a concubine; yet, although such alliances were not generally regarded as reprehensible, and he remained faithful to the object of his choice, his mind was not at rest.⁵ He was, in short, a man of the world, a brilliant professor of rhetoric, enjoying the society of men like himself. He describes the charm of such society: "The talk, the laughter, the courteous mutual deference, the common study of the masters of eloquence, the comradeship now grave now gay, the differences which left no sting, as of a man dissenting with himself, the spice of disagreement which seasoned the monotony of consent."⁶

1. *Confess.* III. 6. He speaks of "uisicum confectum commixtione Syllabarum nominis tui et Domini Iesus Christi et Paracliti Consolatoris nostri Spiritus Sancti." Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, p. 203.

2. *Confess.* IV. 3. See also VII. 6.

3. *Confess.* IV. 4. Glover, *op. cit.*, p. 204. 4. *Confess.* IV. 16.

5. *Confess.* IV. 2. Augustine speaks of the "pactum libidinosi amoris, ubi proles etiam contra votum nascitur, quamuis iam nata cogat se diligi".

6. *Confess.* IV. 8. "Alia erat quae in eis amplius capiebant animum, colloqui et corrodere, et uicissim beneuole obsequi, simul legere libros dulciloquos, simul nugari et simul honestari, dissentire interdum sine odio, tanquam ipse homo secum, atque ipsa rarissima dissentione condire consensiones plurimas."

At the age of twenty-nine Augustine was privileged to meet the celebrated Faustus, the Manichaean bishop. Whenever he had expressed any doubts, his friends had told him to wait for Faustus, who would explain all difficulties. He found in Faustus a thoroughly pleasant and eloquent man, whose lectures delighted him. But when he came to know the bishop, it was soon evident that he was entirely superficial. A little Tully and less Seneca were all that his learning comprised, and what success he had managed to secure was due to a ready wit. Augustine, however, discovered that Faustus was not unprepared to admit his ignorance, and conceived a certain admiration for his honesty in this respect.¹

After his interview with Faustus, Augustine as a teacher in Rome. Augustine left the Manichaean sect, and quitted his mother, against her will, in order that he might go to Rome as a teacher of rhetoric.² He confesses that at this time he was a materialist and could not understand how God was without a body of some sort.³ From Rome he went to Milan, and there St. Ambrose "welcomed the stranger as a father". But Augustine was not really intimate with the great bishop. He attended the church to listen to his sermons, at first as a critic, then as an enchanted hearer. He had a few brief interviews with him—no more.⁴ But he was greatly impressed by Ambrose's allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, as he had found great difficulty in understanding the ancient Scriptures when taken literally. "I rejoiced," he says, "because I was able to read with other eyes those ancient Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets, which used to seem so absurd, while I was reproving the saints for thinking what they never thought."⁵

1. *Confess.* v. 3, 6, 7. "Iste uero cor habebat, et si non rectum ad Te, nec tamen nimis incautum ad se ipsum. Non usquequaque imperitus erat imperitiæ suæ."

2. *Confess.* v. 8.

3. *Confess.* v. 10.

4. *Confess.* v. 13. "Suscepit me paterne ille homo Dei." See also

v. 1. 3.

5. *Confess.* vi. 4. "Cum arguebam tanquam ita sentientes sanctos tuos; uerum autem non ita sentiebant."

Alypius and the arena. In passing, Augustine relates a story of his friend and pupil Alypius, which helps us to understand the habits of the men of his age. When at Carthage, Alypius was a passionate frequenter of the circus. Augustine feared that his blind and reckless devotion to the sport would prove his ruin, but could not dissuade him because he was on bad terms with Alypius' father. Alypius, however, attended Augustine's lectures, and a chance sarcasm in them against the pleasures of the circus made him decide to free himself from their fascination.¹

At Rome, whither Alypius had preceded Augustine to study law, he was dragged by his friends into the circus, against his will. During the performance he kept his eyes shut till the excitement of the people provoked his curiosity. "Then" says Augustine "he was struck with a deadlier wound in the soul than the gladiator whom he lusted to behold received in the flesh."² The mad passion for blood possessed him, and he not only gave way on this occasion to his delight at seeing bloodshed, but became again an *habitué* of the gladiatorial shows. It was not for some time that he was able to tear himself free of them. Alypius was at Milan with Augustine at the crisis of his life.

Augustine's perplexities. A most interesting description of Augustine's mental struggles follows the story of Alypius, in which we may notice two important stages in his conversion. He began to realise that the mystery of the origin of evil was to be solved by attributing it to the will; and by the study of the works of Plotinus he learned to understand how God could be incorporeal.³ At this time he was ready to acknowledge that Christ was a man of excellent wisdom, and that He merited the highest authority. The mystery of the Word made Flesh was to Augustine still incomprehensible.

1. *Confess.* VI. 7 ff.

2. *Confess.* VI. 8. "Et percussus est graviore uulnere in anima, quam ille in corpore, quem cernere concupiuit."

3. *Confess.* VII. 6 ff. This part of the *Confessions*, Harnack says, is the best account of Neoplatonism in the Fathers. Glover, *Life and Letters*, p. 211.

Visit to
Simplicianus.
Story of
Antony related.

As we near the crisis, we see that to Augustine conversion meant the complete surrender of the will to God. He went to the aged Simplicianus, "the spiritual father of the bishop of Milan, whom Ambrose truly loved as a father."¹ When Simplicianus heard that Augustine had studied Platonism from the translations made by Victorinus, he related how this great Roman professor had in his old age become a Christian and had openly confessed Christ, not privately, as was customary in the case of distinguished persons, but publicly on the platform from whence those about to be baptized proclaimed their faith.² Deeply as this recital moved Augustine, he still wavered till a friend, Pontitianus, came to pay him and Alypius a visit. Pontitianus spoke of Antony, the founder of Egyptian monasticism, and of how the reading of his wonderful career had converted two of his friends. Augustine was deeply moved, he rushed into the garden. A child was calling out in a neighbouring house "Tolle, lege; tolle, lege." Augustine took up a volume of St. Paul's Epistles. His eyes fell on the passage, "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying: but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof."³ He abandoned his career, giving up his professorship after the vintage holidays, placed himself under the guidance of St. Ambrose, and, with his friend Alypius and his natural son Adeodatus, received the sacrament of baptism (April 25, A.D. 387). Shortly afterwards his mother, Monnica, whose life had been one long prayer for her son's conversion, passed away.⁴

1. *Confess.* VIII. 1, 2. "Perrexi ergo ad Simplicianum, patrem in accipienda gratia tua tunc episcopi Ambrosii, et quem vere ut patrem diligebat."

2. *Confess.* VIII. 2.

3. *Confess.* VIII. 6—12.

4. Augustine's description of his mother—the patience and amiability she shewed to her somewhat violent husband, her loyalty to him in refusing to allude to the sorrows of her married life, and her zeal as a peace-maker—is one of the most interesting portions of the *Confessions*. It is followed by the account of his conversation with her on the Kingdom of Heaven when they were at Ostia, and of her last illness and death. *Confess.* IX. 9—11.

The conversion of St. Augustine is one of the most important events in Christian history, since it gave to the Western Church the man whose wonderful personality, genius, and earnestness, practically moulded her destiny for more than a thousand years.¹

The controversies in which Augustine was subsequently engaged served to give to the opinions which he had formed at his conversion a more definite shape.

After his conversion and the death of his mother, Monnica, Augustine went to his home at Thagaste, where he lived four years with his friends in a sort of religious community. In A.D. 391 he yielded to the persuasion of the aged Valerius, bishop of Hippo, and was ordained priest; in 395 he became coadjutor bishop, and he ultimately succeeded Valerius in the see. Next to Carthage, Hippo Regius was the most important town in Africa: but Augustine's influence extended far beyond his see or province, as he was soon recognised as the ablest and saintliest bishop of his time; and the authority of his words, at any rate in the Western Church, was everywhere acknowledged. This unquestioned ascendancy he maintained till his death in A.D. 430.

(2) Augustine's great work in Africa was the suppression of the Donatist schism. He found the Catholic Church a depressed and unpopular body, suffering persecution at the hands of the Donatists, who, though proscribed by law, were still dominant in Northern Africa. Donatism was the nonconformity of the ancient Church. Having in the first instance appealed to the State for support against their opponents, and having been proved in the wrong, the Donatists turned against the Catholic Church as a government institution, declaring themselves to be the only true Church in the world. They gloried in the

1. "He gave" says Mr. Glover (*Life and Letters*, p. 194) "to Christian thought on God and man, on sin and Grace, on the world and the Church, an impulse and a direction, the force of which is still unspent. He gave the great Popes the idea of the City of God. . . . He was the father of the mystics, the founder of the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages, and above all the hero and master of the Renaissance and the Reformation." See also Harnack, *Lecture on the 'Confessions' of St. Augustine*.

fact that they had kept themselves clear of all commerce with the *traditores* of the Diocletian persecution, whereas the Church's ordinations and sacraments had been vitiated by being administered by apostate bishops and priests.

The policy of the Emperors in regard to the Donatists had been marked by vacillation. First Constantine attempted to put them down by force, then he tried a persuasive letter, finally he ignored them. His successor, Constans, hoped to bribe the sect into submission. But Donatus, when he saw the Emperor's gold, cried "*Quid imperatori cum ecclesia?*" thus putting tersely the principles subsequently adopted by this sect in regard to the State.

The cry was taken up by Donatists throughout Africa, and the duty of separation from the Church was proclaimed on every side. The *Circumcellions* rose and committed fearful atrocities. Such were their excesses, that Donatus himself was compelled to call in the aid of the civil power. But Macarius, who was entrusted with the suppression of the revolt, made no distinction between Donatists and *Circumcellions*. Donatus was banished and the Catholics were left to enjoy their triumph.¹

When Julian became emperor, the Donatists appealed to him and obtained leave to return to Africa; they at once took possession of the churches, and treated them as though profaned by the presence of the Catholics. They made all Catholics who joined them do penance, re-baptized the laity and re-ordained the clergy. Donatus died in exile, and Parmenian, one of the ablest of the party, succeeded him. As a foreigner, he was less prejudiced than the native Africans, and in his controversy with the Catholic champion, Optatus, bishop of Milevis, whom Augustine calls "a second Ambrose of Milan", there are many points on which the disputants were agreed.²

1. *Vide supra*, Chap. XII.

2. Optatus' work, *de Schismate Donatistarum*, despite some lapses into abusive language, is written in a conciliatory spirit. The author

Donatist
schisms.

On the death of Parmenian, A.D. 392, Primian succeeded to the bishopric of Carthage, and the Donatists felt the effects of schism in their own body. A sect called Rogatists arose in the followers of Rogatus, bishop of Cartennae, and a dispute between Primian and his deacon, Maximian, caused the party of the Maximianists to be formed. The laws against heresy were applied to the Donatists with little effect; and when Gildo, in A.D. 397, usurped the government of Africa, and supported the schismatics, he exacted heavy reprisals from the Catholics. Gildo was defeated in A.D. 398, and new edicts were put in force by Honorius; but the Donatists were at this time far more powerful in Africa than the Catholics.

Augustine
against
Parmenian.

Augustine was naturally the moving spirit in the African Church; and the fact that he had once been himself outside her pale, a member of the sect of the Manichaeans, who at least resembled the Donatists in considering themselves purer than the majority of Christians, helped him to understand the danger of the separatist position. He was the preacher at the synod at Hippo, held under the presidency of Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, in A.D. 393, where the Donatists were allowed to enter the Church on very wise and liberal terms;¹ and he followed the example of Arius and Gregory of Nazianzus by composing popular verses to make the merits of the controversy clear to the unlearned.² In 398 Petilian, a Donatist bishop, published an unsigned letter, proposing to stop all communion with the Catholic Church. This man had been a

even calls Parmenian 'brother'. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. v., pp. 42 ff.

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Donatism', vol. I., p. 887b. Donatist clergy were to retain their positions if they had not re-baptized, and if they had brought their flock back with them; and Donatist children were not to be excluded from the service of the altar. At this council Augustine (then still a priest at Hippo) delivered his discourse *De Fide et Symbolo*. Hefele, *Councils*, § 109.

2. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Donatism', p. 888a. It was called the *Abecedarium*, and was a metrical composition arranged according to the letters of the alphabet.

Catholic catechumen, but had been carried off by force by the Donatists and instructed in the principles of the sect. He had been a lawyer of some eminence, and now became the champion of his party. Augustine wrote three books against him, and other three against Parmenian, who had, as we have seen, succeeded to the bishopric of Carthage. Parmenian's book, which provoked an answer from Augustine after the author was dead, was directed against the famous biblical scholar Tychonius, who, though a Donatist, was opposed to the narrow and exclusive views of the sect, to which, however, he still adhered.¹ In Augustine's treatises against Parmenian and Petilian, the doctrine of the Church, as he conceived it, is set forth.

Augustine's
view of the
Church.

According to Augustine, the Church depends on her external organic unity and the episcopal succession. When our Lord "breathed on" His disciples, He bestowed the Holy Ghost on the Church, which they represented. Outside the Church is no salvation, and heretics and schismatics must come into the fold to receive that love which is the peculiar gift of Catholic peace and unity. The existence of the Church, he says, depends not on the holiness of its members, but on its divine character as an institution. In opposition to the Donatists, Augustine said that in the Church were tares as well as wheat, and outside the Church wheat as well as tares. Here we see the large-mindedness of Augustine: but on one occasion he unfortunately used language which was employed to justify the persecutions of later days.²

1. Tychonius (or Tichonius) is best known for his *Seven Rules*. See *Cambridge Texts and Studies*.

2. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. v., pp. 143 ff., Eng. Tr. On p. 142, the Donatist position is summed up by a quotation from Augustine's *Contra lit. Petilian* I. 3: "Qui fidem a perfido sumpserit non fidem perficit sed reatum." That is, an unfaithful priest cannot administer grace but only guilt. Augustine has to defend the sanctity of the visible Church against the individual minister as a channel of grace. He develops the doctrine of the Church with a view to the circumstances in which he finds himself placed. The unity of the Church depends on love: heretics by breaking with her shew that they do not possess this virtue. Only in the Church can holiness be attained. But at present there are unholy members in the visible Church, though these will ultimately be removed, and all

The conduct of the Donatists was certainly exasperating, and the extreme section of the party became a formidable danger to African society. The *Circumcellions* were especially active in the neighbourhood of Hippo, and their ravages and plundering almost laid waste Augustine's diocese. The vigorous measures taken by the Imperial authority resulted in a partial suppression of Donatism, and Augustine, in his treatise against a layman named Cresconius, justified the employment of the secular arm. These sentiments, so much at variance with Augustine's ordinary conduct in regard to his opponents, provoked a bishop named Vincentius to ask him if they really expressed his opinions. His reply was summed up in the words of our Lord in St. Luke's Gospel, "Compel them to come in." Augustine had said to Petilian, "I would have no man compelled to believe against his will." But the few words by which he justified the principle of persecution outweighed what he had said in favour of toleration, and were destined to bear terrible fruit in after days. Augustine, however, earnestly deprecated bloodshed in coercing the Donatists. He urges Boniface to enforce the laws but to avoid imitating the *Circumcellions* in shedding blood.¹

will be pure. Augustine, however, has to admit that sacraments may be validly administered outside the Church; but he affirms that to reap their benefit (*utiliter habere*) it is necessary to be within the fold. Yet Augustine is singularly free from the hierarchical or materialistic notion of the Church. He makes apostolic succession a mark of a true branch of the Catholic Church: but, as Dr. Bethune-Baker truly remarks, "He lays stress on the bishops as the centre of unity, in proportion as he emphasises more the thought, that the presence of the Holy Spirit and of love are the true notes of the Church." Harnack points out that in Augustine's teaching, the Church is *heavenly*, its true home is in heaven; it is *primeval*, including those before and after Christ (see Dante, *Paradiso*, Canto xxxii.); it is *holy and spiritual*, containing the number of the elect. "Augustine" he adds "subordinated the notion of the Church and Sacraments to the spiritual doctrine of God, Christ, the Gospel, faith, and love, as far as was at all possible about A.D. 400." See also Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, pp. 368 ff.

1. Augustine, *De Correctione Donatistarum* (circa A.D. 418). Dean Milman (*Hist. of Christianity*, vol. III., p. 161 n.), speaking of Augustine's attitude towards Church miracles, exactly describes his inconsistency in regard to persecution: "It is singular how often we hear at one time the strong intellect of Augustine, and at another the age of Augustine, speaking in his works."

It is but right to bear in mind that toleration is only possible when a religious body submits to certain laws. A sect which incites its members to acts of lawless violence against other religious bodies can never, in our days, obtain toleration in a civilised country. And such a sect was the Donatist. Had the State sternly repressed and punished all acts of violence, whether committed by Donatist or Catholic, the *Circumcellions* would have been suppressed without the government's incurring the reproach of persecution. But the age was incapable of comprehending these fine distinctions, and Augustine was in advance of his time in so earnestly desiring to avoid bloodshed after the provocation his flock had endured at the hands of the *Circumcellions*.¹

The Great
Conference.
A. D. 411.

In A. D. 411, a great conference was held under the presidency of Marcellinus, proconsul of Africa. The Donatists sent 279 bishops and the Catholics 286. Each side chose seven representatives. The conduct of the Donatists disgusted Marcellinus, and his decision was that every Donatist bishop should go to his home and there join the true Church, or at least not impede the execution of the law. If they did not restrain the *Circumcellions*, the principal Donatists were to be deprived of their places in the State. The Donatists appealed to the emperor Honorius, but received no encouragement, and orders were given that they were to be henceforward reckoned as heretics, and if they did not return to the Church their property was to be confiscated.

Donatism now began to decline, not merely on account of the imperial decree, but because the whole movement was discredited. Augustine had shewn how unreasonable the schism was, and the quibbling of the Donatists at the conference had disgusted every impartial person. At a council held at Carthage in A. D. 418, the Church speaks in a very different tone to that used twenty years earlier. Catholic and Donatist alike went

1. In this he differed from Optatus, bishop of Milevis, who approved of the death penalty. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, v., p. 155 n., Eng. Tr.

down before the Vandal invaders; and except for a revival quickly suppressed in the sixth century, Donatism is heard of no more.¹

(3) We now reach the controversy with which the name of Augustine will always be associated. The problem of man's salvation, though in the East it aroused only a passing interest, has had an abiding influence on the mind of Western Christendom. Herein lay the essential difference between the two Churches. The Church of the West was practical, concerned with the question how men are saved; the more speculative Eastern mind, on the contrary, devoted its energies to determining profound problems of theology, such as that of the nature of God or of the relation of the Son to the Father.

It is noteworthy that the originators of the dispute about Grace and Free Will agreed in being chiefly interested in promoting the cause of personal religion. Augustine and Pelagius had both earnestly pursued the path of holiness, and their divergent views resulted from different religious experiences. They were equally strenuous in opposing the nominal Christianity of their age. Pelagius, whom even Augustine admits to have been a man of blameless life, began the controversy by denouncing the excuses for not being consistent made by professing Christians. He was a zealot for righteousness; and we can never hope to understand the merits of the question, if we regard it simply as a debate between a godly bishop and a wicked heretic.

The real difference between Augustine and Pelagius was that they had passed through opposite experiences. Pelagius had apparently led the tranquil life of a monk and a man of learning.² Such a training, at any rate to some natures, makes goodness appear to be a comparatively easy matter. Their own will, rather than the hand of God, seems to dispose them to do right.

1. From Gregory the Great's letter to Columbus, bishop of Numidia, (*Ep.* xxxv.), we learn that in Africa Catholics allowed their children to receive Donatist baptism.

2. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. v., p. 170. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, pp. 312 ff.

Very different is it with the man who has sinned deeply and repented, whose conversion is an event to be looked back upon as an astounding miracle of mercy. To Augustine salvation seemed to have come in despite of himself, and to have been the work of God alone.

Pelagius
in Rome.

Pelagius, a native of Britain, and a layman of mature age, had long been a conspicuous member of the religious society of Rome in the first years of the fifth century. He was a friend of Paulinus of Nola, who speaks of him as a true servant of God.¹ While at Rome, Pelagius became acquainted with a fellow-countryman named Celestius, who practised as an advocate till his friend induced him to adopt a religious life. Pelagius was deeply grieved by observing the general laxity of Roman Christian morality, which he attributed to disregard of the truth that men are responsible to God for their own actions. He was violently indignant at hearing a bishop quote Augustine's prayer to God in his *Confessions*, "*Da quod iubes et iube quod uis,*"² as if it meant that we were mere puppets in the hands of the Creator; and wrote to Paulinus of Nola on the subject. Pelagius in fact saw no safeguard for righteousness, unless men recognised the freedom of the Will and realised that they were accountable for their actions. Owing to Alaric's approach Pelagius left Rome in A.D. 409, first for Sicily and thence in company with Celestius for Africa. He visited Hippo during Augustine's temporary absence from his see. Though deeply engaged in the Donatist controversy, Augustine was perturbed by hearing that Pelagius had taught that infants are not baptized for the remission of sins, but in order to be sanctified by union with Christ. Pelagius, however, soon left Africa for Palestine, leaving Celestius at Carthage.

1. Augustine bears testimony to the high character borne by Pelagius. "Nam ut de me ipso potissimum dicam, prius absentis et Romae constituti Pelagii nomen cum magna eius laude cognoui." *De Gestis Pel.*, cap. xxii.

2. *Confess.* x. 29. The context is "O amor qui semper ardes et numquam exstingueris, caritas Deus meus, adcede me. Continentiam iubes. Da quod iubes et iube quod uis." The incident is related in Augustine's *De dono Perseverantiae*, cap. liii.

Council at
Carthage,
A.D. 412.

In A.D. 412 a Council was held at Carthage (at which Augustine was not present), and Celestius was condemned on seven charges brought against him by a deacon named Paulinus, the biographer of St. Ambrose.¹ The Council declared Celestius guilty of teaching doctrines contrary to the Catholic faith. Celestius was accused of holding:

- (1) That Adam was created mortal, and would have died, even if he had not sinned.
- (2) The sin of Adam hurt only himself and not the whole human race.
- (3) Infants at birth are as Adam was before the Fall.
- (4) In the death or fall of Adam all men do not die, nor does the race of man rise again in the resurrection of Christ.
- (5) The Law introduces men into the Kingdom of Heaven in the same way as the Gospel.
- (6) Even before Christ's coming there were some men without sin.
- (7) Infants though not baptized have eternal life.

Celestius threatened to appeal to Rome against the sentence of the Council, but afterwards changed his mind and betook himself to Ephesus.²

Pelagius in
Palestine.

Pelagius had been some time in Palestine, when a Spaniard named Orosius, a devoted disciple of Augustine, arrived, and after spending a short time with Jerome, who was already opposed to the new doctrines, went to Jerusalem and informed the bishop John that Pelagius was teaching doctrines of which Augustine disapproved. Pelagius not unnaturally asked Orosius "What is Augustine to me?" and John refused to be browbeaten into condemning Pelagius, bluntly remarking to Orosius,

1. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. v., p. 175.

2. Bright, *Anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine*, *Introd.*, p. xvii. Augustine says that Celestius was more easy to refute than Pelagius. "Quid inter istum et Celestium in hac quaestione distabit nisi quod ille apertior, iste occultior fuit; ille pertinacior iste mendacior; vel certe ille liberior, hic astutior." *De Peccato Originali*, xii. Celestius opposed the doctrine of original sin. He delighted to shock people (*fortiter scandalizare*) by the boldness of his teaching.

"I am Augustine here." It was however agreed that as the opinions were of Latin origin they should be referred to Pope Innocent, as head of the Western Church.¹

Jerome now endeavoured to procure a condemnation of Pelagius in the East, and a synod was held at Diospolis (Lydda), A.D. 415. Two deposed Western bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, accused Pelagius of heresy before Eulogius, bishop of Caesarea and Metropolitan of the province, and fourteen other bishops. Pelagius' explanations were accepted, and, though the heresy of Celestius was condemned,² he was acquitted, much to the disgust of Jerome, whose monastery was attacked by the supporters of the accused. Pelagianism was in fact not entirely opposed to the views of the Orientals, who had always laid especial stress on the freedom of the Will.³

In the following year, A.D. 416, two Councils were held in Africa, at which Pelagius and Celestius were condemned. A book by Pelagius was sent to Pope Innocent, who pronounced it to be blasphemous and dangerous, adding that the author and his abettors deserved to be excommunicated.

In A.D. 417 Innocent died, and Zosimus, his successor, after seeing Celestius and receiving from Pelagius a profession of faith, reversed the decree of Innocent,⁴ rebuking Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, for his haste in condemning them. Augustine, however, perhaps by his influence with the Count Valerius, obtained an imperial decree banishing Pelagius, Celestius, and their followers. Zosimus had now no alternative but submission. He selected certain passages from the writings of Pelagius

1. These proceedings are related in the *Apology* of Orosius. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Pelagius', vol. IV., p. 286 b.

2. Jerome, *Ep.* CXLIII.

3. The proceedings are related by Augustine in the *De Gestis Pelagii*. Pelagius can hardly be acquitted of falsehood, or at least of misleading statements. Augustine says that Orosius, Heros, and Lazarus were not present. "Si enim praesentes essent, possent eum fortasse, absit ut dicam, conuincere de mendacio, sed forte commemorare, quid forte fuisset oblitus," etc. cap. xiv.

4. Augustine, *De Peccato Originali*, cap. xii. Bright, *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. xxxviii.

for reprobation, and forced the bishops of Italy to subscribe to his sentence. Eighteen refused and were immediately deprived of their sees, among them Julian of Eclanum, Augustine's most uncompromising opponent.¹ The Eastern Church endorsed the action of the Western some years later by condemning Pelagius at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), thereby condemning the Antiochene theologians' view of sin as expounded by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and even St. Chrysostom, who realizes less even than Theodore the weakness of man and his inability to attain to righteousness.²

Pelagianism. Pelagianism never attempted to form a sect, and the persecutions which its advocates endured were not, as in the case of the Donatists, directed against an institution but against opinions. Augustine's conduct, if he incited the civil power to suppress Pelagianism, is far less defensible than his action in regard to Donatism. The only possible excuse for him would be the intensity of his conviction that Pelagius' doctrine was fatal to Christianity.³ To Augustine the denial of the necessity of Grace seemed to give the lie to the most real experience of his own life; and it is to this that we may perhaps attribute the exceeding bitterness with which Predestinarians have in all ages opposed the doctrine of the freedom of the Will. Yet, though we have some natural sympathy with the opinions advocated by Pelagius and Celestius,

1. For Julian of Eclanum see Hefele, *op. cit.*, pp. 171, 191 ff. He boldly taunted Augustine with being a Manichean in his doctrine of the Will. See also Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vol. I., p. 164. Bright, *op. cit.*, p. xliv.

2. See Dr. Srawley's article in Hastings' *Dict. of Religion and Ethics*, 'Antiochene Theology', sec. 5. Julian of Eclanum and his companions, after their expulsion from the West, sought refuge with Theodore.

3. Two phrases in Holme's Introduction to the English Translation of St. Augustine's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises* deserve attention. Augustine recognised that "The Gospel was being fatally tampered with, in its essential facts of human sin and Divine grace; so in the fulness of his own absolute loyalty to the entire volume of evangelical truth, he concentrated his best efforts in opposition to the now formidable heresy." (p. xii.) Despite the intensity of Augustine's conviction it is said with equal truth, "Of all theological writers in ancient or modern times, it may fairly be maintained that Augustine has shewn himself the most considerate and charitable towards his opponents." (p. xvi.) See also Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

we must admit that they are open to serious objections. Pelagianism was, as we have seen, a practical protest against the low ideal of Christianity prevalent in Rome during the first years of the fifth century. Augustine's *Confessions* had in many cases induced a belief that men were but passive instruments in the hands of God, without freedom of Will or moral responsibility of any kind. To counteract its effects Pelagius had extolled the freedom of the Will so highly that he left but little room for the operation of Divine Grace.¹ Celestius, more zealous and less guarded than his master, not content with insisting that the Will is free, denied the existence of original sin, and maintained that infants were baptized, not in order that the taint of Adam's sin might be removed, but for the purpose of being consecrated and sanctified for God's service. He admitted, however, that baptism gave remission of actual sins to adult persons.

The opinion of Pelagius concerning the freedom of the Will is expressed in his letter to Demetrias, a young lady, granddaughter of Falconia Proba, the friend of Jerome and a member of the highest aristocracy of Rome, who shortly after the capture of the city decided to be a professed virgin. In Jerome's opinion this triumph of the Faith seemed sufficient to console Italy for the sack of Rome! Pelagius, at the request of the mother of Demetrias, wrote a letter full of sensible advice, in which his peculiar views revealed themselves.² In protesting against those who made excuses for not leading a religious life, he says, "We contradict the Lord when we say 'It is hard: it is difficult: we cannot: we are men, we are encompassed with mortal

Letter to
Demetrias.

1. Augustine gives Pelagius' view of the Will. "Ecce est totum dogma Pelagii in libro eius tertio *Pro Libero Arbitrio*, his omnino uerbis diligenter expressum, quo tria ista, unum quod est *posse*, alterum quod est *uelle*, tertium quod est *esse*, id est possibilitatem, uoluntatem, actionem, tanta curauit subtilitate distinguere, ut quandocunque legimus, uel audimus, diuinæ gratiæ adiutorium confiteri, ut a malo declinemus bonumque faciamus siue in lege atque doctrina, siue uilibet constituat, sciamus quid loquitur." *De Gratia Christi*, lib. 1., cap. v.

2. The letter is in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xxx., p. 22. Bethune-Baker, *Introd. to Early Christian Doctrine*, p. 314.

flesh'. Oh unholy audacity—we charge God with a twofold ignorance, that He does not seem to know what He has made, nor what He has commanded; just as if, forgetting the human weakness of which He Himself is the Author, He had imposed laws on man which he cannot endure."¹

Grace. As regards Grace, Pelagius is somewhat vague. Augustine seems to attribute to him the opinion that Grace is nothing more than those natural endowments which God has bestowed on us, or the example of Christ and the precepts of the Gospel. His error, however, seems to have been that he gave man such freedom of Will, that he denied the need of Grace to set the Will in action.² Augustine, on the contrary, taught that Grace was irresistible; Pelagius implied that it might be unnecessary, and quoted the example of those in the Old Testament of whom no sin is recorded, as a proof that man might live sinless unaided by Grace, though it is in most cases necessary.

Semi-Pelagianism. A modified sort of Pelagianism arose in Gaul under John Cassian, the organizer of Monasticism in that country. Cassian differed from Pelagius by maintaining that all men fell in the fall of Adam, and that no man is sufficient of himself to do any good work. He considered that the call of God comes as a rule to those ready to receive it, and quoted the example of Zacchaeus and the Penitent Thief. He denied that God predestined man to wrath, whilst acknowledging that God foresaw that some would deserve punishment for misusing the freedom of their

1. Thus Pelagius remarks: "Et improbissimi hominum dum dissimulant id ipsum bene administrare quod facti sunt: aliter se factos fuisse malunt, ut qui vitam suam emendare nolunt, uideantur emendare uelle naturam." *Ad Demetriadem*, cap. iii.

2. Pelagius was ready to use the term Grace, but he seems to have meant sometimes the natural endowment of free will, viewed as the Creator's gift, sometimes the moral law or other divinely bestowed instruction as to duty, or the pattern of instruction in Christ, and sometimes also the gift of Divine pardon. He held that God assisted by instruction the innate possibilities of good, but would not admit that He assisted by stimulus the actual exercise of volition. Holme, Intro. to *Trans. of St. Augustine*. See Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. v., p. 188, Eng. Tr. Bethune-Baker. *Intro.*, pp. 314, 318 note 1.

wills.¹ This view was termed Semi-Pelagianism, and was popular in Gaul; it was strenuously opposed by the School of St. Augustine, especially by Prosper, author of the poem *De Ingratis*. The famous Vincentius of Lerins was probably a Semi-Pelagian.²

**Doctrine of
Augustine.**

Augustine took a severely logical view of the questions of Free-will, Grace, Predestination, and Election, drawing his conclusions from his own experiences and the teaching of Scripture: nor did he shrink from accepting what the seemingly irresistible force of argument led him to believe was true. With mathematical precision Augustine sets forward his premises and makes his deduction. The unbaptized infant perishes,³ Grace once given is indefectible and cannot be resisted; the number of the elect is known to God, those outside it are justly cast away.⁴ The call being from God, man's will cannot resist it, nor can it accept salvation unless God so wills. This terrible system—put forward by a man of remarkable piety, full of love and sympathy, whose own conversion, described by himself with matchless skill, was the result of a long mental struggle—found acceptance not only in Africa, the home of uncompromising Christianity, but throughout the West. There is something naturally Augustinian in strong and serious minds, against which

1. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. v., p. 245, Eng. Tr. Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 322.

2. A note in Harnack's *History of Dogma* (vol. v., p. 247, Eng. Tr.) says "The *Commonitorium* is directed exclusively against St. Augustine." The second part of the *Commonitorium* is, it is true, in mutilated form, and there is a silence as to St. Augustine, which together with an allusion to him in Prosper seems to give some plausibility to the view that Vincentius was a Semi-Pelagian. See *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Vincentius', vol. iv., p. 1155.

3. Augustine admits of degrees of misery. Infants who die unbaptized suffer a very mild punishment, 'mitissima poena,' *Enchiridion*, 103. "Thus the man" (says Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, v. 213) "permits himself to soften the inscrutable righteousness of God which he teaches elsewhere." Bright, *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. xiv.

4. But Augustine is unlike Calvin, because he guards against the idea which ascribes arbitrariness to God in His rejection of the wicked, the notion that human nature is totally depraved, and the denial of personal responsibility. "It is necessary," says Dr. Cunningham, "if we are to weigh St. Austin's teaching fairly, that we should note how at point after point Calvin failed to follow the doctrine of the African Doctor." *St. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought*, p. 82.

more rational views of God's dealings seem to strive in vain. Determinism appears to many the only possible logical view of human life, whether regarded from a scientific or from a religious standpoint. Yet there is something in us constantly rebelling against this conception; and few, like Augustine, can face the conclusions to which it leads.¹ Again and again have Christians risen up in protest; their hearts condemning the view from which a stern logic seems to leave no escape. Yet, strange to say, wherever Christianity has been most zealously adopted Augustinian views have prevailed. Men possessed with the idea that they are predestined instruments in the hands of God have effected more than those who have believed themselves to be free agents; and strange as it may seem, the dark dogmas of Augustinianism have frequently succeeded in raising in the heart a passionate desire for purity of life and conduct. The remarkable influence of Augustine is manifest in the way in which he shaped the subsequent course of Western theology.

Whatever opinions we may hold concerning the system of Augustine and the doctrines he taught, there can be no doubt as to the elevation of character and the purity of motive displayed by him throughout the controversy. Though Pelagius had earnestly disclaimed any intention of propounding new dogmas, and declared that the question was an open one on which good men might agree to differ, his theory, as developed by Celestius and formulated by Julian of Eclanum, was in reality a

1. See the discussion of Augustine's position by Dr. Cunningham, *St. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought*, under the heading 'Commonly Recognised Facts of Human Nature', pp. 81 ff. There is, however, a very strong tendency at the present time to deny that original sin is transmitted; but a different sense is given to original sin from that implied by Augustine. Weismann, for instance, maintains that acquired characters are not transmitted, and the inference drawn is "that each child has a new beginning; the way is as open to the child of the wicked as to the child of the virtuous". But Augustine taught that as the very act of generation was sinful all children are born in sin, and are therefore unfit to be members of the kingdom of heaven until they are regenerated. Augustine's anthropology depends in some degree on a view of the propagation of the human race which is almost revolting to the modern mind. See the Essays by Prof. H. Jones and Mr. Tennant in *The Child and Religion*.

dangerous and insidious heresy. In practically denying the operation of Divine Grace and leaving salvation to the will of man, the Pelagians gave God no part in the regeneration of the world. Augustine was as right in opposing a system which would have emptied Christianity of its Divine Element,¹ as Athanasius had been in resisting Arianism. But in doing so these two Fathers agreed in never allowing the personal element to prejudice their judgment. Augustine did not even want to force his own views on Pelagius; but only required him to acknowledge the necessity of a "true internal and assisting grace without admitting it to be irresistible".² Even at the time when he was most provoked by the acquittal of Pelagius, he could speak with consideration of him. In the later controversy with Julian of Eclanum he maintained a similar tone of courtesy; though his antagonist pressed him with all the arrogance of youth, taunted him with being imbued with Manichaean opinions, and attacked his favourite doctrine of the perfection of a virgin life. Augustine is the most modern of the Fathers in his command of temper; and it may be added, in his unwillingness to be over-positive in the case of the mysteries of the Faith.

(4) *The City of God* is Augustine's greatest literary production, on account of the circumstances that called it forth, the scope of the work, and its immense influence on posterity.

On August 24, A.D. 410 (or 409, for the actual year is uncertain), Alaric, who had twice before led his army to Rome, took the city. Her fall is a most inglorious ending to the long period of immunity from foreign foes which Rome had enjoyed. Since B.C. 390, the year of the destruction of the city by the Gauls, no hostile army had entered her gates. Alaric, however, captured the city without heroic defence or protracted siege. The Porta Salaria was opened by treachery: the Goths entered by

1. Harnack (*op. cit.*, vol. v., p. 189) calls Pelagianism as expounded by Julian of Eclanum a Stoic Christian system.

2. Bright, *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, p. ix. "Quid enim dici brevius potuit et uerius, quam possibilitatem non peccandi, quantacunque est vel erit in homine, nonnisi Deo debere reputari? Hoc et nos dicimus; jungamus dexteras." Aug., *De Natura et Gratia*, cap. lii.

night and fired the neighbouring houses, destroying the villa of Sallust as they poured into the defenceless city. The sack lasted three days, and terrible as it must have been, the bloodshed was small in comparison with subsequent captures of Rome by an enemy. Though Alaric's soldiers were barbarians, they were Christians; and many examples of their forbearance and reverence for the churches are recorded.¹ Jerome's friend, the pious Marcella, however, died of the treatment she had received;² and there were doubtless many other atrocities committed. But, though we have no record of the sack by an eye-witness, we need not hesitate to affirm that a three days pillage by troops which were sufficiently under control to be withdrawn at the end of that brief period, cannot compare with the horrors which have not unfrequently followed the capture of cities even in comparatively modern times.³

Impression produced by the Fall of Rome. But the impression made on the world was tremendous. Men could not believe that Rome had fallen. Jerome on hearing the news can find no language but that of Isaiah to express his horror. "*Nocte Moab captus est, nocte cecidit murus eius.*"⁴ The heathen laid the blame on Christianity, and declared that had Rome remained faithful to her ancient gods she never would have been taken. This led Augustine to commence his great work on the City of God.

The argument of 'The City of God'. It would not be possible to do justice to so important a work in a few lines, but a short sketch may serve to indicate the scope of the argument. Augustine shews that other cities had not been saved by their gods, and that the Romans had shewn no mercy to captured

1. Orosius, vii. 32. Sozomen, ix. 10. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, bk. 1. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 798.

2. Hieron., *Ep. CXXVII., Ad Principiam. Hom. in Ezechielem.*

3. It may be conjectured that "Rome suffered less, externally, from the barbarians in 410 than Paris from the leaders of the Commune in 1871". Hodgkin, *op. cit.*, p. 799.

4. Isaiah, xv. 1. "Quia nocte uastata est Ar Moab, conticuit; quia nocte uastatus est murus Moab, conticuit." (Vulgate.)

cities nor to their temples. But, because they were Christians, the Goths had respected the churches and the fugitives who took refuge in them. They had spared even those pagans, who were now blaming Christianity for having caused the fall of Rome, but who yet had saved their lives by fleeing to the churches.¹ What shocked Augustine so much was the way in which the fugitives from Rome, who had taken refuge at Carthage, clamoured for theatres and amusements.² He devotes much space to exposing the horrors of the Roman stage.³ The plays, be it remembered, were acted in honour of the gods, and he asks what sort of gods they were who persuaded their worshippers to act plays in their honour which no decent man could look at. He speaks of the noble morality of the ancient Romans, and shews how far their descendants had departed from following their example. He asks what the gods had done to improve morals. Are any of the great moral works read in their temples? Plato's for example?⁴ Then he discourses at some length on the character and origin of the Roman religion. Varro is of opinion that there is really but one god, Jupiter; and Augustine asks how it is, if this is the case, that so many deities reign for him by presiding over every act in life.⁵ He next discusses the view of Scaevola, the Pontifex Maximus, that there are three kinds of gods, those of the poet, of the philosopher, and of the statesman.⁶ After indignantly condemning the notion that cities should be deluded in the matter of religion, Augustine goes on to discuss the different conceptions of gods; and declares that it was not the worship of the ancient Romans which had made them great, but their virtues.

1. *De Civ. Dei*, i. 1. "Nam quos uides petulanter et procaciter insultare seruis Christi, sunt in eis plurimi, qui illum interitum clademque non euasissent, nisi seruos Christi se esse finxissent."

2. *De Civ. Dei*, i. 23.

3. *De Civ. Dei*, ii. 7.

4. *De Civ. Dei*, ii. 7. "Quanto melius et honestius in Platonis templo libri eius legerentur, quam in templis daemonum Galli abscederentur."

5. *De Civ. Dei*, iv. 9 ff.

6. *De Civ. Dei*, iv. 27; vi. 5.

Estimate of the work. A large portion of the work is devoted to Platonism, especially the doctrine concerning *daemons*; and though this is decidedly tedious to the modern reader, it is of importance to Augustine's argument, as it was necessary for him to shew wherein the Christian doctrine of angels differed from the Platonic teaching. There follows a long discussion as to the nature of the soul, the origin of evil, the character and the justice of God's rewards and punishments. When, however, we seek for the main subject of the book, the City of God, it must be owned that it is disappointing to learn so little of Augustine's opinions as to its nature. But although it has been not altogether untruly said that the conception of the work is greater than the work itself,¹ hardly any book has so profoundly influenced Western Christianity. The idea of the Christian Society being the City of God was never absent from the mediaeval mind, and prevailed long after the Reformation. It caused that sharp distinction between sacred and profane which has still so much influence;² yet despite this separation of religious from secular life, which in theory was potent in all Western theology, the conception of the City of God gave a distinctly practical turn to the ideals of the Western Church. As a work of learning, the *De Civitate Dei* shews how widely read Augustine was, and how varied were his sympathies. In many cases he anticipates modern ideas in such a way as to make his book a necessary study to-day. In some respects, however, his method of thought is singularly alien, not only to modern notions, but to the more liberal theology of the Greek Church. The hard judicial logic of the West characterises his whole treatment of salvation and reprobation. He falls far short of Jerome as a critic, if indeed he can be considered to be a critic

1. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 805.

2. "But Augustine gave a much stronger hold than his predecessors to the conception that the Church is the Kingdom of God, and by the manner in which in his 'Divine Comedy', the *De Civitate Dei*, he contrasted the Church with the State, far more than his own expressed view, he roused the conviction that the empirical Catholic Church . . . was the Kingdom of God, and the independent State that of the devil." Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, v., ch. 151, Eng. Tr.

at all. He accepts the literary traditions of his age as easily as Jerome believes a miraculous story about a monk. The story of the inspired origin of the Septuagint, for example, is related without hesitation, and the prophecies of the Sibyl readily gain credence. On the other hand, the difficulties of the Old Testament, moral, chronological and other, are discussed at length and with considerable acumen.¹ The contradictions and inconsistencies in the mind of Augustine, like those in the character of Jerome, are illustrations not only of their age, but of mediæval methods of thought, which these two great men so largely contributed to form.

Nothing now remains but to speak of the Vandal invasion of Africa and the closing scenes of Augustine's life.

The Vandals in Africa. A great reason for the intellectual vigour displayed by the Christians of the African provinces in the fourth and fifth centuries had been their isolation. Protected by sea, though the southern frontiers were in constant danger from the Moors, the country and the coast towns remained undisturbed by the hordes of barbarians which were spreading desolation in Gaul, Spain, and Italy. Hitherto the troubles of Africa under Roman rule had been chiefly due either to the turbulence of the Donatists, or to the rebellious spirit of the provincials and their governors.² Thus when Rome was taken by Alaric it was to Carthage that the fugitive citizens betook themselves, as to a secure haven of refuge. But during the last days of the life of Augustine the Roman supremacy in Africa was overthrown, and the Catholic Church shared in its downfall.

Count Boniface. Among Augustine's patrons and penitents none was more distinguished than Boniface, the *Comes* of Africa. By the year A.D. 422 he had, as was admitted on all sides, gained a reputation alike as a military leader and as a man of high and honourable character. In 412 he is said to have driven Ataulfus, the successor of Alaric, from Massilia, and ten

1. *De Civ. Dei*, xv., cap. 17 ff.

2. Like that of Gildo the Moor, A.D. 398, and Heraclian, A.D. 413, both of whom were *Counts* of Africa.

years later he had distinguished himself against the Vandals in Spain. Either as a usurper or as a lawfully appointed governor, for even this is not clear, he administered the affairs of the province of Africa with energy and ability, and at the same time became the friend and correspondent of Augustine. From the writings of this Saint we learn that his friend's official position at this time was that of 'Count of Africa' and 'Count of the Domestics'. Suddenly and unaccountably, at the time of his first wife's death, Boniface's character underwent a complete change. He had been anxious to embrace a religious life, or at any rate to take a vow of continence. But he was called away from Africa, and during his absence he married an Arian wife, named Pelagia. From that time he seems to have steadily degenerated. His morals became daily more irregular, and his indolence proved a source of danger to the province, as no efforts were made to protect the frontier from the Moors. Augustine indignantly remonstrated with Count Boniface for his apostasy and also for his scandalous neglect of duty;¹ and, as one story goes, the Count was destined to be deluded into the commission of an even more serious crime.

The Western Empire was under the nominal government of the youthful Valentinian III. and of his mother, Galla Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius I. The real rulers, however, were the two powerful generals, Boniface and his rival Aetius. The latter persuaded Placidia that Boniface was a traitor, and an expedition was sent to drive him out of Africa. To protect himself Boniface called in the assistance of Gaiseric and his Vandals.²

The Vandal invasion of Africa proved a terrible blow to the Church, owing to the barbarians being Arians and bitterly hostile to Catholic Christianity. In

1. Augustine, *Ep.* CCXX.

2. Freeman (*Western Europe in the Fifth Century*, Appendix I.) denies the truth of the story of Boniface and his rivalry with Aetius, as resting solely on the evidence of Procopius (*Bell. Vand.* 1. 3), who went to Africa with Belisarius in A. D. 533.

A.D. 428 Gaiseric with some 80,000 males, including old men and children, crossed from Spain to Africa and found the whole country an easy prey. By A.D. 430 only three towns were able to offer resistance, Hippo, Cirta, and Carthage. Augustine and the wretched Boniface, the cause of all this ruin, were shut up in Hippo, which stood a siege of fourteen months, during which Augustine died on August 28, A.D. 430, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. The provinces of Africa were ceded to the Vandals in A.D. 435, only Carthage remaining in Roman hands; and that city was taken by Gaiseric in A.D. 439.

The Arian
tyranny.

The Vandal rule in Africa lasted for a little more than a century, including the fifty years reign of Gaiseric. With the history of this period it is not necessary for us to deal, save in so far as it affects the Church. It is, however, in one respect of special interest as being a striking example of the oppression of Catholic provincials by Arian conquerors. The Vandals, proud of their valour and of the superior purity of their lives, treated the orthodox as their inferiors alike in morals and theology. The churches were confiscated, the bishops driven from their sees; in some instances persecution was carried to the last extremity, and men were martyred for refusing to deny the faith of the Church. But, speaking generally, there was not more severity shewn to the Catholic religion than might have been expected to be displayed by victorious settlers towards the faith of a subject people.¹ But for the men who had seen the Church triumph under Augustine over all the powerful sects in Africa, to have to accept bare toleration at the hands of Arian barbarians was indeed a bitter trial, and the oppressed Catholics have caused the name of Vandal for all time to be associated with wanton destruction.

The Church of
Rome.

From the fallen Church of Africa we turn to the rising Roman community, which increased steadily in power and influence during the first half of the fifth century.

1. L. R. Holme, *The Extinction of the Christian Churches in North Africa.*

We have shewn elsewhere how under Damasus the Roman Church, with her apostolic traditions and her wealth of martyrs, had begun to attract Christians from all parts of the world; and under his successors her importance, despite the many calamities of the city, never ceased to grow, as the prestige of the former mistress of the world became more and more centred in the person of her bishop. Three things contributed to this rapid increase of the Apostolic See: (1) its unswerving orthodoxy and moral superiority to the Eastern patriarchates; (2) the ability of two at least of the pontiffs, Innocent and Leo; (3) the reverence with which men looked to Rome as the repository of the glorious traditions of the past. The withdrawal, moreover, of the seat of government from Rome enhanced the importance of the Church; for although the Sees of the administrative capitals of Italy, like Milan and Ravenna, occasionally claimed to be independent and even superior to Rome, these annoyances were more than compensated by the absence of any rival to the Pope in the city itself. Even the two sacks of Rome, by Alaric in A.D. 410 and by Gaiseric in A.D. 455, augmented the influence of the Church by removing the great families, whose secular magnificence had previously obscured the splendour of the hierarchy. Amid the disasters of the age the sole protection of the oppressed, whom the Emperor and his armies were powerless to assist, was found to be the commanding influence of the Christian Church. Outside Italy, moreover, there was a growing tendency to look to Rome for guidance and support; and as a rule the Roman bishops took the side of persecuted orthodoxy and virtue. It was not forgotten that Athanasius had found refuge from his enemies at Rome in the days of Julius; and that John Chrysostom had received the unwavering support of Innocent I., who withdrew from communion with the three great patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, till justice had been done to the memory of that much injured bishop. The preeminence of the Roman See in the fifth century is attributable to many causes, not the least of which was the high character which the Church of the Imperial City deservedly bore.

The Church of Rome had been for nearly three centuries a Greek rather than a Latin community; but after the reign of Constantine the Latin element preponderated, and early in the fifth century the very knowledge of Greek had begun to disappear from among the clergy. It had been long characteristic of Rome that she had been able to attract rather than to produce great intellects; and the sterility of her Church in this respect is in marked contrast to the productiveness of those of Alexandria, Carthage, and Antioch. But Rome amply atoned for any lack of intellectuality by her singular power of fostering administrative ability. The calm dignity, the capacity for affairs, the tranquil order of government, which had characterised the State of Rome in its greatest days, was now manifested in the Church. Her ceremonies were distinguished by their simplicity and restraint; her creed was the briefest and least theological of all confessions of faith. The sermons which have come down to us are not instinct with the eloquence and rhetoric of the Gregorians or of Chrysostom, but have the terse precision of legal decrees. The impression which a study of the Roman Church in the fifth century leaves, is one of solidity and strength. She at least compelled respect from other Churches, and seemed already conscious of her destiny to become the spiritual judge of Western Europe.

Tradition says that the earliest church in Rome, that of St. Pudenciana, was founded as early as A.D. 143 by Pius I.; and the church of St. Cecilia is attributed, but with little authority, to Callixtus I. (A.D. 219—223). The basilicas of St. Alexius and St. Prisca are also supposed to be earlier than the conversion of Constantine.¹

Constantine erected the church of the Lateran, near the palace which he had bestowed on Pope Sylvester, and dedicated it to the Saviour, nor was it till the sixth century that it received the name of St. John the Baptist. It was popularly known as the church of Constantine.

1. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, vol. I., pp. 82 ff. See also Barnes, *St. Peter in Rome*.

The origin of St. Peter's is more obscure; but the great church on the Vatican is generally ascribed to Constantine, who is also credited with having built another famous church outside the walls of Rome, that of St. Paul on the Ostian Way, a mile from the city. This was rebuilt by the praefect Sallust at the command of Theodosius and his sons. The other churches of the fourth century were those of St. Laurence, St. Agnes, St. Crux in Hierusalem, SS. Petrus and Marcellinus, St. Clement, and the two subsequently dedicated to the Virgin, Sta. Maria in Trastevere and Sta. Maria Maggiore.¹

It will be seen that, considering the vast size of Rome, there were but few churches in existence at the beginning of the fifth century, and that it is impossible to measure the influence of Christianity there by the visible tokens of its existence. The most famous churches had been built either outside the walls or far from the heart of the city. They were, as it were, forts erected by the new Faith preliminary to the complete capture of the capital of the world.

How steadily the Roman Church consolidated her authority from the days of Damasus to the death of Leo is shewn by the history of the successive pontiffs. And, as is often the case in human affairs, the policy of the Popes appears to have been guided by the irresistible force of circumstances.

Policy of the Popes. Siricius, the successor of Damasus, presided over the Roman Church from A.D. 384 to 398, and his correspondence with Himerius, bishop of Tarragona in Spain, throws an unexpected light on the relations of the Roman See with the Peninsula. Himerius had sent to Damasus questions on fourteen doubtful points: but Damasus had died, and it fell to Siricius to answer the letter. The language of the Pope shews that he is fully aware of the supremacy of his See. "We bear" says Siricius "the burthen of all who are heavy laden; nay rather the blessed Apostle Peter bears them in us, who, as we trust, in all things protects and guards us, the heirs

1. Gregorovius, *op. cit.*, pp. 88 ff.

of his administration." The bishop of Tarragona is commanded to publish the papal decrees in the five provinces of Spain—Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Baetica, Lusitania and Gallicia. The most interesting part of the letter is the fifth *Canon*, in which the marriage of the clergy after attaining the rank of deacon and upwards, as well as cohabitation with their wives if already married, is sternly interdicted.¹ The letter is really a decretal, and it is the first papal communication of this kind extant. It is maintained by some that Siricius held a council at Rome and promulgated another decretal letter to the Churches of Africa, which is found among the decrees of a council held at Telepte in Africa; but its genuineness is disputed.²

Anastasius succeeded Siricius; but his pontificate (A.D. 398—402) was both short and uneventful. The longer and more important primacy of Innocent I. (A.D. 402—417) is an epoch in papal history full of stirring events, and providing opportunities of which Innocent did not fail to take advantage. Innocent intervened with authority in the ecclesiastical affairs of Gaul, Spain, Illyricum and Africa, and took an honourable part in the disputes which distracted the Eastern Church.

The examples of the intervention of Innocent in the affairs of other Churches shew the position which the See of Rome held in the estimation of the Christians of the fifth century. In every case the extant letters of Innocent were in response to questions concerning the law and practice of the Church. As in the days of Irenaeus, Rome was the repository of tradition; but whereas in the second century men looked to her for decision as to the norm of the faith of the Church, in the fifth century she seems to have been more usually consulted in matters of law. In the decretals of Siricius and Innocent two points are uniformly insisted on—the obligation of the higher clergy to abstain from their wives, and the necessity of men passing through the

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Siricius', vol. IV., p. 697.

2. Hefele, *Councils*, § 105.

lower grades of the ministry before being admitted to the superior orders.

In the matter of St. John Chrysostom, Innocent deserves every commendation for having risen superior to the traditions of his See, the prejudices of his age, and the natural jealousy of Rome at the growing prestige of her rival. Since the days of Athanasius, the Popes had been the allies and supporters of Alexandria, and the opponents of the faction of the Church of Antioch to which Chrysostom, the friend of Flavian, had belonged.¹ Origenism was not in favour at Rome; and Theophilus, supported by St. Epiphanius, the bishop most revered for orthodoxy throughout the Church, and by the great Western theologian St. Jerome, had disguised his enmity against Chrysostom under the specious pretext of zeal for the Faith. Furthermore, the humiliation of Chrysostom was in reality designed to weaken the reputation of the Church of New Rome, which had gained so much from the piety and genius of her eloquent patriarch. Innocent therefore had every worldly inducement to shew hostility to Chrysostom and to support Theophilus. From the first, however, the Pope stood by Chrysostom, writing letters of consolation to him and to the clergy of Constantinople, annulling the decrees of the Synod of 'the Oak', and doing his utmost to induce the emperor Honorius to interfere on behalf of the persecuted bishop. Even after Chrysostom's death Innocent did not let the matter drop; but refused to hold communion with the Churches of the East till justice had been done.² Antioch was the first of the patriarchates to be reconciled to Rome, on the name of Chrysostom being placed on the diptychs in A.D. 413; Constantinople followed soon afterwards; but Alexandria remained out of communion with Innocent till A.D. 417, thirteen years after the deposition of Chrysostom. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Roman See was regarded in the East with reverence as the champion of those who were unjustly oppressed.

1. *Vide supra*, pp. 447-8.

2. Stephens, *Life of Chrysostom*, ch. xx.

The feeble emperor, Honorius, retired to Ravenna in A.D. 404, leaving the task of government to base and unworthy favourites, who were powerless to prevent the advance of Alaric and his Goths; and soon the intrigues which ended with the death of the valiant Stilicho, the one general who could have opposed the invader, left the way to Rome open to the Gothic chief. Into the devious political intrigues of the day it is unnecessary to enter. Suffice it to say that Stilicho was put to death in A.D. 408, and in the same year Alaric laid siege to Rome. There were no warlike operations, there was no defence. Alaric simply invested the city and let hunger do its work. The Romans sent an embassy to the barbarian with bold words; to which Alaric replied "Thick grass is easier mown than thin"; and when asked what would be left if they acceded to his terms, replied "Your lives".¹ In their despair the Romans turned to the gods of their fathers; and the heathen Zosimus tells a strange story, which the Christian historian, Sozomen, partly confirms. He relates that the Etruscan soothsayers were consulted, and that sacrifices were offered at Narni, which were believed to have propitiated the neglected gods and to have terrified the barbarians. Pompeianus, the praefect of the city, though a professing Christian, half persuaded by this alleged deliverance, consulted the Pope whether it would not be advisable to repeat the experiment in Rome. Innocent, as is reported, gave leave to the Etruscans to practise their rites in private. But they declared that to be efficacious the ceremonies must be performed in public, so nothing was done. Soon afterwards the Romans agreed to Alaric's terms, and the Goths retired. The story rests on the prejudiced testimony of a heathen historian, but, even if incredible, it illustrates the feelings of the age.²

1. See Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1., p. 771. The Gothic (*saiwala*) may mean 'life' or 'soul'.

2. Zosimus, v. 41. Sozomen, IX. 6. The former says that Innocent preferred the safety of Rome to his own religion. ὁ δὲ τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς οἰκίας ποιησάμενος δόξης λάθρα ἐφήκεν αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν ἄπερ ἴσασιν. Paganism was exceedingly strong at this time, and the code is full

The second siege of Rome by Alaric witnessed another revival of paganism in the setting up of a rival to Honorius in the person of an Arian Greek named Attalus, who was supposed to be in favour of restoring the sacrifices. He reigned some ten months as the ally of Alaric, whom he raised to the rank of *Magister utriusque militiae*; but finally Alaric deposed this puppet emperor and again made overtures to Honorius. As these proved fruitless he commenced the third siege of Rome, which ended in the capture of the city by the barbarians, August 24, 410.

Fall of Rome. The details of the Fall of Rome, one of the most dramatic events in history, are veiled in obscurity; since no record of the event from an eye-witness has come down to us. But what is remarkable is that the Christian Fathers dwell less on the horrors of the sack than on the singular forbearance of the barbarians. Alaric's Goths were Arians; but it is generally conceded that they shewed the utmost reverence towards the churches and the sacred treasures of the Christians. Cases are recorded of the piety and purity of Christian women winning the respect of their captors. Augustine and Orosius both contrast the mercy shewn by the barbarians with the ferocity of the ancient Romans when they captured the cities of their enemies.¹ But the strongest testimony to the moderation of Alaric is the shortness of the time allowed for pillage. In three, or at most six, days he had reassembled his forces and withdrawn them from the city. When we remember the horrors of the sack of Rome by Catholic Spaniards and Lutheran Germans in 1527,² the irreverence, the brutality, and the complete failure of military discipline of the troops of Bourbon and Freundsberg, we cannot but be amazed at the good behaviour of the Gothic heretics and barbarians who sacked Rome in A.D. 410.

of laws forbidding Christians to relapse into the old religion. Dill, *Roman Society*, p. 33. This explains the minuteness of detail with which Augustine in the *De Civitate Dei* denounces the ancient superstitions. He was contending with a living faith.

1. "Truculentissimas et saeuissimas mentes ille (Deus) terruit, ille traenauit, ille mirabiliter temperauit." *De Civ. Dei*, l. 7.

2. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, bk. iv., ch. xvi.

Innocent and Pelagius. The Pelagian controversy which began during the pontificate of Innocent, came under the cognisance of the Roman See in his days and in those of his successors, Zosimus (A.D. 417—418), and Boniface (418—422). The theological points of this dispute have already been noticed; and it will be sufficient to state the chief synodical acts relating to Pelagius and his friend Celestius. A council at Carthage held in A.D. 411 or 412 had condemned the opinions of Celestius; but he and Pelagius reopened the question in the East. The case was heard by John of Jerusalem at Bethlehem in 415, and by a synod at Lydda (Diospolis). As Pelagius was acquitted, Augustine wrote to Innocent explaining that the Palestinian bishops had been ill informed: and the sentence of the Church of Africa was renewed at a provincial council at Milevis (A.D. 416), at which Augustine was present. A synodal letter, together with an appeal by five bishops including Augustine, was sent to Innocent, who agreed to condemn the doctrines of Pelagius.¹ Celestius and Pelagius, however, sent statements of their faith to Innocent just before his death; and Celestius arrived in Rome to lay the case before the new pontiff, Zosimus. On their consenting to condemn all that his predecessor had pronounced to be heretical the Pope completely acquitted both of them.² The Africans were not however to be balked; and in A.D. 418 a Great Synod held at Carthage condemned Pelagianism. An edict against the heresy was issued by Honorius, and the Pope had no alternative but to confirm the decree of the African council, which he did in his *Epistola Tractatoria*. The success of the Roman See in previous disputes concerning doctrine seems to aggravate her failure in the matter of Pelagianism.³

1. Of this correspondence Harnack says, "The Pope had, perhaps, never yet received petitions from a North African synod which laid such stress on the importance of the Roman Chair. Innocent sought to forge the iron while it was hot." *Hist. Dogma*, vol. v., p. 182, Eng. Transl. Innocent, *Epp.* xxx.—xxxiii. Augustine, *Epp.* clxxxI.—clxxxiv.

2. Celestius used most submissive language to Zosimus, and Pelagius' confession of faith was drawn up with great skill. Hahn, *Symbole*, § 209. Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

3. An attempt has been made to shew that Zosimus' change of front was independent of the Edict. Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 186. Dr. Bright

Pontificate of
Zosimus.
A. D. 417—418.

Short as was the rule of Zosimus, it was important for other reasons than the case of Pelagius. Two other affairs, connected the one with Gaul, the other with Africa, occupied this Pope's attention.

The See of Arles, at this time occupied by Patroclus, laid claim to the primacy of Gaul; but the neighbouring metropolitans of Vienne, Narbonne and Marseilles resisted its pretensions, and succeeded in getting them rejected by a synod held at Turin. Proculus, Bishop of Marsailler, as metropolitan of Narbonensis secunda, asserted his independence by consecrating Lazarus, a friend of Heros, to the see of Aquae Sextiae (Aix). Heros had been put into the primatial throne of Arles by the usurper Constantine; but had been thrust out to make room for Patroclus. Zosimus, a strong supporter of Patroclus, confirmed his authority over the whole of Gaul, and gave him special privileges in proof of his good will. Heros and Lazarus therefore were exiles in Palestine at the time of Pelagius' visit, and exerted themselves as his principal accusers. It is therefore hardly to be wondered at that Zosimus regarded the charges of heresy made at Rome against Pelagius as coming from a somewhat tainted source. The hasty action of the Pope in pronouncing Pelagius innocent may possibly be imputed to personal prejudice against his Gallican accusers.

Case of Apiarius. Zosimus was also involved in a dispute with the prelates of Africa on a question of discipline. Apiarius, a presbyter of Sicca in Mauretania, had been excommunicated by his bishop for grave moral offences. He appealed to Rome, and Zosimus pronounced his acquittal, ordering him to be restored to his office. But the African episcopate resented this attempt at interference in the discipline of their Church; and at their General Council at Carthage

(*Anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine*, p. xl.) says, "This mistake on the part of Zosimus has no direct bearing on the claim of Papal infallibility, for he erred on the question of fact, whether certain persons did or did not hold the faith which he himself held; but still, to use exact and measured language, his was a very hasty judgment in a matter touching the very centre of the Faith."

on May 1st, 418, a canon was passed forbidding "presbyters, deacons and inferior clerics to appeal against their bishops to a court 'beyond the sea'." Zosimus next sent a commission to Carthage, consisting of a bishop and two presbyters, with a written instruction (*commonitorium*). A small synod of the neighbouring bishops was summoned by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, to discuss the question of appeals to Rome. The Pope based the right to hear them on a canon which he believed to be Nicene, but which the African bishops denied to be among the acts of the Council. Requests were made for copies of the Nicene canons to St. Cyril at Alexandria and to Atticus at Constantinople. As a matter of fact, Zosimus had mistaken the fifth canon of Sardica (A.D. 343) for a decree of Nicaea. Apiarius was however provisionally reinstated as a presbyter; but in A.D. 426 a further investigation was held; and Apiarius made confession that he was guilty of the crimes for which he had been originally deposed.¹ The case raised important points in Canon law; and it is the misfortune of Zosimus that during a two years pontificate he proved himself in the wrong in a point of doctrine and also in a matter of discipline, and provided a case both against the infallibility and the authority of the Roman See.

Boniface and
Eulalius.

The death of Zosimus, in December 418, was followed by a disputed election. One faction of the clergy and people elected Eulalius, Archdeacon of Rome; whilst the majority, as was said, chose the presbyter Boniface. The praefect of the city, Aurelius Anicius Symmachus, reported to Honorius in favour of Eulalius, and the Emperor ordered him to be installed as Pope. The people, however, rose in favour of Boniface, who occupied the church of St. Paul outside the walls; whilst his rival held the church and palace of Lateran. Scenes of anarchy and bloodshed, such as had characterised the schism between Damasus and Ursicinus, followed: and ultimately the case was referred to a council summoned by command of Honorius. The matter, however, was

1. Hefele, *Councils*, §§ 120, 122. Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. I., p. 240.

decided, not by the council, but by the conduct of Eulalius, who, in defiance of the imperial commands, celebrated Easter at Rome. Boniface accordingly became Pope; but died, after a brief pontificate, in A.D. 422. The whole incident exemplifies the authority which the Emperor already exercised in confirming the choice of the Roman clergy and people, and also the firm determination of the Romans, who accepted the appointment of all civil magistrates without demur, not to have a bishop thrust upon them against their will.

**The Roman See
and the Eastern
controversies.**

Hitherto we have seen the Roman bishops chiefly in relation to the Churches of Gaul and Africa and Spain. The interest in Eastern affairs was chiefly centred in Illyricum, over which they claimed jurisdiction, delegating their authority to the bishop of Thessalonica. Now, however, we have to observe their action in relation to the controversies which were agitating the Churches of the East. The Nestorian and Eutychian disputes demonstrated the power and wisdom of the Roman Church in the fifth century. Her position made her the arbiter between the rival factions in the distracted Churches of Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor and Constantinople. Situated far from the scene of their rivalries, the Roman pontiffs could the better decide between heated disputants, because their own flock was undisturbed by the questions at issue. In the great theological controversies the decision of a General Council was in the East a signal for a fresh outburst of embittered dispute, whilst in the West all interest in the question subsided when once it had been settled by authority.

**Celestine I.
(A.D. 422—432).
Sixtus III.
(A.D. 432—440).
Magnificence of
churches.**

Thus in the case of Nestorius, Celestine I. (A.D. 422—432) and Sixtus III. (A.D. 432—440) pursued a consistent policy of hostility to the Patriarch in his dispute with St. Cyril; and Sixtus III. marked the triumph of orthodoxy over the error of Nestorius by the erection and decoration of perhaps the first church in Rome dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. Sixtus restored the basilica of Liberius, and dedicated it

to the mother of God.¹ The church, now known as Sta. Maria Maggiore, still preserves the ancient mosaics—the only ones in Rome which illustrate the development of Christianity in a series of Biblical histories. Sixtus endowed his church with lavish gifts, following the growing custom of making the Christian sanctuaries rival their pagan predecessors in the costliness of their adornment. In vain had Jerome protested, in his letter to Nepotianus on his forsaking the military for the clerical profession, against men building churches of marble with gilded ceilings and jewelled altars on the plea that the temple at Jerusalem was thus adorned, forgetting that “our Lord by His poverty has consecrated the poverty of His House”.² The *Liber Pontificalis* extols each succeeding Pope for the zeal shewn by him in giving costly presents to the churches of Rome.

The most remarkable circumstance connected with the Roman See in the period under review is the rapid growth of its influence despite the comparative obscurity of the individuals who filled it. Among the early Popes there is hardly a single commanding personality. The influence of the bishops of Rome depended less on the merits or ability of the pontiff than on traditions of his throne. The very fact that, save Clement, no successor of St. Peter had taken his place among the Fathers of the Church, that Rome could not boast of an Athanasius, a Chrysostom, or a Cyril, enhanced rather than detracted from the dignity of the See; since, whereas all these eminent men had been engaged in the arena of controversy, the Popes had occupied the more secure position of umpires. At last, however, in Leo (A.D. 440–461) one of the greatest men of his age presided over the Church of Rome.

Leo may be justly termed the first Pope who combined the qualities of a politician with those of a bishop. At the time of his election he was absent on a mission to reconcile Aetius, the great Western general, to a rival

Personal
obscurity of
Popes.

Leo.
A.D. 440–461.

1. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, bk. 1., ch. v., § 2.
2. *Ep.* LII., § 10.

named Albinus; and throughout his pontificate he appears from time to time as the representative of the Roman people. It was not to the generals and councillors of Galla Placidia that the Romans turned in their distress, but to their bishop. When Attila invaded Italy in A.D. 451, when Gaiseric was about to pillage Rome in A.D. 455, all men looked to Leo for counsel and assistance.

Early life. A really strong character seldom shrinks from responsibility, especially when prepared by experience to exercise it. Leo, a Roman by upbringing if not by birth, was possibly the acolyte employed in carrying the correspondence of Pope Zosimus to Africa, in which case he must have had personal communication with St. Augustine. Under Celestine he was raised to the dignity of Archdeacon of Rome, a position of immense influence; and in the time of Sixtus III. we find him taking an active part against Julian, bishop of Eclanum, who combined fervent piety and unsparing liberality with a sympathy for Pelagianism.¹ Versed as he was in the business of the great Roman Church, and imbued with its spirit of government, Leo had no hesitation in assuming its leadership; if with a due appreciation of the responsibility he was undertaking, yet without reluctance. He recognises a proof of Divine goodness in the unanimity shewn by the Romans in electing him. The opening words of his sermon on the day of his consecration are words of praise. "It is" he says "a sign not of a modest, but of an ungrateful mind, to keep silence on the kindnesses of God; and it is very meet to begin our duty as consecrated pontiff with the sacrifices of the Lord's praise; because in our humility the Lord has been mindful of us."²

Leo betrays no sign of doubt regarding the assured position of the bishop of Rome. He is unquestionably the successor of St. Peter, the vicegerent of Christ. As Peter is above all the Apostles, so the Roman pontiff

1. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. 1., p. 164. "His long and weary life was prolonged thirty years after his exile. . . . The last act of the proscribed heretic was to sacrifice all he had to relieve the poor in a grievous famine."

2. Leo Magn., *Hom. 1.*

is set over all bishops. His right of superiority is in every case uncompromisingly asserted.

**Leo asserts
his universal
authority.**

Dioscorus of Alexandria is reminded at his accession to the bishopric that he presides over the Church of St. Mark, the follower of St. Peter.¹ Flavian of Constantinople is blamed for not at once communicating the sentence against Eutyches to Rome.² Anatolius, St. Flavian's successor, is constantly warned not to presume to an equality with the Pope, and is asked to send a confession of his faith, that Leo may judge whether or no he ought to be acknowledged by the Apostolic See.³ The bishops of Mauretania Caesariensis in Africa are given precise directions as to how they are to act in regard to ordinations, creation of sees, treatment of individuals, and appeals to Rome.⁴ The Sicilian bishops are warned against alienating Church property, and instructed as to the proper times for administering the sacrament of baptism.⁵ The Spaniards are commanded to be more vigilant, and are directed how Priscillianism can best be refuted.⁶ Illyricum is regarded as peculiarly under the dominion of the Pope; and Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica, is made his vicar, with authority over all the bishops of the province.⁷ When, however, Anastasius used force to summon Atticus, bishop of Old Epirus, to Thessalonica, he is sternly taken to task by Leo for his arbitrary and unjust conduct. Even if Atticus had committed a serious crime, Leo declares that the metropolitan should not have acted until he had taken advice from the Holy See.⁸ Indeed it is impossible in reading Leo's correspondence not to notice that anyone who appeals to him against his ecclesiastical superiors is sure of a patient hearing.

**Eutyches as an
appellant.** Even Eutyches, who was the first to report to Rome his condemnation at Constantinople by bishop Flavian, met with a certain sympathy from Leo. Considering how thoroughly

1. *Ep.* VII.

2. *Ep.* XXIII.

3. *Ep.* LXIX., *ad Theodosium Augustum.* *Ep.* LXXX., *ad Anatolium*

4. *Ep.* XII.

5. *Ep.* XVI.

6. *Ep.* XV.

7. *Ep.* VI.

8. *Ep.* XIV.

the Pope was opposed to the heresy, it is surprising how much tenderness for the person of the heresiarch he displays. Eutyches is described by Leo as foolish, un-instructed, ignorant, but there is no bitterness manifested against him as a man; and even when Leo is most strenuous in condemnation of his doctrine, he never forgets to suggest that, if Eutyches will only repent, he is to be pardoned.¹

But it is very different when the authority of the Holy See is disputed. Leo tells the bishops of Gaul that as our Lord has given to St. Peter the principal charge as chief of the Apostles, He desires that all His gifts should flow to the rest of the body from him as from the head. No one therefore who secedes from Peter's solid rock has part or lot in the Divine mystery. It is consequently horrible to learn that the occupant of the chief see of Gaul has presumed to subject the churches of that country to his authority, in order that he himself might not be subject to the blessed Peter. When called in question for his arbitrary actions, this metropolitan had given vent to utterances such as "no layman should make and no priest listen to".² In another case the same offender, in the exercise of metropolitan rights granted to his predecessors by one Pope but withdrawn by his successor, had by his harshness nearly caused the death of a bishop whom he had supplanted, by consecrating another to administer his see. The activity displayed in visiting his province seems to Leo to savour of an ambition to emulate a courier rather than to act like a priest.³ His violence is severely reprehended, and the Pope warns the bishops of Gaul not to be misled by the customary untruthfulness of their would-be metropolitan. Finally, Leo orders that in future the primacy of Gaul should be entrusted to a certain Leontius, who seems to have had no qualification except that of seniority. It is not a little surprising to learn that this arbitrary, unjust, arrogant and untruthful ecclesiastic was none other than St.

The primacy
of Arles.

1. *Ep.* xxviii. (*The Tome*). See also Leo's correspondence with Julian, bishop of Cos, *Ep.* xxxiv.

2. *Ep.* viii., cap. 3.

3. *Ep.* viii., cap. 5.

Hilary of Arles, one of the brightest lights of the Gallican Church. "He was a man", says Bishop Gore, and his encomium is not excessive, "of pure and lowly holiness, a zealous evangelist, simple and ascetic in his life; loving order and discipline, but hating oppression and fearless in rebuking it. . . . Altogether, the fifth century does not present a nobler and more beautiful character."¹ Hilary had crossed the Alps to plead his cause at Rome against a Gallican bishop named Celidonium, who, after having been deposed, had been reinstated by the Pope; but Leo refused to re-open the case, and actually ordered Hilary to be closely guarded to prevent his escape from Rome. However, he evaded the vigilance of his gaolers, and returned to Arles, saving himself, as Leo ungenerously remarks, "by a disgraceful flight".

The conduct of Leo on this occasion is in keeping with the subsequent action of his successors. To the heretic, regarded as an individual, the most orthodox Pope could shew a certain generosity; but towards those who contested their authority they were implacable.² In the case of Eutyches, Leo could behave as a Christian pastor, condemning the error of the heretic, yet doing all in his power to bring him to repentance. But to St. Hilary, who dared to question the authority of Rome, no consideration could be shewn. "He has" says Leo "on more than one occasion brought upon himself condemnation by his rash and insolent words, and he is now to be kept, by our command, in accordance with the clemency of the Apostolic See, to his own city alone."³

Not content with depriving Hilary and the See of Arles of all metropolitan authority, Leo also obtained an imperial decree confirming the papal sentence: an example of the influence exerted by him over Valentinian III.⁴ The difference of the power of the Church in Rome and in

Power of Leo
in the West.

1. Gore, *Leo the Great*, p. 106.
2. See Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, bk. vi., ch. li.
3. *Ep.* VIII., cap. 7.
4. Leo Magn., *Ep.* XI.

Constantinople is truly remarkable; as Leo found to be the case when he took part in the controversies of the Eastern Empire. With the single exception of Aetius, no one held so great a position in Italy and Gaul as Leo; for if the General has been called "the last of the Romans", the pontiff equally deserves the honour of being styled the first of the great Popes. Galla Placidia and her feeble son Valentinian III. granted Leo all the power over the Church he desired; it was for him to suggest, and for them to legislate. It is true that Valentinian in 452 enacted a law restraining the civil jurisdiction of bishops, which Cardinal Baronius considers sufficiently impious to have provoked the invasion of Italy by the Huns in A.D. 452, and the murder of Valentinian by the outraged senator Maximus in 455;¹ but the constitution supporting Leo against Hilary ought surely, in the eyes of a zealous advocate of Papal power, to atone even for an anti-episcopal rescript. Valentinian declares that it is for the good of the whole Church that all should recognise the Pope as their ruler; and no bishop in Gaul is to presume to make innovations or to attempt anything without his sanction. The provincial magistrate (*moderator*) is to compel any bishop who is recalcitrant to obey a summons to Rome. The correspondence of Valentinian and his mother Placidia with their relatives at Constantinople, during the Eutychian controversy, repeats the claims of Leo in asserting the very highest position for the See of Rome.²

But Leo found even the pious Theodosius II. far less amenable than the Western colleagues of that emperor.

Every emperor in Constantinople considered it incumbent upon him to maintain the right inherent in his office of summoning councils and appointing their place of meeting. Leo pleaded in vain for a gathering of bishops in Italy to decide the question raised by

Leo's influence in Constantinople. The XXVIIIth Canon of Chalcedon.

1. Baronius, *Ann.* 452, § 52. Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, vi. 245, who takes a milder view of this unimportant rescript. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Leo', vol. III., p. 655a.

2. Leo Magn., *Epp.* LV., LVI.

Eutyches. Theodosius assembled the bishops at Ephesus in A.D. 449, and Marcian and Pulcheria called them to meet at Chalcedon in A.D. 451. In the case of the latter council Leo was unable to prevent its being held, though he had declared it to be unnecessary and even undesirable. But the XXVIIIth canon of Chalcedon afforded a final proof that the Emperor claimed the right of acting without regard to the wishes of the Pope; for there can be no question as to this canon being made at the instigation of Marcian and Pulcheria. It declares that the Fathers gave the primacy to Rome because it was the imperial city (*διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην*), and that for this reason "the hundred and fifty most godly bishops" at the Second General Council in A.D. 381 had given equal honour to New Rome, considering that as it was, like Old Rome, the seat of the Empire and the Senate, it ought also to be magnified in its ecclesiastical position and be considered only second in rank to the elder capital. The canon of Chalcedon proceeded to define the jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople, giving to the Patriarch the sole right of ordaining all the metropolitans in the imperial dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, as well as the bishops engaged in missionary work in those countries (*ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων*). The title of Archbishop, hitherto rarely used, is further given by the Council to the occupant of the See of Constantinople.

Leo's indignation. The Council respectfully notified their decision to Leo, admitting however that it had been arrived at despite the protests of his legates, and requesting him to assent to the canon. They asserted that, after all, nothing had been done beyond ratifying the decree of the Second General Council of the hundred and fifty holy Fathers who met at Constantinople in the time of the great Theodosius. But Leo was not to be appeased by fair words. He wrote to Marcian denouncing the self-seeking of Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, and reminding the Emperor that New Rome can never be, like the Old, a see of apostolical origin.¹ To Pulcheria he writes that the canons of Nicaea ought

never to be set aside, and that the attempt to set Constantinople above Alexandria and Antioch, to which the 6th canon of Nicaea had given the second and third places after Rome, would only cause strife and confusion in the Church.¹ To Anatolius, Leo declares that the decree of the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381 is worthless, because it had never been referred for confirmation to the Apostolic See.² It is to the credit of Leo that though he rebuked even his confidential friend and correspondent, Julian, bishop of Cos, for his weakness in having assented to the objectionable canon, he shewed much anxiety that Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople, the prime mover in making the proposal, should receive justice at the hands of Anatolius.³ Two years after the close of the Council of Chalcedon, Anatolius, at the suggestion of Marcian, wrote in terms of humble apology to Leo, and his expressions of regret were accepted by the Pope, with a somewhat sarcastic remark that he would have pardoned Anatolius more readily had he not been so anxious to lay the blame of the canon on his clergy rather than on himself.⁴ The primacy of Constantinople, though not uncontested, seems to have been subsequently recognised in the East; and Leo had to be content with a somewhat illusory victory.

The Tome. But in the more important matter of the decision of the theological controversy Leo enjoyed a complete triumph. At the *Latrocinium* his *Tome* had been disregarded and the famous *Contradictur* of his deacon Hilary had been passed by unnoticed. Dioscorus had at this council to all appearance dictated the creed of Christendom; and, confident in his supremacy, had presumed to excommunicate the Pope. At Chalcedon Leo's *Tome* was declared to be the faith of the Fathers, though not till it had been discussed and the scruples of the Illyrian bishops in regard to it had been satisfied. "Peter has spoken by Leo; this Cyril taught. Anathema to him who believes otherwise." For the first time the Roman pontiff, himself ignorant of Greek, settled a theological controversy at a Greek-speaking council.

1. *Ep.* cv., cap. 2. 2. *Ep.* cvi. 3. *Ep.* cxl. 4. *Ep.* cxxxv.

The Tome of Leo is a judicial summing up of a hotly debated case. There is no attempt to explain the mystery of the Two Natures; Leo simply set forward what Scripture and the Creed of the Church teaches. The tone throughout is dignified; the language, forcible in its antitheses, occasionally becomes even eloquent. The error of Nestorius is made as evident as is that of Eutyches, and the Two Natures of the Godhead and Manhood of our Lord declared to remain unconfusedly and inseparably in His one Person. "In it," says Bishop Gore, "with his other dogmatic epistles, did the master-pen of Leo lay down for the Church the doctrine of the Incarnation with a consummate regard for the equal reality of the Divine and Human natures in this one Person of Christ, the Word."¹

Effect of Leo's
action in the
East.

Valuable, however, as Leo's *Tome* was in defining the Creed of the Church, it is questionable whether the effect of his interference in the controversy was entirely beneficial. The hard legalism of Leo's mind was opposed to any discussion of what had once been decided. In the Arian controversy the definition of the Council of Nicaea was openly discussed and disputed for nearly sixty years; and when it was finally accepted by the Church, it had been proved to be the only possible solution of the point at issue. The reasonableness displayed by Athanasius, the desire to unite himself to those who agreed with him in spirit though they differed as to the language in which their views should be expressed, helped to heal the breach between the different factions of the distracted Church. But Leo and his successors in the Apostolic See were entirely incapable of a sympathetic insight into the scruples of those who differed from their point of view. Any attempt to re-open the question after the publication of the *Tome* was regarded by him with horror; and when the Council of Chalcedon had pronounced its decision, it was regarded as blasphemy even to discuss it.² As a result, the divisions of the Eastern Church were made

1. Gore, *St. Leo the Great*, p. 70.

2. *Ep. CLVI., ad Leonem Augustum*

permanent ; and many, who might have returned to the fold had a bridge been made for them to do so, were forever excluded. The indignation with which the very suggestion, in the *Henoticon* of Zeno, of a modification of the Chalcedonian doctrine was received at Rome,¹ shews the unwillingness of the Papacy to make allowance for the subtler minds of the Greek-speaking Christians, and foreshadows the great division between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

As regards the position of the Roman See, Leo is perfectly explicit. Alike in practice and in theory he upholds the supremacy of St. Peter, of whom he declares himself to be the unworthy representative. It was customary for Leo on his 'birth-day', *i.e.* the anniversary of his consecration, to address the people and clergy of Rome together with the bishops who had assembled for the occasion ; and the main topic of his discourse seems to have been the dignity of the See of Rome as the seat of St. Peter. The whole Church would, he says, always find Peter in Peter's See.² Peter was the first to confess Christ ; he was ordained first before all the Apostles, that "from his being called the Rock, from his being pronounced the Foundation, from his being constituted the Doorkeeper of the Kingdom of Heaven, from his being set an umpire to bind and to loose, whose judgments shall retain their validity in Heaven--from all these mystical titles we might know the nature of his association with Christ."³ Not only is Peter above all the Apostles ; he is also the channel through which all grace is communicated to them and to the Church. It is not the secular greatness of Rome, but the fact of Peter fixing his seat there, that makes her the first Church in the world.⁴ The Council of Nicaea, according to Leo, who, like Zosimus, confounds the Sardican canons with those of the great council, confirms the unalterable supremacy of Rome.

1. The *Henoticon*, published by the Emperor Zeno in A.D. 452, caused a schism between Rome and Constantinople from A.D. 484 to 519. Felix III. excommunicated the Patriarch Acacius, who had suggested it.

2. *Sermo* II.

3. *Sermo* III.

4. *Ep.* LIV., cap. 3.

Uncompromising as is his theory of the primacy of the Roman Church, Leo shews himself solicitous for popular rights in the different Churches to which he writes. He desires the elections to bishoprics to be free and uncorrupt, he defends Churches against unwarrantable assumptions of authority by metropolitans. But Leo has scant sympathy with the diversities of practice. All Churches should follow the norm of Rome. "You could never have fallen into this fault" he tells the bishops of Sicily "if you had taken the whole of your observances from the source whence you derive your consecration to the episcopate; and if the See of the blessed Apostle Peter, which is the mother of your priestly dignity, were the recognised teacher of Church-method." A passion for uniformity in both doctrine and practice is throughout his correspondence characteristic of Leo.

But Leo is at least consistent in his stern adherence to Scripture and tradition. Excessive as the claims to universal domination made on behalf of the Church of Rome in the fifth century may appear to those outside her communion, she had, at least up to that time, retained much of the simplicity of the first ages of the Faith. No festival in honour of the Blessed Virgin was observed in Rome till the seventh century.¹ In an age when ceremonies were multiplying and increasing in splendour, the Roman Mass and Ordinal were remarkable for their austere simplicity.² Leo's predecessor Celestine advises the clergy not to wear a dress to distinguish them from the laity; but to be conspicuous for their conduct rather than from their habit.³ The sermons of Leo, terse and simple, suggestive of a praetor laying down the law rather than of the eloquent preacher, are almost exclusively about our Lord.⁴ He is silent in regard both to the merits of the Saints and the value of their relics. His tone is in many respects rather that of the first or second century than of the fifth.

1. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 270, Eng. Tr.

2. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

3. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Coelestinus'.

4. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, bk. II., ch. IV. Gore, *St. Leo the Great*.

To the controversialist the long pontificate of Leo the Great has an important bearing on the claims of Rome at the present day. But the rise of the Roman See and the great claims already made on its behalf by the middle of the fifth century are facts which the historian may accept without discussion. To one who believes that the supremacy which Rome attained in the Middle Ages was, like its subsequent decline, part of the Providential direction of the Church, the claims and success of Leo present no difficulties. At the very moment at which the whole fabric of the Western Empire was threatened with dissolution, the Roman Church arose in her might, and, with her splendid tradition and the record of an almost blameless past, undertook the guidance of mankind. In Leo she possessed a commanding personality who did not shrink from the responsibility of his position. In his faults and in his virtues he was the incarnation of ancient Rome. If he was lacking in sympathy, and perhaps also in generosity, he was full of courage, uprightness, and consciousness of a great mission. He failed in some respects, notably in his treatment of the Eastern Church: but he at least succeeded in leaving upon his age the impression that the Bishop of Rome could prove a leader in one of the most disastrous periods of the world's history. An iron man in an iron age, Leo was well fitted to prepare the Church to survive the crash of a falling world.

After the death of Leo the authority of the Roman Empire in Italy, Gaul, and Spain waned with startling rapidity. In A.D. 455 Valentinian III. was put to death, and the senator Maximus succeeded him. He reigned, however, only for three months, being slain by the infuriated mob when Gaiseric took the city. The next emperor, Avitus, was deposed by Ricimer, now the real master of the empire; but his life was spared and he was provided for by being consecrated a bishop. He died soon after his deposition. In A.D. 457 Ricimer, now 'Patrician' of Rome, placed Majorian on the imperial throne, a man of virtue and capacity, who, however, was put to death by the Patrician in A.D. 461. The next emperor, Libius

Severus, like his predecessors a puppet in the hands of Ricimer, reigned from A.D. 461 to 465. For a year and eight months there was no emperor, till in A.D. 467 Anthemius, the son-in-law of Marcian the husband of Pulcheria, was raised to the purple. Anthemius tried to throw off the yoke of Ricimer, and was slain on the 11th July, 472. Five weeks later, Ricimer, who for sixteen years had been the real ruler in the Western Empire, died suddenly. During the next three years there were no less than three emperors, Olybrius, Glycerius, and Julius Nepos. The first died a natural death; the second was deposed and made bishop of Salona; whilst Nepos fled to Dalmatia and, according to one authority, retired into private life. The last emperor was a youth who, by a strange fatality, bore the name of Romulus, and was known to posterity as Romulus Augustulus. He was raised to the purple on Oct. 31, 475, and on Sept. 4, 476, deposed by Odovacar. The ensigns of royalty were sent to Constantinople, and the emperor Zeno was asked to bestow on the barbarian the dignity of 'Patrician' and to entrust him with the care of Italy. Thus, almost unnoticed, was the imperial dignity for a time withdrawn from Western Europe. ~



CHAPTER XX.

ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCHES OUTSIDE THE EMPIRE.

A HISTORY of the Christian Church to the close of the fourth General Council is incomplete if it takes no notice of the progress of the Faith in countries beyond the frontiers of the Roman empire and among peoples employing neither the Greek nor the Latin language. The Versions of Holy Scripture in existence in the fifth century are alone sufficient to attest the missionary zeal of the Christian world, and completely to dissipate any conception of a Church confined either to the Roman empire or to the two classical tongues.

The Christianity of the nearer East was primarily Syriac speaking; that language being one of the most important means of diffusing the Faith. An extensive literature and several versions of the New Testament shew how necessary it is to pay careful attention to this venerable branch of the Church.

Under Trajan the Roman empire extended as far as the Persian Gulf, and included the whole district between the Tigris and Euphrates. But by A.D. 297 all the southern plains embraced by these rivers had passed into the hands of the Persians, and the Roman frontier was at Circesium on the Euphrates and Singara on the Tigris; the provinces of the Empire being Euphratensis on the southern bank of the Euphrates, containing the city of Samosata, and on the northern bank Osroene, which took its name from Urfâ, the ancient appellation of Edessa. North of this was the province of Mesopotamia, containing the cities of Amida (Diabeker), Singara, and Nisibis. At the death of Julian, A.D. 363, Nisibis and a considerable territory was ceded to Persia.

These border provinces, together with the country extending to the Gulf, were the home of Syriac Christianity, the starting point being Edessa, which till A.D. 216 was governed by a native prince.

The conversion of the king of Edessa forms one of the earliest romances of Christian missions, and has been already mentioned. According to the *Doctrine of Addai*, Judas-Thomas, the Apostle, sent Addai, one of the seventy, to Edessa, where he was apparently favourably received by the Jewish community, and healed and converted Abgar Ukkâma—Abgar the Black (d. A.D. 50). From the lists of the bishops it has, however, been inferred that the church of Edessa did not receive a regular organization till the second century, and that the prince who then shewed himself favourable to the Christians, if he was not actually a Christian, was Abgar IX., a contemporary of Septimius Severus (A.D. 193—211). As early as A.D. 201 we know that a church had been built at Edessa, for it was destroyed by a flood of the river Daisan.

Whatever may be the date of the foundation of the Syrian church of the East, it possessed many features of its own distinct from the Christianity of the Roman empire. It was in the first place a far more ascetic community than any other orthodox church. Like the Marcionites, who continued their existence for three or more centuries, the Syrian Christians discouraged, if they did not forbid, the marriage of baptized persons, all of whom were supposed to live in a state of absolute continence.¹ The Gospel in use was at first not that of the four Evangelists, but the *Diatessaron* of Tatian the Encratite.

1. But, despite Tertullian's denunciations of Marcion's prohibition to his followers to marry, he says himself that unmarried persons had better defer baptism till they have made up their minds not to marry. "Non minore de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus temptatio praeeparata est tam uirginibus per maturitatem quam uiduis per uacationem, donec aut nubant aut continentia corroborentur." *De Baptismo*, cap. 17. See Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 125 ff., who bases his contention that marriage was forbidden to baptized persons on Aphraates, *Hom. VII.*, § 20. But the passage in Aphraates appears to be capable of another interpretation, and the writings of St. Ephraim do not support the view propounded by Burkitt. See Connolly, *J. T. S.*, vol. VI., p. 522, 'Aphraates and Monasticism'; and *J. T. S.*, vol. VIII., p. 41, 'St. Ephraim and Encratism'.

The Syrians had a theology of their own; one strange feature being due to the fact that, their language having only two genders, the Holy Spirit is described as feminine, and thus it is possible for an allegorical preacher like Aphraates to speak as follows:—“We have heard from the Law that a man will leave his father and mother and will cleave to his wife. What father and mother doth he forsake that taketh a wife? This is the meaning: that when a man hath not yet taken a wife, he loveth God as his Father, and the Holy Spirit his Mother, and he hath no other love. But when a man taketh a wife he forsaketh his Father and Mother, those namely that are signified above,” etc. This and similar expressions imply, not that the Syrians were heretical, for they subscribed to the doctrines of Nicaea, but that they moved in a totally different ecclesiastical atmosphere from the Greek theologians; whilst their passion for allegory made their doctrine less clear-cut and precise than that of the rest of Christendom.

Four representatives of this interesting branch of the Church may be taken into consideration: St. James of Nisibis; Ephraim the Syrian; and the two successive bishops of Edessa, Rabbulas and Ibas.

A very celebrated Syrian is James, bishop of Nisibis, the spiritual father of St. Ephraim, who is called by Theodoret ‘the Great’. He connects the third and fourth centuries, and is said to have borne the marks of persecution when he attended the Council of Nicaea. He is also described as a kinsman of Gregory the Illuminator, the apostle of Armenia. But the fame of James rests mainly on the patriotic zeal displayed by him in defending his city during the three sieges, in 338, 346, and 350, when the inhabitants held out against the Persians. When Nisibis became Persian, the Christians, as was stipulated in the treaty, retired, bearing with them the bones of their brave and saintly bishop.

Ephraim. St. Ephraim (Syr. *Afrēm*) Syrus, the glory of the Syrian Church, was a disciple of James of Nisibis, whom he had accompanied when a mere boy to the Council of Nicaea. He resided in

Nisibis till the death of James, or, as some say, till its surrender to the Persians in A.D. 363. One of the great events of his life was his visit to Basil, whose fame as bishop of Caesarea had reached Ephraim's home at Edessa. The pomp of Basil as he sat on the episcopal throne shocked the Syrian ascetic; but when the bishop preached Ephraim was so delighted that he repeated the words as he heard them and joined in the applause which followed, despite his ignorance of Greek. It is remarkable testimony to the unwillingness or incapacity of most of the Fathers to learn any language but their own, that these two saints had to converse through an interpreter, though Ephraim is said to have been miraculously enabled to understand Basil's sermon and to utter words in Greek. By the same power Basil pronounced a Syriac sentence to his guest. Ephraim passed his life in poverty as a rigid ascetic, holding no higher office in the Church than that of a deacon. He was an indefatigable writer as a controversialist, homilist, scriptural exegete, and poet. He is said to have left behind him three million lines; and, though much of his work has been lost, his literary remains still fill six folio volumes. The general verdict upon his compositions seems to be that of Cardinal Bellarmine, 'pious rather than learned'; and indeed this seems characteristic of the Christianity of Syria, which does not seem to have been illuminated by much intellectual brilliancy.¹

When we reach the Nestorian controversy we find manifested in two successive bishops of Edessa the tendencies which led to the disruption of the Syrian Church into two religious parties, both of which broke off from the orthodoxy of the Greek-speaking Church. Rabbulas, who was made bishop of Edessa in A.D. 412, represents the Oriental under Hellenic influence. Born of heathen parentage, a man of wealth and position, he embraced Christianity in its most ascetic form, with all the fervour

1. A convenient account of the life and writings of St. Ephraim, together with an English translation of a few of his homilies, etc., will be found in the *Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. XIII., edited by Dr. Gwynn. Some of his works are also translated into English by J. B. Morris, and published in the *Oxford Library of the Fathers*.

of his nation. He manifested his hostility to Nestorius in a sermon preached, probably in Syriac, at Constantinople, but later on we find him, at the Council of Ephesus, among the supporters of the accused in opposition to Cyril. Soon, however, Rabbulas became reconciled to the bishop of Alexandria, together with John of Antioch and other Orientals who had defended Nestorius. For the rest of his life he devoted his energies to the suppression of Nestorianism, and to abuse of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the admired teacher of the School of Antioch, whom he declared to be the real author of the heresy.¹ He died about A.D. 435, having done all in his power to bring the Syrian Church into conformity with the other churches of the Empire. But his work was in a measure undone by his successor, Ibas.

The proximity of Antioch made the influence of anti-Cyrrillan doctrine powerful among Syrian scholars, inasmuch as it was opposed to the teaching of the revered Theodore of Mopsuestia. Ibas, the most fervent admirer of this theologian, who had laboured to make his writings popular in Edessa and the East by translating them into Syriac, was elected bishop in place of Rabbulas, A.D. 435, and held the See for twenty-two years. The furious opposition he encountered during his life-time, his trials, condemnation, imprisonment, acquittals, his friendship with Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, as well as the storm of controversy which raged over his name in the sixth century, are part of the history of the controversy concerning the Two Natures of our Lord. His letter to Maris, bishop of Hardaschir in Persia, was one of the famous *Three Chapters* condemned by the fifth General Council in the reign of Justinian. (A.D. 553.)² Ibas was the founder of the famous Nestorian School of Edessa,

1. See especially his *Letter to Cyril* and Ibas' *Letter to Maris*. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, arts. 'Rabbulas' and 'Ibas'.

2. This controversy was instigated by Theodore Askidas, bishop of Caesarea, who suggested to Justinian the condemnation of the anti-Cyrrillan writings of Theodoret, the person and writings of Theodore, and the letter of Ibas to Maris. These 'Three Chapters' were condemned by the fifth General Council, A.D. 553. Harnack, *History of Dogme*, vol. IV., p. 245. Eng. Tr.

which was driven beyond the Roman territory, and became even more famous and influential in Persia.

The Syriac language must always be of interest to the student of the New Testament, owing to the numerous translations made therein. The dialect, it must be remembered, is not that of Palestine, represented by the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament, the Targums, etc., but that in use in Mesopotamia and the adjoining districts. It would be out of place to discuss the relation of the different Syriac Versions of the New Testament to one another; but a bare enumeration of them will shew that the Church of the East exhibited a pre-eminent anxiety to obtain a good version of the Scriptures. The authorised version of the whole district was the Peshittâ or 'Simple' translation, which was received by orthodox, Nestorian, and Monophysite Christians with equal reverence. Whether it is the oldest version is open to question; but it certainly preceded the schisms of the Oriental Church. Modern scholars seem to be agreed that a more venerable version of the Gospels than the Peshittâ exists: two manuscripts having been discovered, one in 1858 by Cureton, and the other in 1892 by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson. These are both styled the 'Gospel of the Separate' (*Evangelion da Mēpharrēshē*), to distinguish the four Gospels from the Harmony of Tatian, once so popular among the Syrians, and styled the Gospel of the Mixed (*Evangelion da Mēhallētē*). Two later versions appeared, the Philoxenian, by Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbog (A.D. 485—519), and the Harklensian by Thomas of Harkel (Heraclea) in Mesopotamia. There is also a Palestinian Syriac, used by the Greek Church of Palestine and Egypt, in a dialect more akin to that of the Jewish Targums.¹

1. For an account of Syrian Christianity see Professor Burkitt's *Early Eastern Christianity*; Tixeront, *Les Origines de l'église d'Edesse*; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient. I.*; Mommsen's *Provinces of the Roman Empire*; vol. II., ch. ix.; *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, arts. 'Abgar', 'Thaddaeus', 'Ibas', and 'Rabbulas'; Phillips, *Doctrine of Addai*; Eusebius, *H. E.* I. 13, II. 1; Sozomen, *H. E.* III. 16; Theodoret, *H. E.* II. 30; Gibbon, ch. xviii. For the Syriac Versions and Tatian's *Diatessaron* see *Encyclopedia Biblica*, art. 'Texts and Versions', col. 5000 (Burkitt); Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, vol. IV., arts. 'Versions' and 'Text of New Test.' (Nestlé), Extra Vol., art. *Diatessaron* (Stenning); also Burkitt, *Evangelion da Mēpharrēshē*.

Persia. The only other power acknowledged by the Romans during the first six centuries of our era was that of the Parthians, which stretched from their eastern frontier to India. The Parthians, a rude and semi-barbarian people, long maintained their hegemony in western Asia, and disputed for the mastery of Mesopotamia and even of Syria with Rome. In the third century, however, the ancient race of the Persians once more asserted itself, and the dynasty of the Sassanidae claimed to continue the empire of Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes. The appearance of this Neo-Persian empire was that of a formidable rival alike to the Roman and the Christian world. A rival world-power and also a world-religion arose to challenge the supremacy of both the Empire and the Church. The founder of the dynasty, who bore the name of Ardeshir or Artaxerxes I., was the restorer of the old faith as well as of the temporal power of Persia. Indeed he seems to have regarded himself as called upon by heaven to make the religion of Zoroaster supreme on earth. "Never forget" he is reported to have said in his dying speech to his son "that as a king you are at once the protector of religion and of your country. Consider the altar and the throne as inseparable; they must always sustain each other. A sovereign without religion is a tyrant; and a people who have none may be deemed the most monstrous of all societies. Religion may exist without a state, but a state cannot exist without religion; and it is by holy laws that a political association can alone be bound." Acting on these principles, the Persians made Zoroastrianism the test of patriotism, and to profess Christianity was considered practically to be in sympathy with Rome, the enemy of their nation. Allusion has already been made to the leading doctrines of the Persian religion; its dualism, combined with a belief in the ultimate triumph of good, its hatred of idolatry, and the zeal of its adherents in propagating their faith. The remarkable heresy which, under the name of Manichaeism, by attempting to fuse together Christian and Zoroastrian belief, caused so much trouble in East and West alike, has also been explained, and the fate of its founder under Varanes I. has been mentioned. It remains, however, to relate the re-establishment of the

ancient Persian religion under Artaxerxes I. The 40,000 or 80,000 Magian priests (for accounts differ) were assembled, and were successively reduced by their own act to 4000, 400, 40, and finally to seven. Of these one was chosen, and after a seven days sleep, watched by king and nobles, he arose and declared the true faith of Ormuzd. The publication of the sacred volume followed, with its authorised commentary. The hierarchy was organized, and all subjects of the Persian empire were ordered to conform to the established religion. They did so with singular unanimity, and shortly after the decree the votaries of other faiths were said to number but 80,000.

The vigour of the Neo-Persian empire is attested by the successes of Shahpoor (or Sapor) I., the successor of Artaxerxes, who reigned from A.D. 240—271, invaded the eastern provinces of Rome, captured Antioch, and took the emperor Valerian a prisoner. After several short reigns another Sapor succeeded to the throne, even before his birth, in A.D. 309, and reigned gloriously for some seventy years. Being a zealous adherent of the national religion, Sapor II. on attaining his majority issued severe edicts against the Christians, who were cruelly persecuted in his reign, despite the remonstrances of Constantine;¹ and the Persian king even made the Roman emperor's sympathy with the Church a ground for hostilities. After the death of Constantine and the partition of his dominions between his sons, Sapor attacked the Romans. His wars with the Romans are marked by the successive sieges of Nisibis, which the Persians regarded as the key to Mesopotamia.

Julian never injured Christianity so seriously as he did by his death. He left his army without a leader, and perhaps but for the inglorious terms accepted by Jovian only a few stragglers would ever have reached

1. References to the sufferings of Christians under Sapor II. and to the wars between Persia and Rome will be found in the writings of Aphraates. Cf. Homily v., *de Bellis*, Homily XXI., *de Persecutione*. A large number of accounts of the martyrdoms of Christians which took place at that time have also survived; most of them will be found in Bodjan's edition of the Syriac *Acta Martyrum*, Paris, 1892. A critical edition of the Greek text of the Acts of the Persian Martyrs with an historical introduction has recently appeared, edited by the Bollandist Father, De la Haye.

the frontier. As it was, the safety of the Roman expedition was only purchased by a cession of provinces, and Nisibis, which had been for two centuries a Roman colony, had to be abandoned.¹ Isdegerd I., who reigned during the first twenty years of the fifth century, to whom Arcadius is said to have committed the tutelage of the infant Theodosius II.—a charge which the Persian monarch accepted and honourably performed—was at first so favourably disposed towards the Christians that he listened to the teaching of Maruthas, bishop of Mesopotamia, and Abdaas, bishop of Ctesiphon. The indiscreet zeal of the latter in burning the great Fire-Temple of Ctesiphon and refusing to rebuild it made Isdegerd persecute the Christians, and his severity was continued by his successor Varanes V.

The glory of the Persian Church is
Aphraates.
cir. A. D. 350. Aphraates, the earliest of the Syriac-speaking Fathers whose works have survived to us. We do not possess any account of his life, and all that can be said about him must be gathered from the internal evidence supplied by his writings, and from a few scattered references to him in ecclesiastical writers of a later date. He was probably of heathen parentage, and, owing to the fact that he took the name of James, he was mistakenly identified with St. James of Nisibis. It is clear from his writings that he was both a bishop and a monk, and we possess a synodical epistle which he was commissioned to write, probably during a vacancy of the see of Selucia Ctesiphon. He may possibly have lived at the convent of Mar Mattai in the neighbourhood of Nineveh. His extant writings consist of twenty-three discourses or homilies (Memrê). Of these the first ten were completed in the year 337, and the second collection, which consists of Homilies xi.—xxii., was completed in the year 344. The twenty-two discourses must have been intended to

1. The terms of the peace between Jovian and Sapor II. were: (1) the cession of the five provinces east of the Tigris, ceded to Rome by the Persian king Narses; (2) the cities of Singara, Nisibis, and the 'Camp of the Moors' were surrendered; (3) Rome withdrew her protection from Armenia. On these harsh conditions the Roman army was to be allowed to withdraw from Persian territory, and a truce for thirty years was proclaimed between the two empires. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 235—236; Ammianus, bk. xxv., 7 *ad fin.*

form a series, as they correspond in number and order to the letters of the Syriac alphabet. One more homily, bearing the title *The Cluster*, was written in the year 345. These writings are full of interest both historically and doctrinally. Although written subsequently to the Council of Nicaea they contain no reference to the Arian controversy. This may probably be accounted for by the fact that owing to the wars between Persia and Rome there was very little opportunity for communication between the two countries at that date. In spite of a certain lack of clearness in doctrinal statements it is possible to reconstruct the creed of the Persian Church from the writings of Aphraates, and to gather much information as to the beliefs and practices of the Christian church which was furthest removed from the influences of Greek and Latin Christianity in the fourth century. Aphraates is an authority of first-rate importance for the earliest extant text of the Syriac versions of Scripture. Apart from certain *Acta Martyrum* his writings are also our chief source of information for the history of the persecutions under Sapor II.¹

**Nestorians in
Persia.**

It is beyond the limits of our period to relate at length how the Persian kings extended their protection to those Christians who refused to accept later definitions of the Faith. The decrees of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon called into being large bodies of Christians who no longer looked to the Roman emperors as their natural protectors. The Nestorians were heartily welcomed in Persia, and their leader Barsumas obtained the bishopric of Nisibis in 435, which he held till 489. His see became the centre of a Nestorian propaganda, which overspread

1. The Syriac text of the writings of Aphraates was discovered and first edited by William Wright, *The Homilies of Aphraates*, London, 1869. It has since been re-edited, with a Latin translation and introduction, by Dom Parissot, *Patrologia Syriaca*, tom. I., Paris, 1894—1907. An English translation of some of the Homilies, together with a very convenient introduction by Dr. Gwynn, will be found in the *Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. XIII. See also Burkitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 84 ff.; and, on the Creed of Aphraates, Dom Connolly, 'The Early Syriac Creed', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Unchristentums*, 1906, pp. 202 ff.; also H. L. Pass, 'The Creed of Aphraates', *J. T. S.*, vol. x., p. 267.

the East and created the most wide-spread church in Christendom, extending even to China. The Armenians also may have owed the toleration for which they struggled so bravely to the fact that they refused to obey the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon. Thus Persia became the centre of a Christianity which held no communion with that of the Romans.¹

Armenia. Armenia is specially interesting to the student of ecclesiastical history, not only as the first Christian nation, but as one which made its faith the supreme test of patriotism. Confronted by a religion which made as insistent a claim to the obedience of mankind, the Christianity of Armenia rallied the nation to resist its demands. From the first, Christianity was a national affair in Armenia, as the story of its adoption—for there had been preachers of the gospel at an earlier date—testifies. During the days of the Parthian empire Armenia had been the appanage of the royal house of the Arsacidæ, and its throne a sort of provision for a younger son. When the Sassanian house under Artaxerxes (Ardeshir) assumed the hegemony, and the empire became Persian, Anak, an Armenian noble of royal birth, was instigated by the new 'king of kings' to murder his master Chosroës. Armenia was now occupied by the Persians, but a boy, a scion of the royal family, named Tiridates, was saved by the satrap Artavasdes and committed to the care of the Roman emperor. In A.D. 286 Diocletian, being at war with Persia, allowed Tiridates to go to Armenia. The people, grievously oppressed by their conquerors, rose in favour of a member of the old Arsacid house, and Tiridates became master of the land.

At the time of the murder of Chosroës, a child of the assassin Anak had been brought into Cappadocia, brought up in the Christian faith and baptized with the name of Gregory; but he is better known to posterity as *Gregor Lusavoric* 'the sun of Armenia', or Gregory

**St. Gregory
the Illuminator.
cir. A. D. 302—331.**

1. Rawlinson, *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*; Malcolm, *History of Persia*. For Sapor's persecution see Sozomen, II. 9, 10; for Isdegerd's, Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 39. For the history of the Church in Persia see especially Leboust, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Persé*, Paris, 1904.

the Illuminator. He had married a Christian lady named Mary, by whom he had two sons. Attaching himself to Tiridates, Gregory was advanced to high honour in Armenia; but, owing to his refusal to partake in an idol sacrifice, Tiridates, like his patron Diocletian an enemy to Christianity, subjected him to twelve tortures, and afterwards, having learned that he was the son of his father's murderer, cast him into a loathsome dungeon, where he remained for fifteen years. At the end of this time Tiridates, having put to death a community of Christian virgins under St. Gaiane, because one of them, the beautiful Rhipsime, would not submit to his desires, was punished, says the legend, by being turned into a wild boar, and his people were plagued. It was revealed to his sister that the sole condition of pardon was the release of Gregory. For sixty-five days the saint prepared the people for baptism, and then narrated to them his 'great vision'. One from heaven appeared, Whose presence was Light, and with Him three pedestals each surmounted by a shining cross. At the command of Gregory the people built three churches; one where Rhipsime was murdered and two where Gaiane and her companions fell. Gregory named the place Etchmiadzin (the descent of the Only Begotten), and it is now known as Utch-Kilise (Turkish for 'three churches'). In A.D. 302 the patriarch Leontius of Caesarea consecrated Gregory as bishop of Armenia. He lived till A.D. 331, dying in solitude in the wilderness, after having consecrated his son Arisdages to be bishop in his stead.¹

Such is the legend of the origin of the national church of Armenia, which played an honourable part in the history of the fifth century. The primate at an early date took the title of *Catholicus* (which has been explained to mean 'procurator' or 'vicar-general') of the

Church and sufferings of the Armenians.

1. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Gregory (7)'. The original life of St. Gregory the Illuminator was by Agathangelos, secretary to king Tiridates. See Langlois, *Historiens de l'Arménie*, vol. 1.; S. C. Malan, *Life and Times of St. Gregory*; Hastings' *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, art. 'Armenia (Christian)'. For the romance of the conversion of Tiridates see Duchesne in the *Liber Pontificalis*, where he compares it with the Roman legend of the conversion of Constantine.

metropolitan of Caesarea, to whom Armenia was ecclesiastically subjected to such a degree that even permission to hold ordinations was not always granted to the primate. The Illuminator is said to have divided the country into ten dioceses; and the presiding bishop was as a rule a member of his family. The policy of Armenia, which owing to its geographical situation was alternately under Roman and Persian influence, was greatly dependent on the Church. Thus in the days of Julian the known anti-Christian bias of that emperor made the Armenians unwilling to aid him in his fatal expedition against Persia (A.D. 362); though the peace concluded by Jovian in A.D. 363, by which the Romans pledged themselves not to support Armenia, was highly distasteful, because it left the country at the mercy of Sapor II. and the Zoroastrians. In A.D. 384, by a treaty between Rome and Persia, Armenia was partitioned into what we should term 'spheres of influence', an arrangement which lasted till A.D. 420. Two years later Armenia became a Persian satrapy under Varanes V., whose successor Isdegerd II. (A.D. 440—457) resolved to force the people to renounce Christianity for the Zoroastrian religion. Summoning the principal chiefs of Armenia, the Persian monarch commanded them to abandon Christianity for the Persian Fire-worship, and on their compliance sent them back to their own country. But during their absence the patriarch Joseph had held an assembly which declared that the Armenians as a Christian people were resolved never to abandon the Faith. The whole nation then rose in arms against the Persians, under Vartan, one of the nobles who had abjured the Faith at the command of Isdegerd but afterwards repented. A great battle was fought in A.D. 455 or 456, in which the Christian Armenians were defeated, Vartan slain, and Zoroastrianism was enforced upon the nation, the patriarch Joseph and other bishops being taken to Persia, where they suffered martyrdom. The leader of this rebellion, St. Vartan, is now above all others the national saint of Armenia. Within thirty years Armenia again rose in revolt in sympathy with the Iberians, who had thrown off the Persian yoke. Headed by Vahan of the Mamigonian family, to which Vartan also belonged,

the allies carried on the war with varying success from 481 to 486, when Vahan was appointed governor by the Persians. Armenia instantly accepted Christianity as the national religion; the fire altars were destroyed, and the apostates themselves abjured Zoroastrianism.

Mesrobes. The centre of Armenian Christianity was Vaharshabad near Mount Ararat, with its convent of Etchmiadzin, and it was here doubtless that the native version of the Scriptures was commenced at the close of the fourth century, at the instigation of the famous Mesrobes. Previously the language of Christianity in Armenia had been Syriac, but Mesrobes inaugurated a patriotic movement for the employment of the national alphabet, which he either invented or recovered. A number of the disciples of Mesrobes attended the schools of Edessa, Antioch, Constantinople, and Alexandria; and to this great literary movement we owe the preservation of some of the most precious monuments of antiquity, notably Tatian's *Diatessaron*, which was published from the Armenian version of the commentary of Ephraim Syrus, in 1876. Mesrobes also invented the Georgian or Iberian alphabet.¹

The Iberians. The little kingdom of Iberia, which lay to the north of Armenia, became Christian at the close of the third century. The story as told by Rufinus is that St. Nina, a pious woman, was taken captive to Iberia and healed the king's son by prayer. The king himself was converted, by the darkness, which overtook him whilst hunting, being dissipated when he cried to the Christians' God. Nina taught the doctrine of Christ to the king and queen, who preached respectively to the men and the women. A church was built, one of the columns of which stood upright at the prayer of the devout Nina. The country is said to have been visited by Eustathius, bishop of Antioch (A.D. 324—331), who consecrated John to preside

1. Rawlinson, *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*; Hastings' *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, art. 'Armenia'; Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, art. 'Armenian Versions' (F. C. Conybeare); Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. II.; *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, arts. 'Armenians', 'Esnik', 'Mesrobes', 'Isaac (Sahag)'

over the infant church. In the sixth century the Iberians were attacked and defeated by the Persian monarch Kobad, because their king Gurgenes refused to abandon Christianity for Zoroastrianism. The Persians were finally expelled from the country by the Saracens in the seventh century, but, despite the oppression of the Mahomedans, the Iberians remained true to the Faith. St. Nina seems to have been related to St. George the Martyr, whose insignia the kings of Iberia adopted at the close of the sixth century, and from whom the country receives its name of Georgia.¹

Ethiopia.

In the days of St. Athanasius the Church of Alexandria became the mother of the one native African church whose existence has continued down to the present day. The foundation of the Abyssinian or Ethiopian Church was owing to the wreck of a mercantile or scientific expedition headed by Meropius, a philosopher. Ethiopia, among the ancients, is almost as vague a term as Arabia or India, and it is a disputed point whether Christianity was not introduced in Apostolic times, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles of the baptism of the eunuch of Candace, "queen of the Ethiopians". Various Apostles are credited with having first evangelized the country, but the foundation of the Ethiopian Church must be placed as late as the fourth century, when all the expedition of Meropius was massacred by the natives except two youths, named Frumentius and Edesius, who were spared and obtained prominent positions at the court of the king, near Axum, a city near the eastern coast of the Red Sea, on about the fourteenth parallel of latitude, a little north of Aden. When the lads grew up they became the chosen counsellors of the king, and at his death were entrusted by the widow with the custody of her sons. They began their missionary work as laymen, assembling the Christian traders and others for services whenever possible. At last they obtained leave to return home, and Edesius became a presbyter of the church of Tyre, where Rufinus,

1. The story of Nina is told by Rufinus (*H. E.* i. 10), and is repeated by Socrates (i. 20), Sozomen (ii. 7), Theodoret (i. 24). The same tale is told by Moses of Chorene, who quotes it from Agathangelos.

who relates the story, met him and heard the account from his own lips. Frumentius in the meanwhile went to Athanasius at Alexandria, and told him all that had been done in Ethiopia, and how a Christian church had been called into being by lay agencies. The great bishop and his synod, on hearing the circumstances, agreed that none was so well fitted to preside over the new church as Frumentius, who was accordingly consecrated and sent to Ethiopia as bishop of Axum. This was the origin of one of the strangest of all branches of the Christian Church, which to this day is in existence, and looks to Cairo for its patriarch, always a Coptic monk consecrated by the successor of St. Athanasius. The Church of Abyssinia has existed despite the barbarism of the people and the pressure of the Moslem power, and though degraded, the Christianity of the country has still preserved a higher civilization than has been found elsewhere on the African continent. The patriarch is still called the Abba Salama (the father of peace), the same title as was given to Frumentius, the apostle of the country.

Abyssinian Christianity still retains some of the most interesting traces of the practices of the primitive Church, together with customs apparently Judaic in origin. Circumcision is practised, though its religious significance has been denied; the Jewish Sabbath is observed, as is also the law of the Levirate, and the flesh of swine and of things strangled is forbidden. The Virgin Mary is held in high regard, there being no less than thirty-two annual feasts in her honour. The crucifix is not permitted, and indeed all images are abominated, though the naked cross is allowed to be used. The marriage of the clergy was not forbidden, but even among the laity second marriages are discountenanced. In fact, as has been truly said, "The isolation of the Ethiopian Church has tended to many ancient rites and ceremonies; and has unquestionably conserved the strong Jewish element, which is more conspicuous in the remains of the Ethiopian Church than in any other Christian community." One strange ceremony at Epiphany illustrates the simplicity if not the barbarism of these Christians. The entire population

of the district—men, women, and children—meet and plunge naked into the water by torch-light. For this they have been accused of a repetition of the Sacrament of Baptism; but perhaps this strange act is no more than a commemoration of our Saviour's baptism at this season.¹

**The Ethiopic
Version of
the Scriptures.**

The ancient Ethiopic language, belonging to the Semitic family, is still employed by the Abyssinian Church, which has had a version of the Old and New Testament as early as the fifth if not the fourth century. The Old Testament canon is very extensive, but varies in the different catalogues. No less than forty-six books are enumerated, including all those in the Septuagint except the Maccabees; and the Book of Enoch, IV Esdras, Jubilees, and the Rest of the Words of Baruch, are added. The New Testament consists of thirty-five books, which are made up of the usual twenty-seven together with the Canon Law or *Síndodos* in eight books. To this Ethiopian canon we owe the recovery of the Book of Enoch, which was in high credit in the Church till the close of the third century, and then gradually fell into disuse and remained long unknown, till Bruce, the celebrated traveller, brought home two MSS. in 1773. Greek and Latin versions have since been discovered, but the Ethiopic is the only one which gives the entire text, and that in its most trustworthy condition.²

**The Teutonic
Peoples.**

The barbarians who ultimately occupied the Roman provinces in Western Europe were silently converted to Christianity, but the form which they accepted was not that permitted by the law of the Empire. The hordes who followed Alaric into Italy, and the invaders of Africa under Gaiseric, came as Christians but as Arians, and hardly

1. The story of Frumentius and Edesius is told by Rufinus (*H. E.* 1. 9), and repeated by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Ethiopian Church'. Lippmann has an interesting article on Christian Abyssinia in Hastings' *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 1., p. 57, in which he completely ignores the mission of Frumentius and Edesius.

2. It was first translated into English by Archbishop Lawrence in 1821, and has since been edited by Dr. Charles.

any Teutonic race received the Faith in its Catholic form. It appeared at one time as though the Teutonic invaders and the inhabitants of the Roman provinces were destined to be separated by religion as well as by race, and that whilst the more civilised but subject people held to the faith of Nicaea, their proud but barbarian conquerors kept aloof from the more refined Christianity of the despised and unmanly Romans, and made the balder creed of Arius their national religion.

The heretic Arius was banished by Constantine to Illyricum, and whilst there he seems to have impressed his views upon the Christians of the neighbourhood. At any rate, Ursacius and Valens, the two Western bishops who championed the cause of Arianism under Constantius, belonged to the district; and it is quite possible that there were missions to the Goths, who, it has been suggested, found Christianity presented in its Arian form, with a God and His Son like Odin and Balder, easier to accept than the more metaphysical teaching of the Nicene Creed. But the prevalence of Arianism among all the Teutonic people has not hitherto been satisfactorily accounted for.

The greatest of all ancient mission-
Ulfilas.
A.D. 311—381. aries was one of the Arian preachers of the gospel to the barbarians, namely Ulfilas, who has been rightly styled 'the Apostle of the Goths'. The facts of his life are briefly these. He was either of noble Gothic parentage or the descendant of Christian Cappadocians who had been led into captivity. At any rate, he was a Christian by birth, and a disciple of the Gothic bishop Theophilus who was present at the Council of Nicaea. He was made bishop of the Goths by Eusebius of Nicomedia, at the Council of the Dedication at Antioch, A.D. 341. He began his labours in the abandoned Roman province of Dacia, where the Ostrogoths were settled; but when a persecution began he led his Christian converts into Moesia. There, at the foot of mount Haemus, he established a Christian colony of *Gothi minores*, as his people were called. They are described as leading a pastoral life, and as less warlike than the rest of

their countrymen. In order to make the Scriptures accessible to his converts, Ulfilas invented a Gothic alphabet and translated the Bible, thereby preserving an invaluable record of an early Teutonic language. Knowing the warlike habits of the Goths, he refrained from giving them a version of Samuel and Kings, as the records of battle and murder would only reawaken their heathen passion for bloodshed.¹ We have a creed of Ulfilas, preserved by his pupil Auxentius, in which he professes the Arianism of the time of Constantius, and expressly denies the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, a denial which in later days became a peculiar feature of Gothic Arianism, as is shewn by the opening words of their *Gloria Patri per Filium* instead of *Patri et Filio*. The history of the abandonment of Arianism is beyond our period, and it is sufficient to remark that whereas toward the close of the fifth century there were hardly any Catholics among the barbarians, not a single kingdom remained Arian by the end of the seventh.

Imperfect as was the Christianity of the Goths, its salutary effects were seen when Rome fell into the hands of the forces of Alaric; and the testimony of Augustine shews how greatly mitigated that appalling disaster was by the fact that Rome fell before Christians rather than heathen barbarians.

Very different was it with the Vandal conquerors of Africa, whose Arianism made them more instead of less hostile to the conquered Christians. The story of the Vandal occupation of Africa between 430—530 is one of severe repression if not persecution of the Catholic religion. The Vandals regarded the Catholics with haughty disdain as a conquered race, inferior to themselves in morality and virtue as well as in religion. If the persecution of the Catholics has been exaggerated by their writers, the ignominy of their position in Africa under Vandal domination was undoubtedly very bitter to them. Elsewhere the Arian Teutons set the Catholics

1. So the Arian historian, Philostorgius. No MS. of the Old Testament survives, except a fragment in the Ambrosian library of Milan. The chief codex is the Argentinus, written in gold and silver letters on purple vellum, and now at Upsala.

an example of toleration and forbearance, the more laudable that it was not reciprocated by the adherents of Nicaea. When it is remembered that the majority in the Roman army were Gothic Arians, and that Ambrose sternly refused to permit their worship at Milan, and Chrysostom in Constantinople, we can only admire the toleration of the Gothic kings to the Romans within their dominions.¹ Catholic missions to the Goths were encouraged by Chrysostom, who is said to have preached to them himself through an interpreter.

Although Agricola, the father-in-law of the historian Tacitus, had whilst governor of Britain recommended the annexation of Ireland by the Romans, his advice was never followed, and the island remained independent. The task of reducing it would, according to the estimate of Agricola, have been the work of a single legion, whilst the removal of all danger of the spectacle of a free people in the neighbouring island inciting the Britons to endeavour to obtain their liberty was, in his opinion, an important advantage. The harbours and coast-line of Ireland were however well known to the merchants and sailors of the first century, and intercourse with the Empire was frequent and continuous.² The mutual hostility of the inhabitants of the islands was with justice considered a sufficient obstacle to any combination of British and Irish against the dominion of Rome. By the beginning of the fifth century it seems certain that there were already Christian communities in Ireland, and the settlement of Irish tribes in South Wales and perhaps Devon and Cornwall had created a means of intercourse between it and Great Britain.

St. Patrick. Early in the fifth century Patricius, or Sucat, the son of Calpurnius, a man of the rank of decurion and a deacon in the Church,

1. See the concluding section of my article in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, on 'Arianism'; C. A. Scott, *Ulfilas*; *The Extinction of the Churches in North Africa*, by L. R. Holme. The Creed of Ulfilas is in Hahn's *Symbolæ*.

2. Tacitus, *Agricola*, cap. xxiv. Ireland, says Tacitus, is "inter Britanniam atque Hispaniam sita"!

was taken captive to Ireland. His was a clerical family, for the father of Calpurnius, Potitus by name, had been a Christian presbyter. Their home was Bannaventa—a place which has been variously assigned to the neighbourhood of Daventry in Northamptonshire, to the regions of the lower Severn, and to Glamorganshire. When he was about seventeen a band of Irish freebooters descended upon Bannaventa, and Patrick was carried into slavery. The scene of his captivity is uncertain; according to Patrick's own account it was the wood of Fochlad in the north-west of Connaught, but legend also connects the scene of Patrick's servitude with the district of Dalaradia in the county of Antrim on the east coast. His six years of bondage were the years of his conversion. He had never previously given much thought to the subject of religion, but on the hill-side as he fed his master's swine he would utter as many as a hundred prayers a day; for, as he says, "the Lord had opened the sense of my unbelief." Taking refuge in a ship near Wicklow, Patrick made his escape and landed somewhere in Gaul. Finally he reached the island monastery of Lerinum (Lérins) in the south of France. There, in the cloister founded by Honoratus and adorned by men like Vincentius, the author of the *Commonitorium*, St. Hilary, the famous bishop of Arles, and the learned Faustus, a countryman of Patrick, the future apostle of Ireland remained for some years. He then returned to his own home and kindred in Britain. But he could not rest; the thought of the heathen in Ireland troubled him, and he saw in a vision a friend named Victoricus coming with letters in his hand. "And he gave me one of these, and I read the beginning of the letter which contained the voice of the Irish. And as I read the beginning of it, I fancied I heard the voice of the folk who were near the wood of Fochlad, nigh to the western sea. And this was their cry: We pray thee, holy youth, to come again and walk amongst us as before. I was pierced to the heart and could read no more, and thereupon I awoke." But the later story says that the cry which pierced Patrick's heart was the "cry of the children in the wood of Fochlad, even the children yet unborn".

But Patrick did not consider it his duty instantly to start for Ireland as a missionary; he went and studied for fourteen years at Auxerre, first under bishop Amator and then under his more famous successor St. Germanus, the overthrower of Pelagianism in Britain. The spread of that heresy in Britain had aroused Pope Celestine to consider the position of the Christians in Ireland, and he determined to send them a bishop. But his choice fell not on Patrick, but on the deacon Palladius, who had interested himself in the suppression of the British heresy. He was consecrated by the Pope in A.D. 431, but only remained a year in Ireland, dying in the land of the Picts. Patrick had already resolved to follow Palladius; and on his death he received consecration by Germanus as his successor.

He landed in Ireland in A.D. 433, probably near Wicklow, and made his way in a boat along the coast to Strangford Lough in Ulster. Entering this landlocked bay, he and his companions turned southward to the river Quoile, and fell in with a certain Dichu, a man of substance, who became the first convert. It is said that Patrick next journeyed northward to convert his old master, who, fearing the power of the Faith to draw him from his old beliefs, burned himself alive on Mount Miss (Slemish). Patrick then returned to Dichu, and turned a barn or stall, which his convert had given him, into a church. The name of the place has survived in the form Saul (*Sabhall*—Lat. *stabulum*). Proceeding southward into Meath, Patrick or his colleagues approached Loigaire, the high king of all Ireland, at Tara.

The king's son Fedilimid was converted by Lomman, and entrusted the care of his son Fortchernn to the missionary, bestowing upon him the place where the boy first met the Christians, 'the Ford of the Alder' on the Boyne, which still bears the name of Trim (the Alder).

Mindful of the cry of the children in the wood of Fochlad, Patrick visited Connaught and preached with success—the village of Baslic commemorating the fact that he had built a church (*basilica*) between the rivers Shannon and Suck. About 442 Patrick went to Rome

to Leo the Great, presumably to consult him about the foundation of the primatial See of Ireland. The spot chosen was Armagh in the kingdom of Oriel, whose monarch Daire had embraced the Faith; and the See was established in A.D. 444. Patrick's useful and arduous labours ended with his death in A.D. 461.

The establishment of the Irish Church is specially interesting as being the first Western territory added to the domain of the Faith which had never formed part of the Empire. The consecration of Palladius by Celestine was a sign that the Roman pontiffs were prepared to extend their jurisdiction beyond the frontiers of the civilised world and to add to their dominions "realms which Caesar never knew". Ireland was further organized ecclesiastically, not on imperial but on its native tribal lines. It is not likely that Patrick so much as dreamed of dispensing with bishops exercising diocesan authority, but the main feature of the new church was its monasteries, in which tribal and hereditary government prevailed as it did in the Celtic clans.¹

Conversion of the Picts. Beyond the wall of Hadrian the work of evangelization was going on in the fifth century. Ninian, the son of a *regulus* or sub-king in Cumbria, had been brought up as a Christian, visited Rome under Damasus, and was a devoted admirer of St. Martin of Tours. He was ordained by Pope Siricius as a bishop to preach to the Picts, and founded his monastery of Candida Casa, the White House, on the Solway, just after St. Martin's death in 397. It became a famous School, and was attended by both Irish and British Christians. Ninian is one of the early monastic missionaries who made his community the starting point of his labours.²

Rapid missionary extension. The growth of the Church beyond the imperial frontiers was perhaps more rapid in the sixth than in the fifth century, when we find large Christian communities in southern Arabia, traces of missionary work far inland in northern Africa, churches established among the

1. I have taken my facts from Prof. Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*.

2. Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* III. 4.

Nubians and Blemmyes by the energy of the Egyptian Christians. In addition to this were the vast operations of the Nestorians, those undaunted missionaries who journeyed across Asia preaching the word and establishing churches even in China. It appears that scant justice has been done to the expansive powers of the Christianity of the fifth and sixth centuries, and to the enormous efforts then made to evangelize the world. Nor must the influence of the monks and hermits be overlooked, whose austerities and blameless lives exercised so potent an influence on the barbarian tribes of the desert. We are apt to forget, whilst studying the often barren and profitless controversies of the age, the astonishing vitality of the Church in every part of the world. If missionary zeal is a proof of life, the Christian Church was never more alive than at the close of our period.

By A.D. 461 there were strong and vigorous churches in Armenia, Iberia, Mesopotamia, Persia, and Ethiopia. The gospel was being preached in the Sahara among the northern Arabs. Ireland, which had never been incorporated in the Empire, was a province of the Roman Church; and Christianity had overstepped the wall of Hadrian, which the Romans had had such difficulty in defending. Britain was over-run by heathen invaders who were powerless to eradicate what must have appeared to be but a feeble branch of the Christian Church. By means unknown to us, by missionaries whose names will never be revealed, every invader of Gaul and Italy, Spain and Africa, had heard of Christ. Rome had fallen into the hands of barbarians, but those barbarians were Christian. Already the Syriac, Ethiopian, Armenian, Gothic, and Coptic languages had been pressed into the service of Christ; and the Gospels were translated into tongues whose very alphabet it had been necessary for missionaries to compose. At Nicaea, at Ephesus, at Chalcedon, the delegates of churches over which the Emperor had no authority appeared, to shew that Christ claimed not the Roman but the human race.

It is a remarkable fact that few of these churches owed their inception to orthodoxy, and only one has

remained faithful to the Christianity of the Empire. The Syrian Church became Monophysite in the Roman provinces and Nestorian beyond the frontiers. The Armenians, by a mistaken interpretation of the decrees, have never recognised the Council of Chalcedon. The Abyssinians look to the Monophysite patriarch of Egypt. The Teutons received their Christianity from Arian missionaries. One nation alone took its faith from an orthodox source; and the Celtic Irish have remained true to the See which sent forth first Palladius and then Patrick to the extreme limit of the Western world known to the ancients.



CHAPTER XXI.

CHURCH LIFE IN THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES.

Difference between Christianity before and after the Edict of Milan.

WITH the publication of the Edict of Milan the Church passed into a new era. The extent of the change can be measured by the simple fact that, whereas hitherto every man, woman and child who accepted baptism did so at the peril of his life; henceforward the profession of Christianity was a material aid to worldly advancement. The Faith was shortly destined to enjoy all the advantages of wealth, respectability, and prestige. Nothing in history is more remarkable than the story narrated in an earlier chapter, in which the ancient cults declined, decayed, and disappeared.¹ The amazing rapidity with which Christianity spread, from the fourth century to the rise of Mahommed, is one of the phenomena of history. At the time of assembly of the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325 the Roman empire may be said to have been covered with great or small Christian settlements, a few of which had appeared beyond its frontiers. In little more than two centuries Christianity was the religion not only of the ancient Roman empire in its fullest sense, but of vast tracts in both East and West which had been practically unknown in the ancient world.

The great bishoprics. Such progress would have been humanly speaking impossible without most careful organization and, one may add, centralization. The Church, even before persecution had ceased, had become a polity of remarkable strength. The Roman genius for administration and government had

1. *Supra*, Chapter XVII.

never displayed its forces with more effect than when it welded all the scattered Christian communities into the one body of the Catholic Church. Consciously or unconsciously the tendency was to centralize authority; and though in theory all bishops were equal, the administrative power was gradually concentrated in the hands of the occupants of the Sees of the great capitals. Although these chiefs of the episcopate asserted that they owed their authority rather to the apostolic founders of their sees than to the temporal glory of the cities in which they were established; yet it is doubtful whether they could have retained their position had the cities themselves failed to maintain their pre-eminence. Indeed the Church followed the Empire almost servilely in her arrangement of patriarchates, provinces, and dioceses, and even the most venerable of all the churches, Jerusalem the Mother of Christendom, could only maintain an independent position by legislation passed with her special interests in view at Nicaea.¹

Rome. The great patriarchates were Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—later Constantinople. Modern controversy on the claims made by the popes must not let us in any way minimise the dignity and importance of the Roman bishop. The fact that no single bishop of the primatial See can be compared in elevation of character, distinction, or theological ability, with such men as Cyprian and Ambrose in the West or Athanasius, the Gregorys, Basil, and others in the East, enhances rather than diminishes our estimate of the importance of the Roman chair; for it only shews how immense was the prestige attaching the position which alone needed no man's commanding talents to commend it in the eyes of Christendom. Almost by instinct the Roman bishops avoided the perilous duty of presiding at councils or taking sides in the great controversies, with the result that they came to be regarded as holding the balance between the disputants, and as exempt from the danger of falling into heresy. Their political power came comparatively late, as did their influence over the populace of Rome.

1. *Supra*, p. 319.

Alexandria. Next to Rome stood Alexandria, second in dignity as its reputed founder St. Mark was the disciple of St. Peter. The bishop exercised authority over all Egypt and the province of Cyrene, and to this day is regarded as the head and founder of the Ethiopian Church.¹ The power of an Athanasius or a Cyril over the populace of the great capital was almost unbounded, and the fame of Alexandria as one of the great centres of learning added to that of the bishop of a city famous throughout the world for its school of theology.²

Antioch. Third in rank was the capital of the East, the See of Antioch, where Christians had first gained their name. Less famous in its precedents than Alexandria and less fortunate in their escaping the taint of heresy, the Church of Antioch held an immense position. The patriarch was acknowledged in Asia Minor and was the recognised head of the Armenian community, besides exercising authority over the vast Syriac-speaking Christian Church which extended to the Persian Gulf and to the more remote East.³

Constantinople. After much dispute the Church of Constantinople won the second place in the hierarchy. Founded by neither apostle nor evangelist, the daughter of the obscure city of Byzantium, the Constantinopolitan community raised itself above the more ancient and famous churches and even presumed to lay claim to rank with Rome itself.⁴ Nor must it be forgotten that the position of the bishop was more attractive if less venerable than that of the pope. For whereas Rome in the fifth century was daily sinking in wealth, opulence, and population, and becoming in name only the head of the world, the rival city was attracting all the wealth and commerce of the Empire, and the bishop presided over a splendid establishment and enjoyed the prestige of a great prince and potentate. But the constant presence of the emperor in the capital allowed the archbishop (for the

1. *Supra*, pp. 438 and 556.

2. *Supra*, p. 271.

3. Purkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 35.

4. *Supra*, p. 535.

title was first given to this patriarch) far less independence than his Roman colleague, and after the tragic fall of John Chrysostom, none of his successors were so much as allowed to contemplate the idea of freedom from imperial control.¹

Not that patriarchs alone exercised vast influence. Other bishops had widely extended powers. Carthage, for example, had authority over Roman Africa and the neighbouring provinces, but the Donatist schism and the Vandal invasion combined to lessen the power of this church. Arles in Gaul enjoyed a primacy of the churches north of the Alps. Caesarea in Cappadocia exercised an authority independent of the fact that it could number St. Basil among its bishops. In Palestine Caesarea Stratonis overshadowed even Jerusalem. Even in the less conspicuous dioceses, as we have seen in the case of Theodoret of Cyrus, the bishop exercised a widely extended jurisdiction.²

The Chorepiscopi. The larger dioceses imitated the provinces and patriarchates in so far that the bishop presided over others of the same rank. Subordinate to the diocesan were local bishops called *chorepiscopi* (χωρεπισκόποι). These seem undoubtedly to have been consecrated to the episcopal office; as a rule, however, only a single bishop, and not three at least, laid hands on them. They were allowed to ordain readers, exorcists, etc., but as a rule they had no right to admit to the priesthood or even to the diaconate. In some cases however the ordinations, though irregular, were recognised as valid. They disappeared about the ninth century, and their duties—those at least of a non-episcopal character—were discharged by the archdeacons, now no longer deacons but presbyters.³

The Clergy. The clergy before the close of the great persecution were distinguished neither by dress nor even by occupation from the laity. A man on being ordained did not cease to apply himself to

1. *Supra*, p. 450—51.

2. See *supra* as follows: for Carthage, pp. 263—69; Arles, p. 532; Caesarea in Cappadocia, p. 383; Caesarea in Palestine, p. 319; diocese of Cyrus, p. 470.

3. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 139.

his trade and reputable worldly avocations. This continued in a measure for a considerable time; and we find Pope Agatho (A.D. 678—681) explaining that his envoys were poor men who have to work with their own hands, and must not on that account be despised by the wealthier clergy of Constantinople.¹ It was only by degrees that the clergy were endowed, and also that they were distinguished when they went abroad by a different dress. Both St. Jerome and Pope Siricius condemn the last-named practice. It is a noteworthy fact that the words *κλῆρος* and *κληρικός* are never applied to bishops and not always even to priests and deacons, but more generally to the minor orders.

The Priesthood. From the repeated assurances we have as to the dignity of the priestly office, especially when contrasted with the diaconate, we are led to infer that its importance was often overlooked. In many cases the presbyters were so completely overshadowed by the bishops, at least as regards their ministerial duties, that we are somewhat in the dark as to what these were. In other cases the priesthood seems to have encroached on the prerogatives of the episcopate. Even the duty of preaching was rarely entrusted to presbyters, though some of the most famous sermons of antiquity were delivered by St. John Chrysostom whilst he was a priest at Antioch, and Cyril of Jerusalem gave his *Catechetical Lectures* before he was bishop. In Africa Augustine preached as a priest with the consent of his bishop, Valerius. In Rome only the bishop preached, and that very rarely. On the whole, the question of the status and functions of the second order of the ministry during our period is very complex and difficult.

The Diaconate. The diaconate was not merely a step towards the priesthood but a separate and very important office. According to St. Jerome the deacons were often better paid than the presbyters. The inferiority of their office was marked by their having to stand whilst bishop and presbyters remained

1. Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, II., p. 167. The letter of Agatho to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus is given in Labbé, *Concil.* D VIII., 655 (according to Gregorovius).

seated; but their power was great. In many churches their number was limited—at Rome they were but seven. They administered the funds and the temporal concerns of the church. At the Communion the presence of deacons—not priests acting as deacons—was indispensable. They directed the service, acted as spokesmen between the celebrant and the people, and administered the chalice.¹ The chief deacon—the archdeacon in our modern sense is a later office—was considered the natural successor of the bishop. It was indeed asserted of the Church of Rome, but on doubtful authority, that the archdeacon had the right of succession.² To make one of these permanent deacons a priest was nominally to promote, but really to degrade him to a less important office. Leo the Great rebuked Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, for venting his spite against the deacon Aetius by making him a priest.³

The minor Orders. Besides bishops, priests, and deacons, we find numerous inferior clergy—subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, etc. Cornelius of Rome, writing A. D. 251 to Fabius of Antioch, says that in the Roman Church there are 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 sub-deacons, 42 acolytes, 52 exorcists and readers together with door-keepers.⁴ The subdiaconate is now reckoned among the higher orders of the Roman Church; but this is only since Innocent III. in the thirteenth century. In early days it was considered a minor order; and it is primarily of Roman origin. Despite its Greek name the acolyte is a purely Roman office.⁵ The exorcist is of earlier origin, and is a survival of the old charismatic ministry. Primarily he took charge of the *energumens* or possessed persons, but he also prepared candidates for baptism. The reader was perhaps a survival of the ‘minister’ of the Jewish synagogue. He took charge of the books of the church. It was an ancient office, and, as may be remembered, the Emperor Julian was admitted to it.⁶

1. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 158.

2. *ib.* p. 162.

3. *Supra*, p. 536.

4. Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. 43.

5. Wordsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

6. *Supra*, p. 355.

Ministry of women. The co-operation of women in the work of evangelising the world was recognised from the first, and we find it acknowledged in the New Testament. In the fourth century the female ministry was more or less in existence throughout the East ; but in the Western Church it does not seem to have made much progress. Church widows, as in the Pastoral Epistles, existed from the earliest times, and were put on the roll (*κατάλογος*) of the churches.¹ In some cases they enjoyed a sort of precedence in church as 'presbyteresses' (*πρεσβύτιδες*).² Their duties are defined to be attendance at prayer, ministration to the sick, exhorting the younger women to live chastely, and missionary work. Deaconesses were recognised in the East as a regular order, and, unlike the presbyteresses, were in some cases ordained to their office. In some instances they were not admitted till they were at least forty years of age. They took a special part in baptizing the women and in being the means of communication between the bishop and females of his flock.³ One of the most famous deaconesses was Olympias, the rich and pious friend of St. John Chrysostom.⁴

Marriage of the clergy. As a rule the clergy in the fourth century were married men, though the prejudice in favour of celibacy was continually increasing, especially in the West. Very frequently, when a married man was raised to the episcopate, he and his wife resolved to live in chastity for the rest of their days ; but Synesius when made a bishop absolutely declined to be bound by any such arrangement.⁵ The *Apostolical Constitutions* and the *Apostolic Canons*, the Council of Nicaea guided by the ascetic bishop Paphnutius,⁶ and the Canons of Gangra,⁷ all refuse to insist on clerical celibacy, though marriage *after* ordination is forbidden ; but the Spanish council of Elvira (A.D. 306) and the Roman bishop Siricius (A.D. 348—398) strictly enjoin it.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. I. Tim. v. 9. | 2. <i>Dict. Chr. Antiq.</i> , s.v. 'Widows'. |
| 3. Wordsworth, <i>op. cit.</i> , p. 36, for the deaconesses in the <i>Didascalia</i> also chap. v. on women's work. | |
| 4. <i>Supra</i> , p. 475. | 5. <i>Supra</i> , p. 438. |
| 6. <i>Supra</i> , p. 320. | 7. Canon IV. |

Councils and Church Law. Councils had become a very prominent part of Church administration and were especially frequent in the fourth and fifth centuries. They had been common even in the days of persecution. In Cyprian's time assemblies were held annually in Africa to determine disputed cases, and in Cappadocia we are told that the same rule was observed by Cyprian's contemporary, Firmilian of Caesarea. According to the 5th Canon of Nicaea and the *Apostolic Canons*, councils were to be held in the spring and autumn in every province.¹ Universal or General Councils were only possible when the Church had peace and was protected by the imperial authority. The bishops were regarded as the representatives of their respective churches, and voted and subscribed to the decrees of the assembly. In case, however, a bishop could not be present, his delegates could sign in his name. The Roman bishops established a tradition from Nicaea onward of never attending a council away from the city if they could possibly avoid it. At the earliest General Councils they were represented by delegates.² The advice of doctors of the Church and theologians who were not bishops was taken, and in the fifth century monks obtruded themselves into the deliberations of councils, and often influenced their decisions.³ The Canons passed became the law of the district or province, or of the Church Universal; and Canons of even small councils have found their way into the canon law of the Church.⁴

The churches as buildings. Even before the Diocletian persecution the Christian churches were public buildings and conspicuous objects in the great cities. Christian worship was essentially congregational, and the buildings had to be adapted to large audiences. We have examples of churches of the third century in Rome, Africa, and Syria;⁵ but naturally those of the period after Constantine had obtained the supreme

1. *Supra*, p. 319.

2. Notably at Nicaea (*supra*, p. 304), Chalcedon (*supra*, p. 472), Ephesus, and the Lactrocinium (*supra*, p. 536).

3. *Supra*, p. 471.

4. Hefele, *Councils*, vol. I., pp. 20 ff.

5. *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, art. 'Church', vol. I., p. 366

power are more characteristic of triumphant Christianity, for example the church at Tyre described by Eusebius.¹

The churches built in the fourth and fifth centuries were of two kinds. The *basilican* or 'dromical' was an oblong building with an apse at one end, sometimes at both, and a broad nave with aisles on each side. The altar stood in the chord of the arc of the apse, and in the centre of the apse against the wall was the *cathedra* or chair of the bishop; the clergy sat on benches on either side of him. There were also round churches built over the remains of martyrs or as memorials, the most famous being that of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. The altar was railed in to prevent the possibility of profanation, the screen being generally open—the *iconostasis*, which at the present time renders the altar invisible in the East, being a later adaptation of the earlier barrier. Old St. Peter's at Rome, which was built by Constantine, and was only removed by Pope Julius II. (A.D. 1503—1513), to make room for the modern church, was an excellent example of a basilica of the fourth century. The church of St. Paul 'outside the walls', restored after the fire in 1823 in its original form, gives a good idea of the church of this period.

The churches themselves were often lavishly decorated. Here is a description of what the pilgrim Etheria (formerly known as Sylvia) saw at Jerusalem about A.D. 385:—

"Now it would be superfluous to describe the adornment either of the Church, or of the Anastasis, or of the Cross, or in Bethlehem on that day (Epiphany); you see there is nothing but gold and gems and silk. For if you look at the veils they are made wholly of silk striped with gold, and if you look at the curtains they are made wholly of silk striped with gold. The church vessels too, of every kind, gold and jewelled, are brought out on that day, and indeed, who could reckon or describe the number and weight of the candles (*cereofala*) or of the tapers (*cicindelae*), or of the lanterns,

1. H. E. x. 4, § 63.

or of the various vessels. And what shall I say of the fabric itself, which Constantine, under his mother's influence, decorated with gold, mosaics and costly marbles, as far as the resources of his kingdom allowed him."¹

Baptism. The ceremony of baptism was perhaps the most impressive in the early Church, and it was celebrated at the greatest festivals and frequently only at the cathedral church. Buildings were attached to certain churches for the reception of the very large number of candidates for the sacrament. On the Thursday before Easter when St. John Chrysostom was arrested, he had already baptized three thousand men and many more were awaiting the rite.² For such ceremonies extensive buildings were required, and, as baptism was almost invariably by immersion, a very large supply of water.

In the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem we have a full account of a baptismal ceremony at Easter. After delivering a *Procatechesis* or introduction, eighteen lectures on the duties of a Christian believer and on the Creed, Cyril gave further lectures to his hearers after their baptism in order to explain the nature of the mysteries into which they had been initiated.

First, he tells them they entered the vestibule (*προαίλιον*) of the baptistery, and facing westward renounced Satan, saying "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomp, and all thy service." Turning then to the east, the place of light, the candidates declared their belief in the Trinity and in one baptism. Next they entered the inner chamber of the baptistery and put off their clothes, and were anointed with oil "from the hairs of your head to your feet". The oil had been exorcised and was "a charm to drive away every trace of hostile influence". After this the candidates entered the pool (*κολυμβήθρα*) and were asked their belief in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The immersion which followed was threefold and completed the actual baptism. The newly baptized were now

1. *Holy Week in Jerusalem.* (S.P.C.K.).

2. *Supra*, p. 449.

anointed, first on the forehead, then on the ears, nostrils and breast. "Having been counted worthy of this holy Christ," the preacher assured them, "ye are called Christians." The candidates, clothed in white garments, now proceeded to receive the Eucharist.¹

The Eucharist. The Liturgy, as the Communion Service is technically called, may be said to have already received a more or less stereotyped form in the different Churches. The subject of Liturgiology is, however, one which cannot be treated in a brief description of the main features of church life; and here it must suffice to follow Cyril's description of what took place in Jerusalem at the middle of the fourth century. First the deacon brought water to the officiant, probably the bishop, who is distinguished by the title of *ιερευς*, and after he had washed, the presbyters who stood round the altar did the same. Then follows the kiss of peace, the deacon crying "Receive one another; and let us kiss one another." The priest says "Lift up your hearts," and "Let us give thanks unto the Lord," the response to each respectively being "We lift them up unto the Lord," and "It is meet and right." "After this" says Cyril "we make mention of all Creation, Angels, Archangels, etc., and of the Seraphim, who cried *Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Sabaoth.*" After these hymns prayers were made to God to sanctify the gifts lying before Him by His Holy Spirit, that the Bread may become the Body and the Wine the Blood of our Saviour, "for whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched the same is sanctified and changed." After the 'spiritual sacrifice' of the 'bloodless service' is completed, prayers are made for the peace of the world, for the emperors, soldiers, and allies of the Romans, for the sick and afflicted, etc. This is followed by a commemoration of Patriarchs, Prophets, Martyrs, etc., and those who have fallen asleep. The prayers conclude with the Lord's Prayer, and at the Amen the priests proclaim "Holy things for the holy," and the people respond "One is Holy, One is the Lord, Jesus Christ." Then the chanter's voice invited the people

1. Cyr. Hier., *Catechesis* XX. (*de Myst.* II.)

“with a sacred melody” to communicate, singing “O taste and see that the Lord is good.” The communion is to be made with all reverence; the left hand is to support the right and the palm is to be hollowed as the right hand is to be a throne to ‘receive the King of kings’. After receiving both the Bread and the Wine the communicant is to say ‘Amen’. The service concludes with a short thanksgiving. It must be borne in mind that this description is given in a series of popular lectures to candidates for Baptism, and one must not therefore look for more than a general outline of the service; but Cyril certainly gives us enough to shew the main features of a fourth-century Liturgy and of the many correspondences which it has to the service to which we are accustomed. By the end of the century the ceremonial tended to become more and more imposing, and the awfulness of the mystery to be more forcibly asserted, where the moment of consecration is said to have been more clearly defined as time went on.¹

Preaching. Church oratory, perhaps, attained its zenith at the close of the fourth century, especially at Antioch and Constantinople, where it reached an excellence, perhaps never since attained, in the eloquence of St. John Chrysostom. Grammar and rhetoric in the widest sense of these terms were the main subjects of education, and everybody was encouraged to make himself proficient in the art of oratory. Strange as it may seem, all the great preachers of this period—Basil, the Gregorys, and Chrysostom himself—studied under the heathen orator Libanius. In his treatise *De Sacerdotio*, the last-named gives a most amusing account of the difficulties of a popular preacher. The congregations were most critical, and if a man had a reputation he had to preach in accordance with it, or to learn that he had disappointed his audience. Nor had he to wait to know what their verdict was. If the congregation heard him in silence, his discourse was a failure. When, on the contrary, he caught the fancy of the people, clapping of hands and loud cries

1. See Srawley, *Early History of the Eucharist*, p. 209 f.

of applause welcomed every well-rounded period.¹ As a rule, however, the sermons were extremely scriptural, and often whole books or epistles were explained verse by verse from the pulpit. Sometimes the most mysterious doctrines of the Faith were expounded to mixed audiences, presupposing a very high standard of education and intelligence. Chrysostom, on the other hand, is an extremely practical moralist, and to him we are indebted for a vivid description of the foibles of society both in Antioch and Constantinople. The influence of sermons was immense. Gregory of Nazianzus won back Constantinople to orthodoxy by his famous discourses.² In Milan, Ambrose, a careful student of Basil, owed much of his influence to his preaching, which, as we have seen, had a great effect on Augustine.³

Discipline was relaxing in severity, but was more systematized than it had been in early days. In ancient times penance was regarded not so much as a penalty as a privilege. As we have seen, the question was as to whether the Church had the power under any circumstances whatever to readmit to communion a man guilty of a heinous offence. Now, however, there was a tendency to regard penance as a penal instrument in the hands of the clergy to secure good order among their flocks. The delinquent had first to make a public confession of sin, and then had to work his way through the different degrees and stations of 'penitence' according to his guilt. These are first mentioned by Gregory Thaumaturgus in the third century, but they were formally systematized by the legislation of the fourth. The essence of penitential discipline being loss of status, the sinner was degraded, and the lowest state to which he could be assigned was one in which he might not even join in the prayers of the faithful. Outside the church, exposed to the weather, the sinner had to stand and confess his sin and to intercede for the prayers of the people. In some cases this penance lasted for years. The lowest class of penitents were known as *mourners*; after this the

1. Chrys., *de Sacer.* iv. 5. 2. *Supra*, p. 394. 3. *Supra*, p. 493.

sinner was promoted to the second grade, the *hearers*, who with the heathen might listen to the reading of Scripture in the *narthex* or porch of the church; next he became a *kneeler* among the catechumens, but departed before the Canon of the Liturgy began; and finally he was allowed to be present at the Mass but not as a communicant. These divisions did not prevail everywhere, and public penance fell rapidly everywhere into general disuse.¹

Holy Days. The Christian year was beginning to assume somewhat of its present form by the close of the fourth century. Sunday was protected by the legislation of Constantine; and in the Theodosian code Saturday, still known as 'the Sabbath', is mentioned as a holy-day second only to Sunday, with special prayers and services. The Roman Church observed it as a fast. Wednesday and Friday had long been kept as days of abstinence. Easter was naturally the central festival. It was preceded by a fast which varied considerably in its duration, and the 'Preparation day' (Good Friday) was kept with great solemnity. There were many striking ceremonies on the Easter festival, especially the lighting of the lamps, and it was the chief season for Baptisms. The other great festivals were Pentecost and Christmas. The latter seems to have been of Roman origin, whereas the Epiphany was rather an Oriental festival commemorative of the Manifestation including the Birth of Christ. Gradually the whole Church practically accepted the birth-day of the Saviour as December 25th, despite the fact that it was necessary for Christian teachers to warn their flocks against connecting it with the worship of the sun at the winter solstice. The Nativity of St. John the Baptist at Midsummer was one of the earliest and most popular festivals of the Church. As a rule the birth-days of martyrs (*natalitia*) were the days of their sufferings, and were celebrated at their tombs. At a slightly later date the days of St. Stephen, St. Peter, St. Paul, and the Maccabees were festivals held in

1. *Supra*, p. 236-7. Perhaps these elaborate grades of penitents never existed in their entirety.

especial honour. Local martyrs were honoured on their 'birth-days,' and churches erected in their honour.

The reproach of ill-judged and indiscriminate charity cannot be made against the primitive Church. The Pastoral Epistles are models of practical good sense, and St. Paul was fully alive to the danger of pauperising his converts. By the time of Julian charitable institutions had become a characteristic and most important feature of the Christian system, and that emperor exhorts the heathen priesthood to emulate and surpass their rivals in this respect. Monasticism, especially as organized by St. Basil, gave a great impetus in this direction. The hospital (*hospitium* or *hospitale*) was originally, as its name implies and as it survives in the word *hôtel*, intended for the reception of guests, and as the poor were the most welcome guests to a true Christian the words *ξενοδοχεῖον* and *πρωχοτροφεῖον* are almost interchangeable. Eustathius of Sebaste may have led the way by establishing hospitals, but probably they had been in existence long before the middle of the fourth century. Basil regarded the lepers, whom it was customary to drive out of the cities, with especial solicitude, and is said to have devoted a portion of his hospital specially for them.¹ Chrysostom enlarges on the charity of the Church of Constantinople towards the poor, the aged, and the sick; nor was Rome behindhand in this respect. In times of pestilence, as we have seen, the courage and devotion of the Christians was constantly conspicuous. The *parabolani*, especially at Alexandria, devoted themselves to the care of the sick, and at Constantinople the *copiatae* made it their special duty to conduct the funerals of the poor.

The tendency towards materializing the spiritual facts of the Gospel was growing in strength throughout this period. Christianity, whilst retaining the sublime doctrines of the Deity as pure Spirit, demanded more and more

Relics and Holy Places.

1. Two English books which may be studied with advantage on St. Basil have appeared almost simultaneously; by Mr. Morrison on *St. Basil and his Rule*, and by W. K. L. Clarke, *St. Basil the Great*.

insistently tangible objects of devotion. In the later days of persecution, the martyrs had attracted veneration, and their remains were preserved and not unfrequently superstitiously adored. By the close of the fourth century the remains of the martyrs began to be credited with magical powers over daemons and diseases, as is attested by such men as Basil and Ambrose, Chrysostom and Augustine. Mention has already been made of the discovery of the true Cross; but an earlier relic is mentioned by Eusebius as having been preserved at Jerusalem in the chair of St. James, the Lord's brother and first bishop of Jerusalem. A fortunate priest discovered the tombs of St. Stephen, Nicodemus, and Gamaliel. The head of the Baptist was found in Cilicia in A.D. 330; in 390 it was removed to Constantinople. A second head was fortunately unearthed at Emesa in A.D. 454! All the sites of importance mentioned in the Old and New Testament were carefully located; and for many of these we have no earlier evidence than the fourth century. The visit of Helena to Jerusalem and the lavish gifts of her son Constantine to the Holy City stimulated inquiry and discovery. Altars had been placed over relics from a very early date indeed, and to the present day the law of the Roman church is that every altar must contain relics. If the superstition of the fourth century was less than that of a later age, the materialism which prompted it was already on the increase.

Pilgrimage. St. Helena's visit to Jerusalem did much to encourage the vast influx of pious visitors who poured into the Holy Land before the close of the century; and five years after her visit a pilgrim who journeyed from Bordeaux to Jerusalem has left us a record of his experiences. At Jerusalem he saw the pools made by Solomon, the two pools of Bethesda, the crypt where Solomon confined evil spirits, the place where Solomon wrote the book of Wisdom, and a great many other interesting sites. The places connected with our Lord were the pinnacle of the Temptation, the house of Caiaphas, the pillar where Christ was scourged, the walls of Pilate's palace, mount Golgotha outside the city, the Sepulchre, over which Constantine had built

his church, the grave of Lazarus, and the mount of the Transfiguration.¹

A third record of an early pilgrimage is the *Peregrinatio Silviae*, discovered in 1887. It was supposed that the pilgrim was Silvia, sister of Theodosius' minister, Rufinus, but it appears that she was actually named Etheria, an abbess in Gaul or Spain, who visited Jerusalem with much pious pomp towards the end of the fourth century. The document is of especial value owing to the important contribution it makes to our liturgical knowledge. Rome also began to become a place of pilgrimage, especially on account of the opening up of the Catacombs by Pope Damasus. The danger of pilgrimages morally and spiritually was recognised by some of the Fathers, and Jerome warns people against undue confidence in the merits of a visit to the Holy Land.

It is evident from the foregoing that the Christian religion had already lost much of its early simplicity, and was unconsciously conforming itself to many of the ideas of the heathenism which it was supplanting. Everywhere there are evidences of the influence of the older religions on the Church, which is not to be wondered at, when we recollect that it was being flooded by new converts who were at best very imperfect Christians. In some cases a certain conformity with the more innocent features of paganism was deliberately practised. St. Paulinus of Nola, for example, evidently endeavoured to adapt his teaching as far as possible to the understanding of the people of Campania who dwelt around his monastery, and some of his poems about St. Felix relate stories which might easily have been told of a local tutelary deity.² But paganism insinuated itself into Christianity in many forms. The subject is a vast one, and here it is only possible to give a few examples by way of illustration. Sacred trees, wells, mountains, were being taken over by Christians as places if not objects of worship. Heathen

**Strange customs
and survivals of
Paganism.**

1. *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, art. 'Pilgrimage', vol. II., p. 1635 b.

2. *Supra*, p. 420.

legends were constantly reappearing among the acts of the Saints. The eve of St. John the Baptist (June 24) was in many places celebrated by the lighting and leaping over fires, as had been customary at Midsummer in honour of the sun. Animals were killed at the doors of churches and at the shrines of saints in a manner hardly distinguishable from the ancient sacrifices;¹ and it may be said generally that, great as was the break with the past by the introduction of Christianity, the clergy sought to make it as small as was possible.

**No rigid
uniformity.**

It is a varied picture that Church life presents during the momentous years which followed the conversion of Constantine; but despite the many criticisms to which it is open—the growing corruption, the increase of superstition, the materialism so detrimental to Christianity—we must not forget that many Christians realised better even than perhaps they do at the present time that the Faith is not an affair of ceremonial and usage, but that these things are of but secondary importance. Among Christian writers there are few more sensible and in the best sense modern than the historian Socrates, who lived in Constantinople about A.D. 430, and was a lawyer by profession. In the close of his fifth book he breaks off into a digression on the subject of church usages, including the keeping of Easter, in which he quotes St. Paul, and plainly says that the Faith in Christ is not a ceremonial religion, and that the times of keeping festivals and fasts and the customs of the churches are matters of complete indifference. He shews how various these customs are, how the observance of the Lenten fast varies in almost every church, how in Egypt they sometimes celebrate the Eucharist in the evening and partake of it though they have taken food in the daytime. He notes the difference in dealing with penitents in the churches and has no word to say in blame of variety of usage. It was not everybody who shared in this enlightened spirit; but it must never be forgotten that if the fourth and fifth

1. I have heard Mr. F. C. Conybeare assert that in Armenia in early days animal sacrifice in front of the churches was regarded almost as important as the Eucharist!

centuries are called the days of the 'undivided Church' unity was not secured by a monotonous uniformity or the tyranny of customs.¹

Monasticism. But by far the greatest force in the fourth century was the movement in the direction of a monastic life. If the impulse had been previously felt in many other religions, in the case of the men of the fourth century it may be considered as primarily Christian. It was the word of Christ to the young ruler, "Go sell all thou hast," which compelled Antony to take refuge in the desert, and it was the thought of the example of Antony and the monks of Egypt which made Augustine decide finally to throw in his lot with Christ. Before, however, proceeding to describe the rise of monasticism it is advisable to state what it was not. From the earliest days Christians set high store on a virgin life in both sexes, but a man who practised a life-long continence was not by any means necessarily a monk any more than a church virgin was a nun. The essential qualification for monastic life was complete withdrawal from the world—originally from the haunts of civilized man. Nor can the first monks be rightly described as clergy. The movement was almost exclusively lay, and the acceptance of holy orders was regarded as a hindrance to the monastic career. A bishop by reason of his duties could never be a true monk: he might practise monastic austerities; but his duties forbade him to withdraw from the world. Solitude is implied in the very word monk (*μοναχός*) as the desert is suggested by hermit (*ἐρημικός*).

The first monks or hermits fled from the world in order to be alone in solitude with God. Even the great persecution was unable to hinder the rapid assimilation of the church to the world which had characterised the third century, and those who desired the monastic life felt that life in the world was not compatible with the Christian profession. With the end of persecution, moreover, one of the great incentives for the best men to become Christians was gone. Tertullian was right when he said *Sanguis Christianorum semen eorum*;² for the

1. Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22.

2. Apol. c. 50.

prospect of having to contend for Christ and if need be to die for Him had an undoubted attraction for brave men and women. When this was taken away, Christianity did not seem to some more attractive than other religions. But monastic seclusion supplied the lacking stimulus. When it was realised that it was possible to give up all that the world thought desirable for Christ, and to inflict on oneself voluntary austerities which rivalled the sufferings of the martyrs of old, to be "devoured" as Jacob had been by the burning heat by day and the frost by night,¹ to wander about, as the faithful in the days of the Maccabees,² in sheep-skins and goat-skins and in dens and caves of the earth, the attraction of this new form of Christianity became irresistible. The war against the world which had hitherto been waged in the presence of the magistrate could now be carried on among the beasts of the wilderness. It has been the fashion to describe monasticism as a sort of sublime selfishness, a withdrawal from the sterner duties of social life; but when we recollect the circumstances of the time we can understand that it was a nobler impulse which drove some of the best men to take refuge in solitude, often to return to activity to conquer new realms for Christ. The monastic movement was the great protest against the increasing worldliness of the Church of the fourth century.

As there had been extravagances in martyrdom so were there in monasticism, which in many cases became a gross travesty of self-sacrifice. Asceticism is really the discipline to which every Christian man ought to submit himself, and those who have denounced it as unchristian have in practice made it a part of their Christian life. But an unreasoned and undisciplined asceticism becomes at times absurd and even disgusting. Monks called themselves athletes, and like modern athletes tried to break the record. Thus when some extraordinary act of self-denial was reported another solitary was usually found anxious to outdo it. Solitude also had a baneful influence, and even in early days

**Extravagances
of Monasticism.**

¹ Gen. xxxi. 40.

² Heb. xi. 37.

monastic writers speak of that irritability and disgust of life afterwards known as *acedia*. But in Syria especially the wildest extravagances were indulged in by solitaries, who wandered about reducing themselves to the level of the very beasts of the fields. These excesses are not surprising; what is, is the way the best minds in the Church turned the monastic movement into channels beneficial alike to religion and humanity.

Antony, whom we may regard as the first monk, began as a hermit, but it was impossible for him to remain alone. A great ascetic was sure to be followed by countless imitators desirous of learning his methods by personal contact. Thus the deserts of Egypt became peopled with colonies of hermits.

Cenobitic life. A great step in advance was made when the ideal that even in solitude certain social duties were incumbent upon those who had embraced what was then considered as the higher life, and monastic leaders began to organize communities under definite regulations. The first to do this was the Egyptian Pachomius, at Tabennesi (*see map*). But the greatest of early monastic organizers was St. Basil, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, under whom monks were strictly disciplined and kept constantly at work and prayer. His communities with their charitable organizations were taken as the model of Eastern monasticism, and his rule continues, though only nominally, to be observed. His monastic and ecclesiastical foundations were so great, that Gregory of Nazianzus, his friend, compared them to a second city of Caesarea. All the great authorities on monastic life—Basil, Cassian and Jerome—visited Egypt, and conversed with the famous solitaries of the Scetic and Nitrian deserts.

But it was as organized communities that the monks became a great influence, and that the movement spread. Monks, it is said, first appeared in Rome when Athanasius made his famous appeal to Julius in A.D. 340; and by the close of the century monasteries were everywhere, from remote Britain to the lands beyond the eastern frontiers of the Empire; and for over a thousand years Christianity found its strongest arm in the cloisters of the monks. There they acquired training

and discipline, an education impossible elsewhere in the disordered condition of society. Founded with the idea of withdrawing men from the world, the monasteries became the means of qualifying them for its service as missionaries, as teachers, and as rulers of the Church.



APPENDIX A.

ON THE OPHITES, BASILIDES, AND VALENTINUS.

I. THE OPHITES.

Emanations. THE highest Being was termed the Primal Man, from whom came forth his Thought (*ἔννοια*), also a male principle, who is called the Second Man. In this conception we see the Adam Kadmon of the Kabbala. The two first principles generated the Spirit, a female principle, and in this way we have a travesty of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The Spirit, known as the First Woman, produced Christ. These two latter principles were taken up to the abode of the First and Second Man, and thus the true Church was formed.

Creation. When the Spirit and Christ were taken up a drop of light fell into the abyss beneath. This was Sophia *Prunikos*, who by contact with the waters gave birth to Ialdabaoth, the Demiurgus of the created heavens and earth and the ruler of the seventh heaven. From him came the six angels who rule the six heavens. He strove to hide the fact that there were any powers above him; but when he boasted that he was the highest, his mother Sophia cried, 'Thou liest, Ialdabaoth!' Man was created by the six angels and by Ialdabaoth, who gave him the divine essence. Instructed by Sophia, man gave thanks to the Most High, which deeply offended the ruler of the seventh heaven. In order to degrade man by carnal desires, Ialdabaoth made Eve, but Sophia saved him by means

of the Serpent, who induced Eve to raise herself and her husband by eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The Serpent thus became the great benefactor of the human race.

Redemption. But man had to be redeemed from the wrath of Ialdabaoth; accordingly Christ descended from above on the one perfect man, Jesus, who had been prepared by Sophia. Ialdabaoth seeing in Jesus Christ a power superior to himself, stirred up the Jews to crucify Jesus. Of course Christ could not suffer; and he withdrew himself from Jesus in whom he had worked on earth. Christ did not, however, forget Jesus utterly, but raised from the dead the spiritual body of Jesus, which remained on earth eighteen months. At first Jesus did not fully understand the truth, but Christ enlightened him and he taught his disciples the true doctrine.

View of the Serpent. The Ophite sects were considerably divided, some regarding the Serpent as the enemy, others as the friend, of man. The former held that the punishment Ialdabaoth inflicted on the Serpent for his share in tempting Eve converted him into man's enemy, whilst the more consistent Ophites portrayed the Serpent as good and beneficent, and interpreted our Lord's words to Nicodemus about the brazen serpent to mean that Christ was the true Ophis.

The Cainites. The most extreme Ophites held that Ialdabaoth, the God of the Old Testament, was the active enemy of righteousness. All the worst characters of the Old Testament were therefore really the best men, Cain being the most admirable of mankind with the exception of Judas Iscariot. The latter by betraying our Lord was really doing an act of wisdom and hastening the redemption of the world.¹ The Cainites are accused of having striven to imitate in their lives the characters in the Old Testament for whom they professed an admiration.

1. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 70.

II. BASILIDES.

BASILIDES is considered one of the best types of Egyptian Gnosticism, and according to Hippolytus he borrowed his system from Aristotle. This Father, however, hints at the truth when he says, after describing the heretical opinions of Basilides, "These then are the things which Basilides fables, who taught in Egypt, and having learned the wisdom from the Egyptians, brought forth such fruits as these."¹ It seems from this that Hippolytus also regards the theory of Basilides as an adaptation of the esoteric doctrine of the Egyptian priesthood, and in this he is probably more correct than when he asserts that Basilides plagiarised from Aristotle.

Basilides taught that the only way in which the supreme God could be defined was to say that he was not. Here he follows Aristotle's 'thought of a thought'. He calls God the 'no being' (*ὁ οὐκ ὄν*). This Not-being God made the not-being world, or the seed of the world containing the possibility of all things that exist. "The seed of the world was" says Basilides "this word that was spoken: 'Let there be light.' And to this the Evangelist refers by his words: 'That was the true light which enlightened every man coming into the world.'" In this seed there was a triple sonship: the fine or subtile, the grosser material, and the mixed. The first of these rose to the Not-Being; the second ascended by a wing such as Plato in the *Phaedo* terms the wings of the soul; the third remained in the *πανσπερμία* or seed of the universe. The Holy Spirit acted as the firmament or boundary between the infinite and the finite. Now that finite and infinite were separated the work of creation began. First the great Archon or ruler of the 365 Heavens, whose name is Abraxas, comes forth. He has a son wiser than himself, who was in truth the third person in the 'not being' seed. Afterwards the lesser Archon called the Hebdomad was produced, to rule over the sphere which lies below the moon. This lesser Archon is the

1. Hippolytus, VII. 15. Irenaeus, *Haer.*, cap. XXIV. foll.

God of the Jews. Below these rulers lies the Amorphia or unformedness, containing however all the remaining sonship. But all needed enlightenment, and accordingly, when the time came for the manifestation of the sons of God, the Gospel came, penetrating through every dominion and power, all receiving it with joy till it descended through the Hebdomad to Jesus, the son of Mary. Basilides' idea of redemption was the union of all the sonship with the infinite, and the putting of all things in their true place. The work of the restoration of all things consists in placing all things, now in the confusion of the seed heap, in their proper order, thus bringing about perfect contentment and perfect peace.

The most noticeable feature in the ingenious speculations of Basilides is the entire absence of dualism. There is no being antagonistic to the will of the supreme God. Ignorance and confusion are the only evils, and these are removed by the true knowledge rearranging all things.

From Basilides we are led naturally to Valentinus, another Egyptian Gnostic teacher, who may justly be termed the Poet of Gnosticism.

III. VALENTINUS.

NOTHING can suggest more forcibly the deep gulf which divides the spirit of Christianity from that of Gnosticism, than the contrast between the bewildering intricacy of the system of Valentinus and the profound simplicity of the language of the Gospel of St. John, with which it has a seeming affinity. This complexity, however, was nevertheless the cause of the great popularity the doctrine of Valentinus enjoyed. It had the additional attraction of being eclectic, combining as it did a variety of Greek, Oriental and Christian speculations.¹ It greatly resembles the system of Basilides, but is more elaborate, and the abstractions in the scheme of that teacher are personified by Valentinus. The main point to be noticed is the

1. Irenaeus, *Haer.*, bk. I. Hippolytus, vi., cc. 16—32. Mansel, *Gnostic Heretics*, Lect. XII.

adoption of the Platonic teaching that the perfect patterns or ideas of the things we see exist in the spiritual world above.

The Valentinian theory is as follows. The Pleroma consists of three orders of Aeons: the *ogdoad*, the *decad*, and the *dodecad*. The first order consists of the manifestation of the absolute qualities of God, who is primarily impenetrable depth, and whose companion is Silence. His purpose or *Noûs* is inseparably connected with Truth, his Word with Life. (cf. John xiv. 6.) Man is the Adam Kadmon of the Kabbala, the sum of all the divine attributes. The second order shews the combination of unity as represented by the masculine elements, with variety as denoted by their feminine counterparts. In the third order we see God in his relations towards man, which are described as male, the female being the gifts which those relations convey.

We see therefore in the Pleroma of Valentinus, God represented under a number of attributes, each shewing but a single feature of the Divine nature. Sophia or Wisdom, the lowest of these Aeons or eternities, tries to comprehend in herself all the attributes of the absolute, and hence an element of disturbance is introduced. Sophia soars upward in her rash attempt. But now a new being appears. *᾽Ορος* or *Σταυρός*, the limiting power, checks Sophia, and she abandons her former design (*τὴν προτέραν ἐνθύμησάν*). *᾽Ορος* separates Wisdom from her former design, and casts the latter out of the Pleroma. Henceforth she is known as Achamoth. Order is now restored and Sophia is placed in her original position. To prevent further confusion, *Nous* produces Christ and the Holy Spirit, who teach the Aeons to observe their due places. Having been fully instructed by Christ, the Aeons combine to produce Jesus, in whom are all the virtues of every Aeon. In this way the Valentinians explain St. Paul's words *ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*.¹

1. Eph. i. 10.

**The Woes of
Achamoth.**

We now leave the Pleroma and come to the second world in which Achamoth dwelt after being separated from Sophia by Horus. It is here that the imagination of Valentinus is most fertile. Achamoth, the informed desire of Sophia, was without form until the higher Christ took compassion on her and gave her a form. When he departed from her Achamoth attempted to enter the Pleroma, just in the same way as Sophia had tried to ascend the Bythus. Being restrained by Horus, she gave way to the most violent emotions of grief and passion. Jesus, the Christ produced from all the Aeons, came with his attendant angels to soothe the woes of Achamoth, and she produced a three-fold progeny—the spiritual from her contemplation of the angels, the animal (*ψυχικόν*) from her repentance, and the carnal from her passions. The second and third of these substances were cast forth, in the same way as the unformed wish of Sophia from the Pleroma. From Achamoth's psychical progeny came the Demiurgus, as she had come from Sophia.

**The World of
Sense.**

At last we reach the visible universe, in which all that happened in the higher world was repeated. The Demiurge, like the great Archon of Basilides, unconscious of the powers that are above him, creates man, but Achamoth gives the newly created being a spiritual existence. At first, man had no body, but the Demiurge gave him one, by which is signified the coats of skins which God gave to Adam and Eve. Adam represents humanity, and his sons the threefold division of mankind into carnal (Cain), animal (Abel), and spiritual (Seth). The work of the redemption of man is the counterpart of the redemption of Sophia and Achamoth. Christ descends, taking upon himself a seeming but not a real body, and redeems mankind by placing all in their proper places. He also instructs the Demiurge, whom he will enable to rise to the region of Achamoth. The highest class of men will ascend to the Pleroma, the second class to the Demiurge in the region of Achamoth, whilst all that is carnal will be utterly consumed.

The most notable features of this elaborate Gnostic scheme are :—

1. Its eclectic character : Valentinus borrows from Plato the idea of the higher existences in the celestial world having their counterparts in the visible universe ; from Indian pantheism, the doctrine that material existence is due to the degradation of something more noble ; from Judaism, the declaration that creation is due to the working of God's Wisdom.

2. The peculiar importance given to the work of Horus or Stauros, as a negative and positive agency. As Horus, he defines the limits of existence : as Stauros, he separates and destroys.

3. The redemptive work of Christ is regarded as a grand historical fact, though Valentinus explains it his own way.

The chief followers of Valentinus were Secundus, Ptolemaeus, Marcus, Heracleon, Theodotus, and Alexander. Bardesanes, the Syrian mystic, was his disciple.



APPENDIX B.

ROMAN CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

(By A. C. Jennings, M.A., Rector of King's Stanley.)

THE CATACOMBS AND EARLY MONUMENTS.

IN every impartial survey of the first Ages of Christianity the testimony of annalists and ecclesiastical writers must be qualified by the evidences of fact contributed by scientific archaeology. The natural tendency of the historian is to attach peculiar importance to those phases of his subject which most affected the beliefs or interests of after generations. The archaeologist's task, on the other hand, is a close investigation of actualities, pursued with a mind deliberately steeled against all such 'prolepsis'. He studies the life of a community, unaffected by the issue of controversies and the glamour of subsequent achievements and successes, and is content though the emphasis be thus often diverted to traits afterwards superseded and forgotten. The light thus thrown by archaeological research may appear cold, but it often serves to correct a faulty theological perspective. This method is of peculiar service to the student of Christian life in the times before the Peace of the Church. For its interpretation we now turn not alone to ecclesiastical literature, naturally often of partizan character, but to a vast array of impartial monumental evidences, speaking with sufficient distinctness to correct the traditional conception in several not unimportant particulars. The materials specially

dealt with in this excursus are the inscriptions, sculptures, pictures, sarcophagi, etc., brought to light by archaeological research in Rome. Similar but far less extensive memorials of the kind are to be met with at Naples, Cologne, Syracuse, Trèves, and elsewhere, but these need not be further noticed as they only corroborate the testimony of the Imperial City. The aim in these pages will be first to describe the Roman Catacombs and their contents, and next to tabulate certain inferences which are now recognized as substantiated by their evidence.

The student who has not visited Rome may perhaps get some idea of the early Christian cemetery (now popularly called 'Catacomb'¹) by imagining such a maze as that at Hampton Court sunk a few feet below ground. Let him substitute for its evergreen partitions walls of dark 'tufo granulare' (the soil that was usually selected as being softest to work); and then let him imagine these lined with sepulchral recesses (*loculi*) packed as closely as berths in a ship's cabin. Just as such a maze opens out into harbours, the two or three-foot wide catacomb passages open out into small *cubicula* or chambers—rectangular, polygonal, or round—often with table tombs, projecting or in recess, for the celebration of the Eucharist. Let him imagine this maze not only vastly extended horizontally but repeated downwards in storeys (sometimes as many as five or six) connected by stairs. Remembering that there are over twenty Catacombs of various sizes at Rome, he will sufficiently realize the enormous extent of these labyrinths of cell-lined passages, without dependence on the somewhat conflicting estimates of actual mileage.

It is certain that these subterranean cemeteries take us back almost to the earliest days of Christianity at Rome. The Catacomb of St. Priscilla was probably the family burial-place of Pudens, a contemporary of the Apostles. There is

1. *κοιμητήριον* (sleeping place) was the name adopted by the Church for the place of interment, and was applied to the entire area too. The subterranean cemetery might be distinguished as a *hypogaeum*, *crypta*, or *conditorium*.

little doubt that the Catacomb of Nereus and Achilleus was a bequest from the noble lady Domitilla, Vespasian's niece, who was banished as a Christian by Trajan, her two servants being at the same time martyred. It is supposed that before her conversion it had been used as the *hypogaeum* of the Flavian freedmen. The catacomb named later after Agnes (herself a martyr in the time of Diocletian) also contains monuments assigned to the first century. That of St. Praetextatus received some of the martyrs of the emperor M. Aurelius in A.D. 162. The Catacombs are indeed continually suggestive of the great crises in the early story of our Faith. They are moreover indissolubly connected with names familiar to the student of Church History. It was to the Catacomb of St. Sebastian that the bodies of SS. Peter and Paul were transferred from their respective graves on the Via Aurelia and Via Ostiensis, on the 29th of June, 258, during the persecution of Valerian. The Roman bishop Callistus (whose early career is the subject of Hippolytus' aspersions) had attained distinction as dean or warden of the immense catacomb that still bears his name.¹ Here his patron Zephyrinus was buried, and this catacomb received the martyred Sixtus II. and no fewer than thirteen of the eighteen succeeding Popes.

The full activity of these Roman catacombs is covered by the first four centuries. After the conversion of the Empire the old rule of extramural disposal of the dead was relaxed. Constantine himself had been buried in his Byzantine church, and the practice was now introduced of burying in *loculi* made in the walls of churches, or else in *sarcophagi*, sometimes appropriated from the heathen temples. Jerome's well-known description of his Sunday visits to them as a schoolboy (*cir.* 356)² suggests that even then the Catacombs were a mausoleum of a vanished past. His contemporary

1. Circa A.D. 202. So Hippolytus *Philos.* IX. 11. The later version was that he "made" this cemetery. (Anastas., § 17). Probably he greatly enlarged it.

2. Hieronymus, *In Ezech.*, cap. xl.

Pope Damasus approached them with antiquarian zeal, honoured them in many cases with bad hexameters exquisitely engraved, opened out new light shafts, and set in vogue a relic-mania which spelt destruction to hundreds of valuable ancient monuments and paintings. After 410, when Alaric took Rome, there is scarcely a single example of catacomb interment, and it may be supposed that, save in the cases of persons of distinction, open-air interment now became the rule. Many of the structures were in this period filled up for protection. A few subsequent Popes (Vigilius, *acc.* 538, John III., *acc.* 560, Gregory III., *acc.* 731) made efforts for the conservation of the Catacombs. With Paul I. however (*acc.* 757) the practice set in of transferring the bodies of the illustrious deceased to new and more magnificent shrines, and the Catacombs thus lost all their former attractiveness. Indeed with the exception that the 'Ad Catacumbas,' or locality of the Catacombs of St. Sebastian and St. Callistus, was a continuous resort of mediaeval pilgrims, these sacred spots were utterly forgotten from the 9th till the 16th century; and it was not till the 19th century that scientific excavation and the labours of De Rossi and Padre Marchi exhibited their real value for the student of Church History. Magr. Wilpert, Marrucchi, Lanciani, and others have since largely extended our knowledge of the Catacombs and their accessories. The mere fact that some twenty thousand inscriptions have been catalogued will sufficiently shew the vast range of the material under discussion.

(1) On one point the archaeologists appear to speak unanimously. The old idea that the primitive Roman church was constrained to worship in the *secrecy* of the Catacombs is now exploded. General congregational worship in three-foot wide passages and ten or twenty-foot square *cellae* could never have been practicable for an ever-increasing community such as that of the Christians. Nor is there any reason to doubt, despite the continuous grumbling at the spread of the new religion, and the fact that Christianity was not a 'religio licita'

until A.D. 259, that the Christians had the same facilities for worship within the Roman walls as had the Jews. Buildings made over for this purpose at Rome are mentioned by Pope Pius I.,¹ before A.D. 150; and for Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian *ecclesia* had evidently the same topical significance as our word 'church.'² Neither are we to suppose that these excavations were secret, illicit, or of novel character. The wealthier Roman families are known to have constructed extensive vaults, with *columbaria* for cinerary urns, or *conditoria* for the corpses of the deceased. The funerary associations of the working classes were moreover a common feature in Roman social life, and many of these were endowed with a common place of burial. The chief peculiarities in the Christian case, in fact, were the dedication of such vaults to the wants of a continually increasing *religious* community, and the utter exclusion therefrom of the method of incineration. In this regard it is significant that hard by the Ad Catacumbas there still stands the Jewish Catacomb on the Via Appia. For in both respects the Roman Christians were anticipated, it would seem, by the Roman Jews. From the religion in which she had been cradled the Church had imbibed her preference of burial to cremation, which from the time of Sylla was the common (though not the only) Roman method of disposing of the dead. From it too had been appropriated the idea of a sacred community united in life and death by indissoluble ties. Christianity found at Rome a large Jewish population which was probably already possessed of catacombs, and it naturally adopted the same sepulchral arrangements. In the matter of obsequies at Rome, the only legal limitation was that the dead had to be disposed of at a certain distance beyond the city walls. This requisite was probably sometimes satisfied by wealthy Christians, such as the imperial lady, Flavia Domitilla,

1. Pii *ad Iustum*, Epp. 1, 2.

2. Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 7.; cf. Tertul., *De Idol.*, cap. 7 and *Adv. Valent.*, cap. 3. Alexander Severus' award of a disputed plot of ground to the Christians, who contested it with the 'popinari' (cir. A.D. 230), is another proof that the Christians could hold property as a community.

making over to the community their *villae* or gardens outside the city. In properties so given or purchased then, the Christians constructed catacombs in Jewish fashion, and here they habitually and peacefully disposed of the remains of their brethren. The peculiar honours of the martyr's *natale*, and the practice of celebrating death-anniversaries, in the manner which we describe below, did however undoubtedly induce extraordinary gatherings of Christians in their subterranean burial places. Naturally, therefore, persecutors such as Valerian are found taking tyrannical measures to prohibit the visiting of Christian "cemeteries", as well as of the general assembling of Christians "in any place soever".¹

This explanation of the use of the Catacombs of course does not shut out their occasional employment for refuge, or for the ordinary worship, in times of trouble. But such crises were really exceptional. The liberal spirit of Pagan Rome seldom interfered with the worship of the Christians within the city walls. There is no reason to doubt that in the second century—perhaps before the death of Pope Euarestus—the Roman Christians had developed a definite parochial organization.² It may be inferred, therefore, that each catacomb corresponded to a 'titulus' or parish, with its sacred edifice within the city. The general exemption of funerary *sodalitia* from restrictions on close colleges may have been utilized by the Christian as it seems to have been by other associations,³ and this would have protected the growth of the new religion. At any rate the old notion of the constant peril of the mere profession of Christianity must be modified by what is now known

1. See the account of Cyprian's interview with the proconsul at Carthage, in Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, vol. 1., p. 190.

2. This appears to have been extended by Pope Marcellus, A.D. 308—10, who, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, presided over twenty-five tituli. In the appointment of the seven Deacons of Rome we may perhaps see an adaptation of the primitive number seven to the civil divisions of the city, and suppose that each deacon had in charge two of its fourteen 'regiones'.

3. See Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius*, bk. II., ch. iii.

of the numbers of the community and its formal organization. The connexion of the Christian community with the Catacombs could never have been a secret. The range of each was really indicated plainly above ground by boundary marks delimiting its superficial area. Nor could excavations so extensive have gone on continuously below without official cognizance, or in defiance of recognizable prohibitions.

(2) The Catacombs were the resort of a community which appropriated with startling boldness, not only the artistic emblems, but much of the funereal symbolism and vocabulary of the Pagan Rome in which it dwelt. The frescoes of the sacred *cubicula* reproduce much of the domestic decoration which the traveller sees at Pompeii—the four seasons, the winged genii, the arabesques set off with butterflies and birds. When we detect in the Catacomb of Domitilla the emblematic Vine of the new Faith, we find it surrounded by joyous *amorini*, who pluck off or tread out the grapes. Bacchus himself is sometimes present. The river-god Jordan, gazing at some scriptural scene, is a conception which occurs, not only here, but as late as the fifth century in the mosaics of Ravenna. The butterfly Psyche, the heathen emblem of the soul, is discernible. Oceanus is the central medallion of a ceiling, or a Mercury holding the horses of an Elijah about to be translated in his chariot. The symbolical Orpheus charming the beasts with his lyre is a favourite representation in this school of art. Where this gives place to the more popular emblem of the future—the Good Shepherd—the figure is at first of the Apollo type. In at least one instance it is attended by the three Graces.

Many of the inscriptions on the *loculi* are of like traditional character. After making all possible allowance for re-using of Pagan tomb-stones, and interments of heathen relations in the Christians' burial place, it is certain that the vocabulary of the heathen religion was appropriated without scruple in the first age of the Roman church. On the same stone as the Christian emblems occurs not infrequently the formula

D.M.,¹ or 'Dis Manibus' in full. In Fabretti's Christian list appears the epigraph 'Debita sacratis manibus officia', and even 'Sanctique manes nobis petentibus adsint'. There are allusions to 'Lachesis' and 'Taenariae fauces'; and 'Tartarea custodia' is actually found on the tombstone of one who had been a Christian presbyter. 'Domus aeterna' is sometimes retained, and there is even the epigraph *θαρπέι οὐδεὶς ἀθάρατος*.

Again, the accessories of a heathen's interment were often some cherished possessions, originally for his enjoyment in Hades. The early Christians seem to have seen no inconsistency in perpetuating this practice in a sentimental spirit. Frequently the children of the faithful were buried with their dolls; and the *loculi* of ladies had such accessories as jewellery, tooth-picks, mirrors, toilet implements—even the false hair reprobated by Tertullian and Clement. In the tombs of the men have been found dice, locks and keys, and implements of handicraft—mistaken by the early explorers for instruments of martyrdom. The later period however adopted the less invidious fashion of merely indicating the profession by incised symbols on the outer slab that closed the *loculus*, as e.g. a hammer and chisels for a deceased sculptor, an apparatus of surgical instruments for a doctor.

This portion of the Catacomb evidences necessarily qualifies the inferences we might have drawn from the Patristic literature, as to the severance of the early Christians from all heathen associations, their Puritanism, their general aversion to painting and art. For Petavius as later for our own Bingham,² as Dean Stanley remarks, Tertullian's casual mention of the 'Good Shepherd' on a communion cup was admittedly a quite unique exceptional attestation. We now know that the early Christians delighted to adorn their *loculi*

1. Later this gives place to B.M. or 'Bonae Memoriae'.

2. "The only instance Petavius pretends to find in all the three first ages," says Bingham, (*Eccles. Antiq.* VIII. 8), anent Tertullian's well-known allusion in *de Pudic.*, cap. 10.

and sepulchral lamps with this genial emblem. But more than this, we must conceive of them—at Rome at least—as so free from Puritanism as to incorporate readily all that was capable of adaptation in contemporary artistic usage; so large in their hope as to include the time-honoured phraseology which linked them with their ancestors—even at the cost of theological distinctiveness. The constancy of the many Roman martyrs, when summoned to worship the heathen gods, is sufficient proof that there is here no actual syncretism; no real incorporation of a mythology already sufficiently in discredit with many of its professed votaries. Inferences of such a kind in the very mausoleums of the Christian martyrs would be scarcely less absurd than in the case of our own 18th century monuments. But while it is mere pseudo-classic taste that gives our Westminster Abbey the occasional epitaph ‘*aeterna domus*’, or the statues of heathen deities, at Rome the immediate perpetuation of proud traditions and beloved associations was fostered by patriotism and an almost unconscious atavism. Nevertheless, such bold indifference to theological precision—such affectionate adhesion to ancestral usage—are, in view of the times and their perils, no less surprising than pathetic.

(3) We have next to consider more closely the emblems and inscriptions which assure us that we are in Christian burial places. Side by side with all this idiom of tradition, we find the unmistakable Christian epitaph. It is presented in all variety of language and lettering. It appears in Greek, Latin, and Graeco-Latin. Its characters may be uncial, minuscule, rustic, or ligated. They may have been incised, scratched, written, or painted. The diction too is pretty frequently obscured by a barbarous indifference to concords, syntax, conjugations, prosody, and aspiration¹, and we are reminded of the humble social standing of the majority of the community. More easy to be deciphered are the outcomes of ecclesiastical art, which is already differentiating itself from the pagan

1. *E.g.* there are found *ic, oc, hossa, helerna*. Cf. Catullus, *Carm.*, LXXXIII., “*et insidias Arrius hinsidias*”

tradition and speaks to us in a crude and delimited vocabulary of fresco and relief. The vast collection of sarcophagi, slabs, lamps, glasses, etc., now in the various Christian museums, must be replaced by imagination in the Catacombs, ere we have all the testimony necessary for an exact appreciation of these inscriptions and embellishments in their theological relations. But no extension of our researches will confute the first impression—that here we have most sanguine and cheerful views of death and the future; a determined exclusion of the sombre side of religion; a Hope that excludes even the memories of Calvary in its recognition of Christ as the guide and source of an unbroken life. Thus—in marked contrast with the mediæval practice—there is absolute reticence as to the Saviour's sufferings. We find no crucifix, scarcely any portrayal of the familiar penal cross. In the sixth-century mosaics of Ravenna the visitor may note a series of Holy-Week tableaux, passing abruptly from the scene of Pilate washing his hands to that of the Resurrection, in bold exclusion of the great intervening tragedy. This rule is equally apparent in the early Catacomb art. Here and there Rome's connexion with Peter suggests his 'denial'; and a curious ecclesiastical interpretation¹ of the washing of Pilate's hands seems to make this incident a somewhat favourite subject. But the climax—the sacrifice on Calvary—is only adumbrated in symbolical scenes from the Old Testament, or in the predilection for the emblem of the Lamb. The cross ('commissa' or *tau* shape) may however be occasionally detected forming the handle of the sepulchral lamp, or blended with the chrisma or sacred Greek monogram. This last (sometimes along with A and Ω) is a frequent symbol. It finally bears just the same appearance as on the Constantinian coins.

While there is this striking contrast to Clement's well-confirmed account of the use of the Cross as a Christian sign, the emblems which he notices as allowable for Christian

1. According to Tertullian it suggested a practice of washing the hands before prayer. *De Dominica*, cap. 13.

gems¹ are very common—the dove (or pair of doves), the fish, the anchor, the ship, and the fisherman. Another common symbol is Noah saved in the Ark—always a solitary figure in a small square box with a dove flying to him. Most frequent of all perhaps is the *orante* or praying figure, noticed below. The symbolism is extended, especially in the later period, on the lamps, vast quantities of which may be examined in the museums. Such lamps—of metal or clay, and adorned with sacred emblems—were in habitual use in the Jewish Catacomb. The Jew had commonly ornamented his sepulchral lamp with the seven-branched candlestick, or the peacock.² We find both these occasionally re-appearing as Christian emblems. We notice too, both on the *loculi* and their lamps, the palm branch, and more rarely the phoenix. Both these emblems are familiar on the Imperial coinage and brick-stamps, and here once again we see the Church consecrating the ordinary associations of secular life. The palm branch (not yet reserved as an emblem of martyrdom) spoke to the Christians of a spiritual victory. We remember that the phoenix, which had attested the Emperor's pretence to undying fame, is made by Rome's early bishop, Clemens, an emblem of the glorious Resurrection.³

It remains to notice that of Scriptural emblems the most familiar, in every part of the Catacombs, is undoubtedly the Good Shepherd, bearing the lost sheep or kid, and—in the case of the larger and later pieces—surrounded by His flock. The Shepherd as a single figure appears repeatedly on the *loculi*-slabs and the lamps. It survives as the favourite Christian emblem to the fifth century, and then abruptly passes away, giving place to the mystic Lamb of the Apocalypse,

1. Cf. Clem. Alex., *Paedagog.*, iii. 11.

2. The peacock is also found decorating Pagan *columbaria* of the second century. Its perpetuation—if not its original adoption as a sepulchral accessory—was connected with the notion that the peacock's flesh was incorruptible. Like the phoenix, it was to the Christian an emblem of immortality, cf. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, lib. XXI. cap. iv.

3. Clemens Romanus, *Ep. ad Cor.*, cap. 25.

or to more realistic emblems of the Saviour's sufferings. It appears—perhaps for the last time—in the mosaic of the Ravenna Mausoleum, built by Galla Placidia, *cir.* A.D. 440. By this time the cross and nimbus have been added, and the figure is seated and has gained in dignity, but the “lost” and rescued sheep is no longer portrayed. The only accessories are the tame and attentive flock. The picture is suggestive of a time when the greatest missionary triumph of the Church had been won, and the era of ecclesiastical tutelage had begun to dawn.

Though He is represented so frequently in the Scriptural pieces, of attempted portraits of our Lord there are but two discoverable in the early work. One, a purely unconventional fresco medallion in the Catacomb of Domitilla, is deeply interesting, as undoubtedly telling us how Christians ideally depicted our Saviour's lineaments some seventy years after His Ascension. We notice too that it presents a face singularly like the types of Leonardo da Vinci and Renaissance art. The other, in the later Catacomb of Pontianus, is described as of similar type but less natural in artistic treatment.

(4) It has been noticed how religious sentiment excluded from the Catacomb frescoes and reliefs the story of the Saviour's Passion, and all scenes suggestive of sadness or fear. It must be added that the range of Scriptural subjects seems to be limited, not only by such considerations, but by some sort of generally accepted canon of ecclesiastical art,¹ ruling that the same scenes shall recur repeatedly, and in precisely the same forms. With the exception of the Visit of the Magi, the New Testament ‘cycle’, if it may be so called, seldom presents anything before or after the public Ministry of Jesus. Again and again we have, in stereotyped forms, the paralytic taking up his couch, the blind man healed with the clay, the Samaritan woman at the well, the feeding

1. The range of treatment is similarly dominated and limited in the monuments of Sicily and Arles.

of the multitudes, the raising of Lazarus; less often perhaps the turning water into wine, Christ teaching His disciples, and Zacchaeus in his sycamore tree. The selection seems to illustrate the dominant ideal of Jesus, as above all the ever-present Pastor, Healer, and Teacher of the soul.

The Old Testament selection is in like manner limited to a cycle of favourite scenes. Some are evidently selected as allegorical of Christian doctrine. Such are—Moses striking the rock, the Manna, the sacrifice of Isaac, Jonah disgorged from the whale's belly, the deliverance of Israel at the Red Sea, and Noah "saved by water". The other favourite scenes in the Old Testament cycle would suggest lessons of conduct, and teach the believers faith, patience and constancy. Such are—Jonah under the gourd, David with his sling, the three children in the fire, Daniel in the lions' den, and the stories of Tobit and Susanna.

Before leaving these pictures and reliefs, a few words must be said about the *oranti* which so often appear as accessories. The *orante* is a man, woman, or child, standing in the Eastern attitude of prayer, *scil.* with both the lower arms extended laterally and with open palms. It appears clear that this figure was intended originally as a representation (not necessarily a portraiture) of the person interred. Indeed, in the Catacomb of Callistus, there are four male *oranti* with their names attached. But the female *oranti* occur in such enormous preponderance that it may perhaps be inferred than an ideal of the Church, or a symbol of the soul itself, usually took the place of a personal memorial. The attitude has no connexion in the early monuments with that of the Crucified Saviour. Nor is there ground for identifying the figure in any case with the Blessed Virgin Mary. In this connexion it may be remarked that closer observation appears to exclude the early references to the Blessed Virgin assumed by De Rossi and others. Apart from the 'Visit of the Magi' she is scarcely discoverable in the early Christian art. The most notable exception is the well-known fresco in the

Catacomb of St. Priscilla. This is a picture of the Mother and Child, attended by a youthful figure who points to a star, and who, if not Joseph, may be Isaiah or some other Old Testament Prophet. This fresco probably dates from the middle of the second century. In the same catacomb is an equally early, but much disputed 'Annunciation'. Both frescoes are natural in character; and the latter is especially free from the stiffness and conventionality characteristic of the Scripture 'cycle'. It must be added, however, that the Virgin Mary appears repeatedly—but usually between St. Peter and St. Paul—on the sepulchral glasses of the third and fourth centuries which we describe below.

We find it more strange to realize how seldom in the first age any direct allusion to the rite of the Eucharist appears to be substantiated. Perhaps the earliest certain reference to this subject is the emblem in the third-century Catacomb of St. Cornelius—a *canistrum*¹ or basket, which contains loaves and a bottle of wine, and which itself rests on the symbolical Fish. The difficulty here is to distinguish between the Eucharist and the Agape, or charitable supper, which is certainly often portrayed. Thus the fresco in the Catacomb of Callistus, with seven persons seated round a table laden with fish, and a man blessing the bread,² is probably an adaptation of the Resurrection Miracle described in John xxi. to the Agape rather than to the Eucharist. On the other hand it is obvious that the Eucharist is represented in the much later mosaic at Ravenna (*cir.* A.D. 560), where the Lord and eleven Apostles recline round a semi-circular table bearing only small loaves and two large fishes.

1. For the ecclesiastical use of such baskets *cf.* Jerome, *Ep. ad Rusticum*, cap. xx. "Nihil illo ditius qui corpus domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro."

2. It need scarcely be remarked that throughout this period there is no distinctive clerical dress to help our interpretation. Even in a piece (second or third century) accepted by Bosio as representing an Ordination, the seated bishop and two standing presbyters all wear the customary toga and tunica, while the ordinand has the tunica only.

A decision therefore cannot be reached either by the mere absence of the element of wine, or by the presence of the fish.¹

The Agape, where certainly distinguishable, commonly appears as a picture of men and women seated at a meal, the provision for which is bread, fish and wine. Its religious character is usually not indicated, unless it be by the predilection for seven (*cf.* John xxi. 2) as the number of the guests. Besides the instance noted above, seven persons take part in the meal represented in the third-century fresco of the Catacomb of Priscilla (Cappella Greca). In the fresco in the Catacomb of Marcellinus, however, there are only three guests. Two women are seated at the corners of the table, and there is a boy in attendance carrying amphorae. The guests say to the women "Irene da calda", "Agape misce mi".

(5) The inscriptions in the Catacombs, in their bearing on such practices as prayers for the dead and prayers to saints, have been very differently interpreted by archaeologists according to their theological bias. Undoubtedly, however, the most apposite illustration of the original purpose of the Catacombs' *cubicula* is supplied by a well-known passage in the 'Martyrdom of Polycarp'.² In this circular letter the Church of Smyrna relates how her foes in their ignorance demanded the complete burning of the martyr's body, lest the Christians should worship him instead of Christ (*ἀφέντες τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον*). "For it is He whom we worship," protests this letter, "but the martyrs we duly love, as disciples and imitators of the Lord." "And so" it continues (after stating how the centurion gave way and Polycarp's body was burnt) "we afterwards took up his bones, which are more honourable than precious stones and more valuable than gold, and deposited them where it was fit. And here, if it be in our power, we will assemble in gladness and joy; and the Lord

1. It must be remembered that the Fish was certainly deemed doubly emblematic (*cf.* Tertullian, *De Bapt.* cap. 1) from a very early period. Hence the frequency of the inscription IXOUS.

2. *Mart. S. Polycarpi*, cc. xvii., xviii.

shall permit us to celebrate the birth-day of his martyrdom, both as a commemoration of the departed warrior, and as an exercise and preparation of those whom the battle still awaits." Just such a meeting place was the *cubiculum*. Here the Christians met on the *natale* or death-day of the martyr, and expressed their belief in the Communion of Saints by receiving the Eucharist from a table beneath which lay his remains, and by the less solemn fellowship of the Agape. There was nothing that we should deem superstitious in the first conception. As certainly as our sovereigns lie in Westminster Abbey, their still inscribed tombs or *cubicula* once held the remains of the martyred bishops Zephyrinus, Cornelius, Anteros—the martyred deacons Agapetus and Felicissimus—the martyred laymen Nereus and Achilleus. But for the mistaken piety or necessary caution of the succeeding age, they might all be there still. No surroundings better calculated to inspire devotion can be imagined. There was wisdom in Valerian's withdrawing from the Church that protection which the burial laws accorded to rites connected with places of sepulture. Only a few weeks before (June 29, A.D. 258) the supposed remains of Peter and Paul had been triumphantly transferred to the Catacomb of St. Sebastian. The execution of two malefactors two centuries earlier had itself become a stimulus to Christian constancy.

It is however easy to conceive how such devotion always ran the risk of unduly exalting human merit, and of fostering the idea that the saints, or the deceased friends, could be approached in prayer, as mediators between earth and Heaven. And a curious discovery enables us to contrast the popular theology at the time when Cyprian suffered, with the repudiation of worship of martyrs so emphatically expressed a century earlier, on the occasion of Polycarp's death in A.D. 156. When Valerian's victims at Rome were interred in the Catacomb of Praetextatus (A.D. 258), the still wet plaster about their graves was scratched by some unknown hand with the words "Mi refrigeri Januarius, Agatopos, Felicissimus, martyres." Nor

can it be denied that this illiterate *graffito* has many counterparts in the third century, and perhaps earlier, in more formal epigraphs. 'Pete pro nobis', 'roga pro nobis', 'pro parentibus', 'pro conjuge', etc., are among the inscriptions, and become more frequent as the fourth century is reached. But curiously enough the names of any sainted martyrs are rarely found in these epigraphs. Such petitions as 'martyres sancti in mente havite Maria' are in fact exceptional. It is usually the case of surviving relatives imploring the mediation, not of noted saints, but of the friend deceased.

In regard to the converse practice 'prayer *for* the dead' it must be remembered that the future was throughout this period unclouded by the gloomy speculations of theologians. The state beyond is plainly viewed in the Catacombs with serene cheerfulness, as a continuation and development of the present spiritual life. It is consistent that in the first six centuries but very few examples are found of the address to the reader for his prayers. It is no real qualification of this position, if we find the early Christians appropriating as a fit epigraph the familiar Jewish ejaculation 'on him be peace', here appearing in such forms as 'pax tecum', 'quiescas', 'vivas in deo', *ζησῆς ἐν θεῷ*, 'in bono refrigeres', etc. At least as frequent are the expressions of a sure and certain hope. The pious acclamation is itself indeed probably much less common in the epitaphs than on the glass Agape cups, which have been found sealed up in the *loculi*. But there is a sufficiency of such inscriptions as 'in pace', 'requiescit in pace', 'dormivit in pace Jesu quem dilexit', 'refrigera in spiritu sancto,' *θαρρῆ, θάρσει*, and (curiously contrasting with the 'quiescas' above) *γρηγόρει* 'wake up'. Sometimes, as we have seen, there is an appropriation of the traditional vocabulary of Paganism. Sometimes there is merely a pathetic ejaculation of human affection: 'innocent little lamb', 'my innocent dove', 'dulcis anima', 'anima innox', or the like. In most cases seemingly there is no expression of the survivor's sentiments at all.

(6) It will have been noticed that the Catacombs testify to a much greater prominence of the Agape than has usually been recognized. Formerly the idea of this institution was too readily taken from Fathers who looked coldly on it, or, like Tertullian, aspersed it in the spirit of intolerant Puritanism. The Catacombs tell us in their pictures, and in the accessories of their *loculi*, what an important part the Agape really played in the life of the Christian populace. Doubtless the institution demanded modifications, as the Church grew and gained proselytes in all ranks of life. It is unlikely that it was maintained in its original simplicity in the intra-mural churches, and it is inconceivable that large congregations came for this purpose to the contracted *cubicula* of the Catacombs. Probably, as appears to have been the habit later of Monica¹ at Carthage, the wealthier Roman Christians substituted the contribution of provisions for attendance at the congregational Agape. The prevalence, however, of this bond of fellowship was seemingly sufficiently notorious to excite those allegations of 'Thyestean banquets' and shameless impurities, that were the stock-in-trade of the assailants of the Faith. St. Paul's rebuke of the sacrilegious Corinthians (1 Cor. xi.) shews us moreover how easily the Agape might lend itself to actual abuse. We may well conceive that in many cases the good cheer of the *natulitia* may have been more attractive than the pious example of the sainted martyr. As in the case of our own Dedication festivals and Harvest homes, the religious associations might easily be lost in mere material enjoyment. For such reasons the institution was destined to obliteration; and we forget till we study the Catacombs how long it remained an essential feature in popular Christianity.

The Catacombs attest too the prolonged connexion of the Agape, not only with the commemoration of saints and martyrs, but with the ordinary obsequies of the departed Christian. The proof of this is the immense quantity of

1. Augustine, *Confess.* vi. 2.

glasses, cups, saucers, and other vessels which were once in and about the *loculi* of the Catacombs and are now in the preservation of the museums.¹ These are inscribed in many cases with the pious ejaculations,—‘vivas’, *ζησαίς*, ‘in pace’, etc., which we noticed above in connexion with the subject of epitaphs. There seems to be little doubt that it was customary to use these vessels at the Christian obsequies, and that they were deposited in the *loculus* ere it was closed up.²

Here again we may see an evidence of the adaptation of early Roman Christianity to social environments and hereditary usage. For the Pagan not infrequently provided by testament for *cellae memoriae*, where his freedmen should thereafter assemble for a banquet commemorating his death.³ The Pagan sepulture moreover had the accessories of food-vessels and food—in connexion originally with primitive ideas of the world beyond. Further, the Pagan religion, besides prescribing the public *Feralia* when food was brought to sepulchres, directed a similar observation in families of the birth-day of a departed member. We infer that these usages were retained with little alteration by the Roman church. The Christians for the birth-day substituted the death-day, as the anniversary of an entry into heavenly life, and the *Agape* in its connexion with the *natalitia* took the place of the Pagan birth-day offerings of oil and wine and milk at sepulchres. Similarly, the old Roman use was perpetuated by an interment in the *loculus* of the vessel actually used at the funeral meal.

A study of the inscriptions which appear on these vessels brings home to us the closeness of this connexion with heathen practice. It must be understood that the glass beaker, used on such occasions, had generally a picture and inscription wrought in gold leaf, on and within the base. This ornamentation was protected by a glass plate welded into the sides of

1. See Prof. Babington's article in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, ‘Glass’.

2. Sometimes they contain traces of a red liquid. This was hastily assumed by the early explorers to be evidence of a martyrdom.

3. Cf. Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 275, 277.

the beaker. The beaker was put into the *loculus*, its base sinking often into the wet plaster. The more fragile bowl was liable to succumb to the action of time or careless handling. Usually therefore the sole memorial now surviving is the pictured or inscribed base, disintegrated from the cup, and presenting merely the appearance of a medallion of some two to five inches diameter.¹ Whatever the age of these pictured glass vessels—the specialists deny most of them an earlier age than the fourth century—they serve to illustrate Tertullian's tirade against Christian art, "procedant ipsae picturae calicum vestrorum, si vel in illis perlucebit interpretatio."² The picture is commonly an Apostle or Saint. It is interesting to find that, again and again, the Apostles Peter and Paul appear side by side—doubtless as the traditional founders of the Roman church. Sometimes the Virgin appears between the two Apostles, very rarely she is represented alone. Laurence, Hippolytus, Callistus, Cyprian, Marcellinus (one of Diocletian's martyrs), are also found portrayed. The tendency to saint-worship now finds expression occasionally in such inscriptions as 'Vivas in Cristo et Laurentio', 'Vivas in nomine Laurete', 'Petrus proteg', etc. But more common by far are inscriptions, singularly combining, in the very spirit of early Catacomb art, the convivial associations of the ancient funerary rites with the pious ejaculation of the Christian at the tomb. Often both are associated with a picture from the usual Scripture cycle.

A few instances³ of such combinations will suffice. (1) The Good Shepherd: round it in Greek 'Drink, Rufus; may you live with all yours; live.' (2) A bust with ZESE ('may you live') in the central circle: round this four scenes from the Scripture cycle. (3) Two busts (man and wife?)

1. A few examples of these relics may be seen encased in the British Museum's 'Early Christian Collection', 2nd North Gallery, Room I. (v).

2. *De Pudic.*, cap. 7. The 'calyx' of Tertullian of course need not be a Eucharistic chalice.

3. These are fully described and pictured in Prof. Babington's excellent article referred to above.

with *PIE ZESES* ('drink, may you live') in the central circle; round this five of the Scripture scenes. (4) Christ turning water into wine; round this the inscription '*Dignitas amicorum : vivas in pace Dei : Zeses.*' This '*dignitas amicorum*' (= the classical '*digni amici*', 'here's to our worthy friends') is particularly suggestive of the ordinary convivial usages. Yet more striking, if it could be proved that it came from the Christian catacombs, would be the glass cup in the miscellaneous Vatican collection inscribed '*In nomine Herculis Acherontini felices bibatis [or vivatis].*' If Christian, this and similar inscriptions must be interpreted in the same way as the pagan pictures and epitaphs on the walls of the *cubicula*, above noticed. The 'heredity of religion' which Dr. Dill recognizes as a potent influence in the Pagan epigraphy must be borne in mind, even in the Christian case. His caveat that "an epitaph should not be construed as a confession of faith"¹ seems especially essential in our study of the Catacombs. It is intelligible that they shew us the Italian mind clinging, as it has ever clung, to the ancestral traditions, and investing or embellishing even the most solemn of all themes with the conventionalities and fictitious characters of the national mythology. There was doubtless as little disloyalty to the Faith in such adaptation, as when the post-Nicene Roman bishops themselves appropriated the heathen title '*Pontifex Maximus*'; or as when the nimbus of the sacred heathen statue became the indication of the Christian saint; or as when, in the 14th century, unconsciously assuming the very attitude of these early believers, the great Florentine poet was escorted by Virgil to Charon's ferry, and across Acheron, to the walls of Dis.

L. Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 496 *seq.*

INDEX.

- Aaron, 12, 223
 Abba Sabama, 557
 Abbott, Dr. E., 24In., 363n.
 Abel, 144, 594
 Abdaas of Ctesiphon, 550
 Abgar Ukkama of Edessa, 41, 543
 Abgar VIII., 41
 Abgar, IX., 543
 Aboth, 10
 Abraham, 25, 74, 98, 127, 140, 143, 305; honoured by Alexander Severus, 74
 Abraxas, 591
 Abyssinian Church, see ETHIOPIAN CHURCH
 Acacius of Antioch in Phrygia, 79
 Acacius of Caesarea, 332, 345, 347, 349, 350
 Acacius of Constantinople, 538n.
 accedia, 586
 Achamoth, 593, 594
 Achilles, deacon, 315
 Achilleus, martyr, 248n., 598, 611
 acolytes, 218, 572
 Actium, battle of, 18
 Acts of Apostles, 11n., 12, 13, 29, 36, 39, 48n., 51n., 94n., 96n., 118, 131, 212, 228n., 556
 Acts of Martyrdom, 58, 66, 79n., 549n., 551; Scillitan Martyrs, 66n.; Perpetua and Felicitas, 73n., 225n., 263
 Acts of Paul and Thecla, 49
 Acts of Pilate, 86n., 92
 Adam, 139, 143, 150, 175, 176, 504, 594
 Adam, the Second, 460
 Adam Kadmon, 124, 125, 567, 589, 593
 Ad Catacumbas, 599, 600
 Addai, 543; *Doctrine* of, 4In., 543
 Adelfius, British bishop, 293
 Adeodatus, 495
 Adrianople, battles of, 92, 296, 392, 393, 427
 Advent, Second, 103
 Adyginus, bishop of Cordova, 410
 Aedesius, philosopher, 355
 Aelia Capitolina, 60, 319, 323-4
 Aelian, proconsul of Africa, 293
 Aemilian, martyr, 372
 Aeons, Gnostic, 127, 593, 594
 Aeon Christ, 142
 Aesculapius, 183n., 197
 Aëtius, heretic, 345, 349, 355, 360
 Aëtius, Roman general, 516, 530, 534
 Aëtius, archdeacon of Constantinople, 536, 572
 Africa, 42, 479, 515-17, 558
 — Church of, 42, 64, 66, 72, 222, 263-9, 288-95, 486, 496-501, 509, 526, 560-1, 564
 Agapè, 55, 65, 232-3; in Catacombs, 609, 610, 611, 613-14; cups, 612, 614-15
 Agapè, a Priscillianist, 409
 Agapetus, deacon, martyr, 611
 Agathangelos, 553n., 556n.
 Agatho, pope, 571
 Agelius, Novatian bishop, 400
 Agilo, 361
 Agnes (St.), Catacomb of, 598; church at Rome, 520
 Agonistae, 294
 Agricola, 561
 Agrippa, 19, 20
 Agrippa, see HEROD
 Ahriman, 123, 133
 Aidoneus, 183
 Akiba (Rabbi), 124
 Alaric, Gothic chieftain, 420, 439, 511-12, 518, 523-4, 558, 560, 599
 Alauda Legio, 70
 Albigenes, 152
 Albinus, general, 530
 Alexander Balas, 9
 Alexander Jannaenus, 16n.
 Alexander, bp. of Jerusalem, 79, 274

- Alexander, bp. of Alexandria, 165n., 298, 303, 304, 306, 309, 311, 312, 316, 319, 388
- Alexander, bp. of Byzantium, 303
- Alexander of Abonitichos, 190
- Alexander the Great, 4, 5, 122, 182, 326, 362, 373
- Alexander, son of Herod, 20
- Alexander Severus, 74, 75, 578n.
- Alexander, a Valentinian, 137, 595
- Alexander, high priest of Syria, 49
- Alexandra, mother of Mariamne, 16n., 18, 19, 20
- Alexandria, 4—6, 59, 72, 78, 81, 86, 126, 159, 161, 177, 182, 183, 226, 269, 274, 372, 406-7
- Church of, 42, 226, 227n., 243, 269—73, 319, 461, 465-6, 469, 474, 519, 522, 536, 556, 569
- Synod of, 368, 376, 455
- School of, 243, 277, 459-60, 464-5, 468, 469, 474, 476-7
- See CATECHETICAL SCHOOL
- Alexandria Troas, 112
- Alford (Dean), 246n., 249n.
- Allard (P.), 355n., 398n., 399nn., 407n., 408n.
- allegorism, 97-8, 127, 272-3, 277, 493
- Allen (A. V. G.), 157n., 158n., 160n., 162n., 175n., 177n., 178n.
- Alogi, 169
- altars, 582
- Alypius, 494, 495
- Amator of Auxerre, 563
- Ambivius (M.) 23
- Ambrose (St.) bp. of Milan, 227n., 266, 324n., 389, 392, 399, 411, 412n., 413—33, 450-1, 471, 481, 493, 495, 561, 568, 579, 582
- Ambrosius, friend of Origen, 198, 275
- Ammianus Marcellinus, 65n., 351n., 353n., 354n., 358n., 361n., 363n., 368n., 392n., 414, 415, 484, 550n.
- Ammonius, monk, 446
- Ammonius Saccas, 200, 274
- Amorphia, 592
- Amos, 2n.
- Amshaspands, 123, 184
- Anak, Armenian noble, 552
- Ananias, 31
- Anastasia, church of the, 394 and n.
- anastasis, 575
- Anastasius, bp. of Rome, 521
- Anastasius, syncellus to Nestorius, 458
- Anastasius, bp. of Thessalonica, 531
- anathema, 314, 315, 336, 337, 339, 345n., 397n., 452n., 456, 536
- Anatolius, bp. of Constantinople, 473, 531, 535-6, 572
- anchor, symbol in Catacombs, 239, 583
- Ancoratus* of St. Epiphanius, 395n., 446
- Ancyra, synod at, see **SYNODS**
- Andrew (St.), 26, 42, 116, 117; *Acts* of, 144n.
- Andronicus, 30n.
- Andronicus, governor, 437-8
- Anencletus or Anacleus, 105, 246
- Angelolatriy, 128, 130, 206
- Angels, 577
- Anicetus, 120-21, 145, 221, 251
- Annas, high-priest, 23
- Annius Rufus, 23
- annus calamitosus, 65
- Anomoean Arians, 166, 344, 345
- Anselm, 176
- Anteros, bp. of Rome, 611
- Anthemius, 541
- Anthimus, bp. of Nicomedia, 87 and n., 92
- Anthimus, bp. of Tyana, 385
- anthropomorphism, 154, 445
- Anthusa, mother of Chrysostom, 440
- Antichrist, 72, 76, 242
- Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, 16n., 17
- Antigonus of Socho, 6n., 10
- Antinomianism, 132
- Antioch, 35-6, 37, 85, 107, 166, 344, 353, 357, 366, 369—71, 549
- Church of, 39, 40, 81, 110, 112, 319, 519, 522, 536, 569
- School of, 168, 273, 277, 447, 454-5, 457-8, 464, 469, 474, 477, 506, 546
- riots at, 354, 364, 366, 369—71, 429-30, 440
- schism at, 378, 386-7, 395, 396
- synods at, 167, 456
- See **COUNCILS**
- Antiochenes, Pseudo-Ignatiusto, 113

- Antiochus the Great, 5n.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 7, 8, 202
 Antipas, see HEROD
 Antipater, father of Herod 10, 16, 17
 Antipater, son of Herod, 20
Antirrheticus, of Gregory of Nyssa, 477
Antitheseis, Marcion's, 138
 Antonine column, 69
 Antonines, age of, 63
 Antoninus Pius, emperor, 60-62, 204
 Antony (Mark), 17, 18
 Antony (St.), 333-4, 488, 495, 585, 587
 Antrim, 562
 Anulinus, a senator, 83
 Anulinus, proconsul of Africa, 290
 Aper (Arrius), 82-3
 Aphraates, 544, 549n., 550-51
 Apiarius, 526-7
 Apocalypse, 40, 50, 51 and n., 58, 93, 94, 96n., 109, 133, 166, 177-8
 Apocryphal writings, 97-102
 Apodemius, 360-1
ἀποκατάστασις, Gregory of Nyssa's doctrine of, 403n.
 Apollinaris (Claudius), 70 and n.
 Apollinaris, 368, 382, 387, 391, 452, 453-4, 456, 476-7, 485
 Apollinarians, 391, 399n., 401, 402
 Apollonius, martyr, 71
 Apollonius of Tyana, 74, 202
 — Life of, 197-8
 Apollos, 271
 Apologies, 59, 159, 161, 204-8
 APOLOGISTS:—
 45, 54, 66, 157, 203-8, 241n.
 Aristides, 59, 204-6 and n., 210n.
 Arnobius, 208
 Athenagoras, 65n., 66
 Greek and Latin, 203-4
 Justin Martyr, 48n., 59n., 65-6, 158-60, 230, 231n., 233, 235, 241n.
 Lactantius, 204, 208
 Melito of Sardis, 54, 59n., 60, 65n., 66
 Minucius Felix, 65n., 66, 92n., 208 and n.
 Quadratus, 59, 204
 Tertullian, 203, 206-8, 208n.
 Theophilus of Antioch, 65n., 161, 208
 Apostles, 29, 30n., 33, 34, 39, 41-2, 93, 115, 119, 145, 212, 213, 214, 216, 218, 221, 233; itinerant, 102, 215
Apostolic Constitutions, 8n., 105, 110, 219, 223n., 228n., 233, 236 and n., 573
Apostolic Canons, 573, 574
 Apostolic succession, 223, 499
 applause, 167, 545, 578-9
 Apuleius, 184n.
 Aquila, version of, 276, 277, 482
 Aquila at Corinth, 38
 Aquileia, 480
 Aquinas (Thomas), 54n.
 Arabia, 42, 564
 Arabs, 74, 565
 Aramaic, 155, 547
 Ararat, 555
 Arbetio, 361
 Arbogast, 419, 430
 Arcadius, emperor, 434-5, 439-40, 449, 451, 479, 550
 arch of Constantine, 282
 archbishop, 535
 archdeacon, 218, 570, 572
 Archelaus, son of Herod, 22, 23
 Archelaus, bp. of Caschar, 149
 Archons, great and lesser, 591, 594
 Ardeshir, 548, 552
 Aretas, 22
 Arianism, 161, 163, 165n., 262, 297-350, 375-400, 452, 453, 476-7, 517, 524, 558-60, 566
 Arians, 371; at Milan, 422-6; at Constantinople, 443
 Ariminum, councils at, see COUNCILS
 Arisdages, 553
 Aristeas, 5
 Aristides, apologist, see APOLOGISTS
 Aristion, 117
 Aristobulus, 5n.
 Aristobulus, brother of Hyrcanus II., 10, 16 and n.
 Aristobulus, brother of Marianne, 16n., 17-18
 Aristobulus, son of Herod, 16n., 20, 35
 Aristotle, 136, 139, 313n., 569; *Categories*, 492
 Arius, 298-304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 311, 315, 317, 330, 388, 390, 475, 559

- Arles, synods at, 293, 316, 342; primacy of, 526, 532-3, 570; monuments, 607n.
- Armagh, 564
- Armenia, 88, 92, 550n., 552-5, 566, 569, 584n.
- Armenian versions, 204, 205, 555
- Arminius, deacon, 293
- Arnobius, apologist, 208
- Arsacidae, dynasty of, 552
- Arsacius, bp. of Constantinople, 450
- Arsacius, high-priest of Galatia, 362n.
- Arsenius, bishop, 317
- Arsinoe, 177
- Artavasdes, satrap, 552
- Artaxerxes I., 548, 552
- Artemius, praefect, 373
- Artemon, 164, 169-70
- Ascension, 28, 41, 478
- asceticism, 13, 25, 32, 126, 129-32, 151, 197, 201, 203, 381-2, 393, 409-10, 483, 487, 543, 545, 565, 586-7
- Ascholiis, bp. of Thessalonica, 393
- Asclepas, 338
- Asia, churches of, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 67, 111, 116, 119, 220, 221, 251, 393
- province of, 38, 42, 116, 318
- Assoneans, 9-10, 16, 17, 19, 36
- Assemani, 547n.
- Assouan papyri, 3n.
- Ataulfus, a Goth, 515
- Aterbius, 487
- Athanasic, Gothic chieftain, 380
- Athanasius, 100, 101, 166 and n., 167, 172, 229, 288, 290n., 302n., 303, 305, 306, 309-10, 313n., 316-18, 325, 330-1, 333, 334-5, 338, 340, 341, 342, 345, 345n., 346n., 350, 368-9, 375n., 376-7, 379-80, 387-9, 390n., 397n., 406, 433, 458n., 466, 476, 518, 556, 557, 568, 587
- 'atheism', 46, 52, 65
- Athenagoras, apologist, 65n., 66
- Athens, 59, 269, 356-7, 381
- Atonement, 171, 176, 185, 300, 403; see also REDEMPTION
- Attalus, martyr, 68
- Attalus, usurper, 524
- Atticus, bp. of Constantinople, 450, 527
- Atticus, bp. of Old Epirus, 531
- Attila the Hun, 468, 469, 530
- Atys, legend of, 136
- Audians, 318
- audientes, 229
- Augusti appointed by Diocletian, 84
- Augustine, bp. of Hippo, 8n., 135, 151, 185, 202n., 230 and n., 243, 289, 295, 412n., 413, 420, 424, 433, 471, 480, 486, 489, 490-517, 524, 525, 530, 560, 571, 579, 582; doctrines of, 175, 499, 502-11; *Confessions*, 491-6, 507, 613n., *The City of God*, 511-15
- Augustus, see OCTAVIAN
- Aurelian, emperor, 81, 82
- Aurelian, politician, 435
- Aurelius (Marcus), 47, 54, 60, 63, 64-71, 76, 80, 180, 189, 191, 192, 194, 195, 198, 203, 598
- Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, 498, 505, 527
- Aurelius Victor, 90n.
- Ausonius, poet, 415, 417
- Autolytus, 161
- Auxentius, Arian, 424
- Auxentius, Arian bishop of Milan, 416, 422
- Auxentius, pupil of Ulfilas, 560
- Auxerre, 563
- Avitus, 540
- Axum, 556, 557
- Aziluth, 125
- Baal worship, 74
- Babington (Prof.), 614n., 615n.
- Babylas, bp. of Antioch, 79, 366, 370
- Babylon, 3, 4, 8, 123, 149, 246n.
- Bacchus, 602
- Bagoas, eunuch, 20
- Bahran, king of Persia, 150; see VARANES
- Balaam, 133
- Balder, 559
- Bannaventa, 562
- Baptism, 29, 30, 102, 173, 227n., 228, 230-1, 235, 237, 241, 262, 269 and n., 507, 543, 558, 580; of John, 25, 30; of infants, 231 and n., 507; ceremonial of, 576-7; Hellenic, 187; Mithraic 185

- baptismal vow, 55, 231, 576
 baptistery, 422, 576
 Bar-Anina, 486
 Barbatio, general, 354
 Barcochab, 59
 Bardesanes or Bardaisan, 137, 141, 595
Barlaam and Josaphat, 205
Barnabas, Epistle of, 8n., 97—100, 101, 103n., 109, 253
 Barnabas (St.), 30n., 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 97, 100, 106, 212, 213n.
 Baronius, 54n., 534
 Barsumas, a Nestorian, 467, 471, 551
 Bartholomew (St.), 42
 Basil, bp. of Ancyra, 342n., 345, 347, 349, 377, 378n., 382
 Basil, bp. of Amasia, 296n.
 Basil (St.), bp. of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 168n., 356, 360, 380—7, 390-1, 393-4 and n., 402—4, 440, 445, 453, 545, 568, 570, 581, 582, 587
 Basil, father of St. Basil, 381
 Basil, presbyter of Ancyra, martyr, 372
 basilicas, 575; at Milan, 423 and n.
 Basilides, 134, 136-7, 138, 591-2
 Basilina, mother of Julian, 352
 Basilic, 563
 Baur, 91n., 93, 114, 115n., 134, 165n., 167n., 170n., 171n., 199n., 200n., 202n., 203n.
Bazaar of Heraclides, 462n., 464
 Beausobre, quoted, 123n.
 Bede (Venerable), 229 and n., 564n.
 Bellarmine, Cardinal, 545
 Belser (Dr.), 91n.
 Benson (Abp.), 223, 224n., 265n., 266n., 268n.
 Berenice, 247
 Bernard (Dr.), 132n., 212n.
 Bernard (St.), 112 and n.
 Bernice, 16n.
 Beryllus of Bostra, 165, 275
 Bethlehem: church at, 324, 575; Jerome at, 482, 485—8
 Bethune-Baker (Dr. J. F.), 142n., 147n., 158n., 162n., 163n., 165n., 166n., 168n., 170n., 171n., 172n., 174n., 313n., 314n., 336n., 340n., 344n., 345n., 391n., 397n., 452n., 453n., 454n., 456n., 457n., 458n., 460n., 462n., 464n., 467n., 471n., 473n., 478, 499n., 502n., 507n., 508n., 509n.
 Beugnot (Mons.), 351n., 364n., 392n., 404n., 418n.
 Bevan, 3n., 9n.
 Biblias, martyr, 67
 Bigg (Dr.), 149n., 162n., 185n., 192n., 195n., 198n., 200n., 246n., 273n., 286n., 420n.
 Bingham, *Antiquities*, 46n., 227n., 229n., 443n., 603 and n.
 'birth-days' of martyrs, 581; see NATALE
 bishops, 42, 63, 102, 145, 212—28, 236, 250, 266, 564
 Biterrae, synod at, see SYNODS
 Bithynia, 38, 54, 57, 233, 352n.
 Bito (Valerius), 107, 108
 Blandina, martyr, 67, 68, 73
 Bleek, 276n.
 Blemmyes, 464, 565
 Blesilla, widow, ascetic, 483, 485
 Bogomili, 151
 Boissier (M. Gaston), 67n., 86n., 282n., 351n., 352n., 367n., 408n., 414n., 418n., 420n.
 Boniface, Count of Africa, 500, 515-16, 517
 Boniface, pope, 525, 527-8
 Bonosus, foster-brother of St. Jerome, 480
 books, Christian, destroyed, 87, 196
 Bordeaux pilgrim, 582
 Bosio, 609n.
 Bostra, synod at, 165
 Botheric, 428
 Bourbon, general, 524
 Brace (C. L.), 188n.
 Brahmins, 197
 brethren, the Lord's, 29, 30n., 31, 53; see JAMES
 Bright, 293n, 395n., 463n., 473n., 504n., 506n., 509n., 525n.
 Brightman, 236n.
 Britain, 39, 52n., 84, 184, 392, 409, 423, 479, 561-2, 565; Constantine proclaimed emperor in, 89
 Brooke, 144n.
 Bruce, traveller, 8n., 558
 Brutus, 195
 Bryennius (Archbp.), 101, 103, 107 and n.

- Buddas Terebinthus, 149
 Buddhism, 126
 Bulgaria, 151
 Bull (Bp.), 166n., 313n., 332n.
 Bunsen (Chevalier de) 114, 229n.,
 253n., 258, 264n.
 Burdegala (Bordeaux), synod at, see
 SYNODS
 Burkitt (Prof.), 32n., 41n., 141n.,
 543n., 547n., 551n., 569n.
 Burn (Dr. A.), 312n., 424n.
 Burrhus, deacon of Ephesus, 111
 Bury (Prof.), 188n., 435n., 449n.,
 450n., 564n.
 Butler (Dom), 334n., 447n., 465n.
 Bythus, 594
 Byzantium, 305, 569; see also CON-
 STANTINOPLÉ
- Cabbalah, see KABBALA
 Caecilianus, bp. of Carthage, 288,
 290—4, 304
 Caesar (Julius), 326, 417
 Caesarea (Palestine), 18, 36, 106;
 church of, 311, 319
 Caesarea (Cappadocia), 381, 383,
 385, 570
 Caesariani, 80
 Caesaro-papalism, 457
 Caesars appointed by Diocletian, 84
 Caiaphas, 23; his house, 582
 Cain, 140, 144, 590, 594
 Cainites, 134, 136, 590
 Caius, 64 and n., 177 and n.
 Caligula (Caius), 35, 36 and n., 48
 Callinicum, riot at, 427
 Callistus, or Callixtus, bp. of Rome,
 169, 170, 171, 254—61, 519,
 598, 615; Catacomb of, 598,
 599, 608, 609
 Calpurnius, 561, 562
 Calvin, 476, 509n.
 Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, 66n.,
 73n., 206n., 263n.
 Candace, 34, 228n., 556
 Candida Casa, monastery of, 564
 Candidian, 463n.
 candles, 575
 canistrum, 609
 canon law, 574
 Canon, New Testament, 51, 63, 96
 and n., 118, 144
 Canons of Nicaea, 319, 527, 535; of
 Antioch, 337n.; of Gangra, 573
- Cantabrum, 92n.
 Canterbury, 408n.
 Capitol, 321
 Cappadocia, 30n., 70, 381, 385
 Cappadocian Fathers, 313n., 380—7,
 397n., 402—4, 433, 445, 455—6
 Captivity of the Jews, 3, 123, 124
 Caracalla, emperor, 73, 271
 Carbonari, 50n.
 Carinus and Numerian, 82—3
 Carneades, Academic philosopher,
 191n.
 Carpocrates, 134, 136, 142n., 252
 Carpochorus, 255—6
 Carpus, bp. of Thyatira, martyr, 79
 Carthage, 74, 288, 491, 515, 517;
 Church of, 222—6, 243, 263,
 269, 289, 290—95, 519, 570;
 cabal at, 290—2; see SYNODS
 Carus, emperor, 82
 Cassian, John, 508, 587
 Castalia, spring of, 370
 Castor and Pollux, 321
 Castricia, 444
 Catacombs, 239—40 and n., 244n.,
 247—8, 422, 480, 583, 596—
 616; Jewish, 600, 606
 Catechetical School of Alexandria,
 161, 165, 168, 271, 275, 381
 catechist, 229
 catechumens, 101, 228—30, 236—7
 Cathari, 261—2. See PURITANISM
 Catholic Church, 145, 209, 223;
 organization of, 209—42
 Catholic Faith, 145
 Catholicity, 398
 'Catholicus', 553
 Cato the Elder, 191n., 195, 285
 Cato the Younger, 194
 Catullus, 604n.
 Celestine, bp. of Rome, 462, 528,
 530, 539, 563, 564
 Celestius, 503—5, 507, 510, 525
 celibacy, 286, 432, 487; of clergy,
 320, 438, 521, 557, 573
 Celidionius, 533
 Celsus, 45, 46, 47, 65n., 76, 178,
 190, 196, 202; his treatise,
 198—200
 Cephas, see PETER
 cenobite monks, 587
 censor, office of, 76, 79
 Centumcellae, 262
 Cerdon, friend of Marcion, 138
 Cerealis, governor, 437

- Cerinthus, 134, 142, 177
 Chaiiah, 125n.
 Chalcedon, council of, see COUNCILS
 charismata, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 222, 225
 charitable organization, 581
 Charles, (Dr. R. H.), 8n., 558n.
 Charles Martel, 282
 Chase (Bp.), 246n.
 Chi and Kappa, 369
 children, exposure of, 285-6
 Children of the Sun, 151
 Chiliasm, see MILLENARIANISM
 China, 241n., 467, 550, 563
 chorepiscopi, 570
 Chosroës, 552
 Chrestus, tumults in Rome respecting, 38, 48
 Christ, times of, 15-28; honoured by Alexander Severus, 74; coming of, 103
 Christ, Gnostic ideas of, 140, 589, 590, 594, 595
 Christian, name of, 34
 Christianity: a *religio licita*, 81, 82, 91n.; a *religio illicita*, 45, 48, 59, 63, 206; Jewish, 95n.
 Christmas, 580
 Christology: progressive in New Testament, according to Baur, 94-6, Marcion's, 140-1; of Clementine Literature, 143; of Letter to Diognetus, 157; of Justin, 160, Arian, 302n.
 Christological controversy, 457-8, 478; see INCARNATION, LOGOS DOCTRINE, etc.
 Chronicle of Eusebius, 482
Chronicon Paschale, 120n., 224n.
 Chrysanthius, 355
 Chrysaphius, eunuch, 468, 472
 Chrysostom (St. John), 40, 101, 110, 230n., 259, 277, 371, 396, 426, 429-30, 440-51, 457, 458, 461, 466, 475, 489, 506, 518, 522, 561, 570, 571, 578, 579
 Church: Constantine's legislation respecting, 286; development of, 210-11; 289, 479; organization of, 209-237
 Church: Apostolic, 29-40, 210; Manichaean, 151
 churches: form of, 574-5; first erected, 75, 519-20; decorations of, 575-6
 Cibalis, battle of, 295
 Cicero, 17n., 45, 421, 491, 493
 Cilicia, 37, 449
 Circesium, 542
 Circumcellions, 294-5, 412n., 497, 500, 501
 circumcision, 98, 557
 Clarke, W. K. L., *St. Basil the Great*, 581n.
 Classics, study of, 367-8, 405, 421, 481, 485, 491
 classification of Gnostic sects, 133-5
 Claudian, poet, 69 and n., 413-14, 415, 439n.
 Claudius, emperor, 35, 38, 41, 48
 Claudius Albinus, 72
 Claudius Apollinaris, 70 and n.
 Claudius Ephebus, 107, 108
 Claudius Severus, 189
 Clemens (Flavius), 44, 52, 104, 106, 108n., 247, 249
 Clement of Philippi, 103
 Clement of Alexandria, 5n., 42, 64, 96n., 97, 99, 100, 119, 120n., 135, 148-9, 154, 161-2, 173, 175, 177, 178, 186n., 203, 239n., 246n., 257n., 271, 273, 276, 600, 603, 605-6
 Clement of Rome, 40-1, 44, 46n., 96n., 103-9, 142-3, 215-16, 233, 234, 246, 452n., 606
 — Epistle of, 41-2, 52, 97n., 101, 103-9, 215-16, 227n., 234, 244n., 249-50, 259-60, 276
 — Second Epistle, see CLEMENTINE LITERATURE
 Clements mentioned by Tacitus, 104 and n.
 Clementine Literature, 95, 101, 103, 105, 106-7, 109, 141, 142-3, 313n.
 Clementine Liturgy, 219, 236
 Cleomenes, 170
 Cleopatra of Egypt, 18
 Cleopatra of Jerusalem, 21
 clergy, 211, 214, 225, 483-4, 557, 570-71; laws respecting, 88, 286-7; pagan, 362; see CELIBACY
 Cletus, 105
 clinici, 262
 Codex Alexandrinus, 107, 109
 Codex Sinaiticus, 97, 109, 253
 Coele-Syria, 382, 470

Cohortatio ad Graecos, 159
 Colluthus, 303
 Cologne, 575: catacombs at, 597
 Colossians, Epistle to, 40, 96n., 129, 130
 Colossian heresy, 40, 129-30, 131
 Comana, Chrysostom died at, 450
 commemoration of saints in Eucharist, 577
 commentaries, 126, 144, 275, 486, 555
 Commodus, emperor, 48, 66, 71, 195, 255
Commonitorium, 527, 562
 Communicatio idiomatum, 460
 Communion of Saints, 611
 competentes, 229
Confessions of St. Augustine, see AUGUSTINE
 confessors, 78, 240, 267, 291
 Connaught, 562, 563
 Connolly (Dom), 551n.
 conscience, liberty of, 92, 279
 consecration of Elements, 234, 235
 Conservatives, so-called, 331, 336
 Constans, emperor, 295, 333, 337, 338, 339, 341, 342, 497
 Constantia, empress, sister of Constantine, 296, 301
 Constantia, daughter of Constantine, 353, 354n.
 Constantine, 84n., 88-92, 203, 211, 279-327 passim, 328-30, 333, 336, 350, 359, 361, 363, 389, 397, 404, 497, 519, 520, 546, 575, 576, 580, 582, 598
 Constantine II., 333, 338
 Constantine, usurper, 526
 Constantinople, 103, 317, 325, 327, 393, 394-7, 398-401, 403, 434, 439, 447, 448, 450, 458, 472, 474, 522, 541, 561, 569; see also BYZANTIUM
 — council of, see COUNCILS; synods at, see SYNODS
 Constantius Chlorus, 84 and n., 88, 89, 280
 Constantius, emperor, 328-50, 351 and n., 353, 356, 357, 358, 359, 363, 375, 377, 378n., 382, 388, 404, 417
 converts, 228, 287
 Conybeare, 13n., 47n., 270n., 334n., 555n., 584n.
copatae, 581

Coponius, 23
 Coptic church, 474
 Coracion, 178
 Corinth, 38, 39; church of, 40, 41, 107, 214, 233
 Corinthians, St. Paul's Epistles to, 40n., 51, 93, 94, 108, 128, 214, 232, 233-4
 — Epistle of Clement to, 40-1, 46n., 52, 101, 103, 107-9, 215, 227n., 234, 259
 Cornelius, centurion, 34-5, 228n.
 Cornelius, bp. of Rome, 226, 261, 262, 268n., 572, 611; Catacomb of, 609
Corona Militis, Tertullian's, 235
 Costobar, 20
 Cotton (Dr.), 7n.
 Councils, procedure of, 574
 COUNCILS:—
 General, 222, 304, 320n., 329, 395, 399, 443, 451, 456, 463, 472, 535, 546, 565
 Alexandria, 368, 376, 390n., 455
 Antioch, 332, 336-8, 339-40, 449, 559
 Ariminum, 347-9, 375, 376, 377
 Arles, 288, 293, 316, 342
 Chalcedon, 320n., 337n., 395n., 443n., 469, 472-4, 534-6, 537, 551, 552, 565, 566, 574n.
 Constantinople, 320n., 395-7, 399, 403, 443, 456, 535, 536, 546
 Elvira, 46, 228n. 237, 573
 Ephesus, 463-4, 466, 506, 546, 551; the 'Latrocinium', 471-2, 473, 536, 574n.
 Gangra, 573
 Jerusalem, 36-7, 95, 245, 332n.
 Laodicea, 311n.
 Milan, 342-3, 356, 375
 Nicaea, 174, 304-320, 329-30, 537, 538, 544, 559, 567, 574n.
 Philippopolis, 338-9
 Sardica, 228, 338-9
 Seleucia, 347-9, 377, 382
 Sirmium, 344-7
 Toledo, 259, 260
 Trent, 486
 See SYNODS
 Creation, theories of, 123, 128, 142, 143, 589, 594

CREEDS:—

- early, 153 and n., 230, 311n.
 Athanasian, 412n.
 of Antioch, 336—8
 Constantinopolitan, 395n.
 the Dated, 337, 347, 348
 of the Dedication, 336—8, 345n.,
 346, 349, 377
 Eusebian, 308, 311-12
 the Macrostich, 340
 Nicene, 172, 243, 308, 311n.,
 312—16, 318, 320, 329-30,
 336, 341, 343, 348, 350,
 389n., 395 and n., 400,
 452n.
 of Nicæ, 347—9, 350, 382
 of Sirmium, 344—7
 the Union, 464
 Crescens, philosopher, 66, 159
 Cresconius, 500
 Crete, Christianity in, 38, 213n.
 crimes attributed to Christians, 67,
 613
 criminals and debtors, laws re-
 specting, 71, 284
 Crispus, son of Constantine, 281n.,
 288, 296, 321, 322, 326
 criticism, Biblical, 277
 Critolaus, Peripatetic philosopher,
 191n.
 Cross, 421, 557; in catacombs,
 605; sign of, 103, 367, 605;
 invention of, 324, Constan-
 tine's vision of, 281-2
 crucifixion abolished, 285
 Cruttwell, 139n.
cubiculum, 611
 Cubricus, 150
 Cucusus, 400; Chrysostom at, 449-50
 Cumont, 185n.
 Cunningham (Dr. W.), 509n., 510n.
 Cureton (Dr.), 318n.; on Ignatian
 Epistles, 114, 115
 Curetonian Syriac MS., 547
 curiales, 287, 367
 Curubis, Cyprian exiled to, 79
 cynics, 360
 Cyprian, bp. of Carthage, 77, 78,
 79, 80n., 222—4, 227n., 238n.,
 241n., 252n., 257, 259, 260—3,
 265—9, 288, 289, 291, 423,
 487n., 568, 574, 611, 615
 Cyprus, 36
 Cyrene, province of, 59, 436—9,
 569

- Cyril, bp. of Alexandria, 270, 373,
 406, 458—67, 469, 475, 476,
 477, 527, 536, 546
 Cyril, bp. of Jerusalem, 324n., 458n.,
 571, 576, 577; *Catechetical
 lectures of*, 571, 576—8
 Cyrus, diocese of, 470
 Cyrus the Persian, 548
 Dacia, 559
 Daemon of Socrates, 176
 daemons, 198, 199, 201, 240
 Daillé on Ignatian Letters, 114
 Daire, 564
 Dalaradia, 562
 Damas, bp. of Magnesia, 111
 Damascus, 34
 Damasus, bp. of Rome, 387, 397n.,
 398, 411, 422, 456, 480, 482,
 484, 518, 520, 527, 564,
 583, 599
 Daniel, 608; Book of, 8, 202
 Dante, 54n., 322, 499n., 616
 'Dated' Creed, see CREEDS
 David, 21, 608; descendants of,
 53
 Davids (T. W. Rhys), 126n.
 Davidson, 155n.
 Da Vinci (Leonardo), 607
 deacons, 33-4, 102, 116, 213, 214,
 215, 216, 218, 222, 224, 227,
 235, 236, 250, 484, 521, 571,
 572, 601n.
 deaconesses, 56, 215, 236, 573
 De Broglie, 282, 286n., 287n.,
 290n., 356n., 376n., 380n.,
 387n., 391n.
decad, 593
 Decius, 76; edict of, 77; persecu-
 tion by, 76—9, 257, 261, 266,
 268, 272
De Civitate Dei, Augustine's treatise,
 511—15
 decretals, 521; false, 109
 decurionate, 286
 Dedication, Creed of, see CREEDS
 dedication festivals, 613
 delators, 45, 52, 71
 Demeter, 187
 Demetrius, Pelagius' letter to,
 507-8
 Demetrius, bp. of Alexandria, 80
 and n., 226, 271, 274, 275,
 277

- Demetrius II., 8
 Demiurgus, 128, 133, 139, 140, 589, 594
 Demophilus, bp. of Constantinople, 379, 394, 399n., 400
 Demosthenes, cook to the emperor Valens, 384
 De Pressense, 114, 169n., 171n., 239n., 240n.
 De Rossi, 217n., 240n., 247, 248, 249, 599, 608
 De Soyres, 174n, 224n.
 Desposyni, 53n.
 Determinism, 510
De Vita Contemplativa, 13n., 334n.
 Devs, 123
 Diana of Ephesus, 182
 Dianius of Caesarea, 335, 349, 382-3
 Diaspora, 3, 4, 33
Diatessaron, 144, 543, 547, 555
 Dichu, 563
Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, 226n., 230n., 260n., 573n., 614n.
Dictionary of Christian Biography, 41n., 79n., 91n., 105n., 107n., 115n., 119n., 124n., 136n., 144n., 151n., 166n., 174n., 202n., 288n., 308n., 324n., 342n., 346n., 366n., 382n., 390n., 394n., 401n., 410n., 435n., 436n., 438n., 439n., 441n., 445n., 465n., 467n., 470n., 481n., 498n., 509n., 521n., 534n., 539n., 547n., 553n., 555n.
Didache, 100-3, 215, 219, 229, 230, 231n., 233, 234
Didascalia, 217n.
 Didymus the Blind, 381, 485
 Dill (Prof.), 52n., 182n., 183n., 184n., 185n., 188n., 191n., 196n., 201n., 217n., 405n., 416n., 484n., 523n., 601n., 614n., 615
 Diocletian, 44, 47, 48, 63, 82-90, 151, 196, 269, 277, 279, 280, 283, 284, 285, 326, 425, 553
 diocese, 220, 470
 Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, 440, 447, 454, 457
 Diogenes, a Stoic, 191n.
 Diognetus, Letter to, 157
 Dion Cassius, 43, 44n., 52n., 69, 70
 Dionysius, bp. of Alexandria, 79, 80, 81, 165-6, 168, 172, 177, 178, 226, 241n., 262, 272, 302, 313n.
 Dionysius, bp. of Corinth, 96n., 109n.
 Dionysius, bp. of Milan, 343
 Dionysius, bp. of Rome, 166, 262, 313n.
 Dioscorus, bp. of Alexandria, 406, 467, 469-74, 531, 536
 Dioscorus, confessor, 78
 Dioscorus, monk, 446
 Diospolis (Lydda), Synod at, see SYNODS
 Dis, 183, 616
 disciplina arcani, 146n., 229-30
 discipline, 40, 214, 218, 236-7, 267, 579
 discourses of our Lord, 24
 divorce, 237
 Döbschutz, 35n., 52n., 128n., 129n., 133n., 253n.
 Docetism, 127, 131, 134, 145, 156, 172, 176, 452, 476
 doctors, present at councils, 574
dodecad, 593
 Döllinger (Dr.), 258
 Dominica, empress, 379n., 393
 Domitian, emperor, 44, 48, 52, 53, 64, 103, 104, 108, 197, 247, 248n., 249
 Domitian, praefect, 354
 Domitilla, see FLAVIA
 Domnus, bp. of Antioch, 470, 471
 Domnus, bp. of Samosata, 298n.
 Donation of Constantine, 321-3
 Donatists, 269, 288-95, 304, 316, 326, 329, 490, 496-501, 503, 506, 515
 Donatus of Casae Nigrae, 292, 293
 Donatus the Great, 292, 293, 497
 Donatus (Aelius), grammarian, 480
 door-keepers, 218, 236, 572
 Dörner, *Person of Christ*, 158n., 160n., 161 and n., 162n., 165n., 172n., 298n., 300n., 302 and n., 309n., 310n., 453n., 467n.
 Dorotheus, chamberlain of Diocletian, 85, 87
 Dorotheus, disciple of Origen, 277
 Dositheans, 11n.
 Drummond, 156n.
 Dual and Monad, 143

- ducenarius, secular office, 167
 Duchesne, 218n., 220n., 228n.,
 229n., 539n., 553n.
- Easter**, question of, 120-1, 221,
 251, 318, 580, 584; public
 holiday, 398n.
- Eastern Church**, 254-5, 325, 377,
 381, 434-76, 502, 537-8, 547
- Ebionites**, 118, 134, 141, 142, 150,
 156-7
- Eborius of York**, 293
- Ecclesiasticus**, 6
- Ecdicius, praefect**, 369
- eclecticism**, 137, 193, 570, 573
- Edersheim**, 6n.
- Edesius**, 556
- Edessa**, church of, 41, 141, 466-7,
 543, 546
- edicts**: of Decius, 77; of Diocletian,
 87-8; of Galerius, 90-1; of
 Gallienus, 80, 82, 86; of
 Maximin Daza, 92; of Valerian,
 79-80; of Constantine, 92; of
 Julian, 366, 376, 405; of
 Theodosius, 398-9, 401, 412n.;
 of Honorius, 525
- edict of Milan**, 45, 92, 243, 269,
 279, 283-4, 300, 349, 567
- Edomites**, 16n., 19
- Egypt**, 3, 6, 64, 72, 91n., 126, 474;
 religion of, 126, 137, 265-6,
 591
- Egyptians**, Gospel according to,
 136
- ἐκκλησία*, 209-10, 217
- Elagabalus**, see **HELOGABALUS**
- elders**, see **PRESBYTERS**
- Eleazar**, high-priest, 23
- election**, 509
- election of clergy**, 226-7
- Eleusinian Mysteries**, 59, 187-8,
 355, 357
- Eleusius**, bp. of Cyzicus, 345, 377,
 378, 379, 400
- Elijah** in catacombs, 602
- Elizabeth**, Queen of England, 320n.,
 326
- Elkesai**, Book of, 141
- Elkesaites**, 143, 150
- Elvira**, Council of, see **COUNCILS**
- Emanations**, Gnostic, 123, 589
- emblems in catacombs**, 602, 604,
 606
- Emesa**, idol of, 74, 184
- Emmelia**, mother of St. Basil, 381
- Emperors**, 48-92, 540-1; see also
CONSTANTINE, **CONSTANTIUS**,
JULIAN, **THEODOSIUS**, etc.
- Encratites**, 66, 144, 412n.
- Encyclopaedia Biblica**, 8n., 93n.,
 213n., 234n.
- energumens*, 240, 572
- Enoch**, 143
- Enoch, Book of*, 6n., 8-9, 558
- En-Soph**, 124
- Epagathus (Vettius)**, 67
- Epaphras**, 118
- Ephebus (Clandius)**, 107
- Ephesians**, St. Paul's Epistle to,
 40, 96n., 130, 141, 214, 593
- Ephesians**, Epistle of Ignatius to,
 111, 114
- Ephesus**, 111, 116, 119, 159, 213n.,
 244; church of, 38, 39, 40,
 42, 214, 271; heresy at,
 130-2; council at, see
COUNCILS
- Ephraim Syrus (St.)**, 544-5, 555
- Epictetus**, 189, 192, 194, 195, 203
- Epicureanism**, 189-90, 195, 196,
 302, 419
- Epigonus**, 170
- Epiphanius (St.)**, bp. of Salamis,
 11n., 138n., 142n., 169n.,
 224n., 276n., 318, 345n.,
 395n., 445n.; 446, 447, 448,
 482n., 483, 487-8, 522
- Epiphany**, 557-8, 580
- episcopacy**, 42, 63, 102, 212-28
- epochs of Church History**, 48, 63-4
- epitaphs**, in catacombs, 602-4, 612
- ἐρανος*, 217
- Erdmann**, 200n, 201n.
- Esau**, 140
- Esāras, Fourth Book of*, 558
- Essenes**, 12-13, 26, 125-6, 131, 143
- Essenism**, Christian, 129, 130n.
- Etchmiadzin**, 553, 555
- Etheria**, pilgrim, 575, 583
- Ethiopia**, 34, 556
- Ethiopian church**, 42, 556-8, 565,
 569; curious custom, 557-8
- Ethiopic version**, 558
- Enarestus**, pope, 601
- Eucharist**, 29, 56n., 102, 109, 214,
 215, 219, 231-6, 241, 251, 428,
 460, 577-8; evening celebra-
 tion, 584; in catacombs, 597,

- Eucharist (continued) :
 609, 611; in Cyril of Jerusalem,
 577; Mithraic, 185
- Euchites, 151
- Euchrocia, Priscillianist, 410, 412
- Euclid, 169n.
- Eudoxia, empress, 439, 442, 444,
 448, 449
- Eudoxius, bp. of Constantinople,
 345, 349, 379, 394, 452n.
- Eugenius, usurper, 419, 430
- Eugraphia, 444
- Euippus, bishop, 384
- Eulalius, bp. of Nazianzus, 402
- Eulalius, anti-pope, 527-8
- Eulogius, philosopher, 306
- Eulogius, bp. of Caesarea, 505
- Eunomius, an Arian, 380n., 399n.,
 400, 401
- Eudius, bp. of Antioch, 110
- Euphratensis, 474, 542
- Euphrates, bp. of Cologne, 339, 340
- Eusebia, empress, 342, 356
- Eusebian party, 330, 332, 333,
 334-5, 336, 337, 338, 341, 343-4,
 345, 350, 380, 389
- Eusebius, bp. of Caesarea, historian,
 5n., 7n., 13n., 32n., 41, 42n.,
 48n., 52n., 53n., 54, 58n., 59,
 60, 62, 64n., 65n., 66n., 67n.,
 70, 71, 72n., 75n., 79n., 80n.,
 81n., 82, 85n., 86n., 87n.,
 91n., 92n., 97, 100, 101n.,
 103, 104, 105, 109n., 113,
 115, 116, 117, 118, 119n.,
 120n., 121n., 127, 141, 142n.,
 144n., 146, 149n., 159, 161,
 162n., 165n., 166n., 167n.,
 168, 169n., 170n., 177, 178n.,
 197n., 202n., 204, 213n.,
 218n., 221n., 224n., 241n.,
 244n., 245n., 248n., 250n.,
 251n., 252n., 258n., 262n.,
 270n., 271n., 272, 277n., 280,
 281 and n., 283, 287n., 293n.,
 296n., 301, 305, 307-9, 310-
 312, 313, 315, 317n., 319n.,
 324, 331-2, 336, 345, 458n.,
 547n., 582
- Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 470
- Eusebius, bp. of Caesarea in Cappa-
 docia, 383
- Eusebius, bp. of Nicomedia, 301,
 303, 307, 311, 315, 316, 325,
 332, 334, 352, 394, 559
- Eusebius, bp. of Samosata, 385
- Eusebius, bp. of Vercellae, 343
- Eusebius, chamberlain, 333, 343,
 354, 360, 361
- Eusebius, monk, 446
- Euselius, martyr at Gaza, 372
- Eustathius, bp. of Antioch, 313,
 316, 378, 555
- Eustathius, bp. of Sebaste, 345,
 349, 377, 379, 382, 386, 581
- Eustochium (St.), 483, 485, 486
- Euthymius, monk, 446
- Eutropius, historian, 283n.
- Eutropius, minister of Arcadius, 439,
 440, 441
- Eutyches, 470-3, 531-2, 533
- Eutychanism, 456, 468, 469,
 470-6, 528, 534-8
- Euty chius of Alexandria, 271
- Euzoius, deacon, 315
- Evagrius, bp. of Antioch, 468n.,
 481
- Evagrius, friend of Julian, 352n.
- Evangelion da Mēhallētē*, 537
- Evangelion da Mēpharrēshē*, 537
- evangelists, 116, 214
- Evē, 135, 151, 589-90, 594
- Evodius, praefect, 411
- Ewald, 8
- exorcists, 131, 218, 225, 240, 570,
 572
- Exucontians, Arians called, 303
- Ezra, 3, 7
- Fabian, bp. of Rome, 79, 224, 258,
 261, 262
- Fabius, bp. of Antioch, 572
- Fabretti, 603
- Falconia Proba, 507
- 'familia' of emperors, 43-4, 244
- family tribunals, 63n., 249
- famine, 65, 81
- Farrar, 46n.
- fast days, 102
- Fatak, 150
- Fausta, wife of Constantine, 84n.,
 89, 281n., 321, 323, 326
- Faustinianus, legendary father of
 Clement of Rome, 106, 107
- Faustinus, 346n.
- Faustus and Faustinus, legendary
 brothers of Clement of Rome,
 106
- Faustus, deacon, 437

- Faustus**, Manichæan bishop, 493
Faustus, of Britain, 562
Fedilimid, 563
Felicissimus, African deacon, 224, 267, 268n.
Felicissimus, Roman martyr, 611
Felicitas, African martyr, 72-3, 225n.
Felicitas, widow, martyred with her seven sons, 66
Felix, bp. of Aptunga, 291, 292, 293, 294
Felix (St.), 56n., 420, 424
Felix III., pope, 538n.
Felix, anti-pope, 346
Feltoe (Dr.), *Dionysius of Alexandria*, 166n., 178n.
Ferovers, 123
Festal Letters, 318, 339n.
Festivals of martyrs, 580
Field, *Hexapla*, 277n.
Figulus (P. Nigidius), 196
Filocalus (Furius Dionysius), 422
fires at Nicomedia, 87
Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 167n.
fiscus Judaicus, 52
fish, emblem, 240, 606, 610n.
Fisher, 149n., 157n., 161n., 162n., 174n., 386n.
fisherman, emblem, 606
Flacilla, empress, 429
Flacillus, 335
flamens, 46, 322-3
Flavia Domitilla, 44n., 52, 104, 108n., 247-9; catacomb of, 247-8, 598, 601, 602, 607
Flavia Neapolis, 158
Flavian, archbp. of Constantinople, 469, 470-1, 531
Flavian, bp. of Antioch, 429-30, 441
Flavian family, 44, 52, 106, 247-9, 358
Florinus, 120
Fochlad, wood of, 562, 563
Fortchernn, 563
Fortescue (Dr. A.), 453n.
Fortunatus, 107-8
Frederick I. of Prussia, 326
Freeman, 516n.
Free Will, doctrine of, 11, 149, 175-6, 184, 456, 458, 470-7, 502-11
Fremantle (Dean), 481n.
Freppel (Mgr.), 225n.
frescoes in catacombs, 602, 607-10
Freundsberg, general, 524
Friday observed as a fast, 102, 287n., 580
Friedländer, 142n.
Frigidus, battles of, 419, 430
Frith (I. B.) 281n.
Fronto of Cirta, philosopher, 65
Fruentius, 556, 557
Fulminata, Legio, 69-70 and n.
Fundanus (Minucius), proconsul of Asia, 54, 59, 204
Fuscianus, praefect, 255
future life, belief in, 7, 8, 10, 12, 185
Gaiane (St.), 553
Gainas, Gothic chieftain, 439, 443
Gaiseric, Vandal chieftain, 420, 516, 517, 518, 530, 540, 558
Galatia, 38 and n., 129
Galatians, Epistle to, 36, 37n., 38n., 93, 108n., 202
Galen, 169n., 196
Galerius, emperor, 84, 86, 87-91, 280n., 326
Galerius, proconsul of Africa, 79
Galilee, 17, 21, 23, 24
Galla, wife of Theodosius, 426
Galla Placidia, 432, 516, 530, 534, 607
Gallienus, 80, 81, 82, 83, 86, 261
Gallus, Caesar, 333, 342, 352-4, 360, 366
Gangra, canons of, 573
Gardner, Miss, 435n., 436n., 438n.
Gaul, 22, 39, 84, 90, 92, 119, 349, 357-8, 359, 408, 409, 423, 479, 509, 540, 562, 565; church of, 40, 64, 413, 521, 526, 532-4; persecution in, 66-8, 408-13
Gautama, 126
Gaza, 372
Geheenna, 9
Genealogies: Asmoneans and Herodians, 16; Diocletian and colleagues, 84; Flavian emperors, 248
Gentiles, 13, 24, 31, 33-8, 60, 61, 93, 94, 143, 183
George, intruding bp. of Alexandria, 343, 368, 372, 373, 376, 406
George of Laodicea, 347

- George tears down imperial edict, 87 and n.
 George (St.) martyr, 556
 Gerhard, 418n.
 Germanicus, martyr, 60
 Germanus (St.), bp. of Auxerre, 563
 Gervasius, martyr, 425, 426
 Geta, emperor, 73
 Gibbon, 43n., 71n., 75n., 82n., 84n., 86, 90n., 188, 272n., 285n., 318, 321n., 343n., 351n., 354n., 357n., 358n., 359n., 362n., 363n., 392n., 418n., 425n., 428n., 547n.
 Gieseler, 133, 134n.
 Gifford (S.) 73n.
 Gildo, 498
 gladiatorial games, 71, 229n., 238, 288, 494
 glasses in catacombs, 605, 614
 Glover, *Life and Letters*, 352n., 357n., 361n., 362n., 373n., 437n., 438n., 483n., 496n.
 Glycerius, fanatical deacon, 383
 Glycerius, emperor, 541
 Gnosticism, 119, 120, 122, 126, 127-30, 133-46, 148-9, 153, 157, 169, 175, 176, 183, 252, 409, 452
 Gnostic Christ, 141-3, 452, 589, 590, 593, 594, 595
 Gnostic, the Christian, 135, 148-9
 Gnostic sects, common features, 127-9
 Gnostics, Alexandrian and Syrian, 133
 Golgotha, 582
 Good Friday, 580
 Good Shepherd, in catacombs, 239, 602, 603, 606, 615
 Gordians, three emperors, 75
 Gore (Bp.), 472n., 533, 537
 Gorgonius, chamberlain of Diocletian, 85, 87
 Gospels, 229; Papias concerning the, 117-18
 Gothi minores, 559
 Gothic version, 560
 Goths, 74, 380, 392-3, 427, 442, 511-13, 523-4, 559-60, 561
 Grace, 458, 502-11
 Graces, in catacombs, 602
 Graetz, *History of Jerusalem*, 6, 12n, 36n., 126n.
 Gratian, emperor, 392, 409-12, 415, 417, 418, 422, 423
 Gratus (Valerius), 23
 Great Synagogue, 7
 Greek Church, 319, 450-1, 466-7, 474, 475, 502, 547
 Greek New Testament, text of, 40
 Greek sources of Gnosticism, 135
 Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, 322n., 414n., 418n., 422n., 484n., 519n., 520n., 524, 529n., 571n.
 Gregory I., pope, 54, 261, 502n.
 Gregory III., pope, 599
 Gregory VII., pope, 254n.
 Gregory of Cappadocia, intruding bp. of Alexandria, 334, 335, 340
 Gregory the Illuminator, 88n., 544, 552-3, 554
 Gregory, bp. of Nazianzus, 349, 377, 381, 498
 Gregory (St.), of Nazianzus, 353n., 356, 363n., 368n., 377, 380-7, 390, 394-7, 399, 401, 402-3, 445, 450, 455-6, 482, 485, 579
 Gregory of Nyssa, 77n., 378n., 380-7, 403-4, 455-6, 476, 477
 Gregory Thaumaturgus, 77n., 168, 579
 Gregory of Tours, 68
 Guizot, 286n.
 Gurgenes, 556
 Gwatkin (Prof.), 155n., 156n., 157n., 270n., 300n., 302n., 304n., 307n., 311n., 312n., 313, 314n., 316n., 330n., 331n., 332n., 334n., 339n., 345n., 346n., 347n., 376n., 378n., 379n., 380n., 382n., 387n., 389n., 391n., 395n.
 Gwyn (Dr.), 545n., 551n.
 Hadrian, emperor, 54, 58, 59, 60, 97n., 100, 205; rescript, 59, 204; letter preserved by Vopiscus, 183
 Hahn, 153n., 317n., 340n., 345n., 347n., 395n., 456n., 460n., 463n., 464n., 525n., 561n.
 Halcombe (T. R.), article by, 435n.
 Hammond on Liturgies, 219n., 235n.

- Hanmer (Meredith), 461 and n.
 Hannibal, 288, 392, 418
 Harklensian Version, 547
 Harnack, 66n., 78n., 79n., 101,
 115n., 127n., 139n., 145n.,
 157n., 161n., 162n., 168n.,
 172n., 174n., 175n., 176n.,
 177n., 210n., 259n., 268n.,
 299n., 302n., 313n., 316n.,
 330n., 355n., 397n., 403n.,
 406n., 445n., 452n., 453n.,
 454n., 455n., 456n., 458n.,
 459n., 400n., 462n., 464n.,
 466n., 470n., 471n., 472n.,
 474n., 476, 477, 496n., 499n.,
 501n., 502n., 504n., 506n.,
 509n., 511n., 514n., 525n.,
 546n.
 Harris (Prof. Rendel), 73n., 102n.,
 205, 225n., 263n.
 harvest homes, 613
 Harvey, 123n., 126n.
 Hastings' *Dictionary of Bible*, 11n.,
 150n., 212n., 246n., 547n.,
 555n.
 Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion
 and Ethics*, 299n., 403n., 453n.,
 457n., 506n., 553n., 558n.,
 561n.
 Hatch (Dr.), 188n., 190n., 217n.,
 226n., 272n.
 Hausrath, 11n., 19n., 21n., 23n.,
 24n., 26n.
 Healey, *Valerian Persecution*, 80n.
 hearers, order of penitents, 580
 Hebdomad, 591-2
 Hebert, *Lord's Supper*, 232n., 234n.
 Hebrews, 15, 33 and n., 39; Epistle
 to, 7, 96n., 97n., 100, 108n.,
 130n., 249; Gospel according
 to, 142; religion of, 2, 123
Hebrews, Biblical History of, 2n.
 Hecate, goddess, 355
 Hecebolius, rhetorician, 355, 360n.,
 371
 Hefele, 46n., 167n., 262n., 292n.,
 301n., 303n., 304n., 305n.,
 312n., 315n., 318, 319n., 333n.,
 335n., 337n., 339n., 342n.,
 343n., 344n., 345n., 346n.,
 377n., 378n., 379n., 390n.,
 411n., 448n., 449n., 456n.,
 498n., 506n., 521n., 527n.
 Hegesippus, 13n., 32, 53, 145, 250n.
 Heinichen, 146n.
 Helena, mother of Constantine,
 84n., 316n., 321, 323-4, 582-3
 Helena, wife of Julian, 357
 Heliiodorus, 7n.
 Heliogabalus, 74, 184
 Heliopolis, 372
 Helladius, priest of Zeus, 407
 Hellenism, 7, 122, 157, 180-1,
 186-8, 201, 203, 205, 355,
 362, 364, 373, 404, 419-20
 Hellenistic Jews, 33 and n., 34, 35,
 127n.
 Helpidius, rhetorician, 409, 410
Heracles, 457, 464, 469
Hereticism, 538
 Henson, Canon, 216n.
 Heraclius, 165, 168, 226, 272, 275
 Heracleon, Valentinian Gnostic,
 96n., 137, 144, 595
 Herculaneum, 239
 Heresy a crime, 401-2, 410-12
 Herford, *Talmud and Midrash*,
 142n.
 Hermas, *Shepherd of*, 101, 104, 109,
 118, 229, 252-3, 257n.
 Hermippus, 5n.
 hermits, 585
 Hero, Pseudo-Ignatius' epistle to,
 113
 Herod Agrippa I., 16n., 31, 35,
 36n.
 Herod Agrippa II., 16n., 247
 Herod Antipas, 22, 35
 Herod the Great, 10, 16-22, 24,
 35, 36, 90, 281
 Herod, irenach of Smyrna, 61
 Herodias, 22, 35, 449
 heroism of Christians, 81
 Heros of Arles, 505, 526
 Hesiod, 186, 368
hetairiai, 57, 217
 Heurtley, 153n., 395n.
 Hexapla, 276-7
 Hezekiah, a brigand, 17
 Hieracas, 168
 Hierapolis, 116, 118; Philip's
 daughters at, 116, 117
 Hierocles, Neo-Platonist, 86, 196,
 200, 202
 Hieronymus, see JEROME
 Hilary of Poitiers, 168n., 337,
 342n., 344n., 345n., 346n.,
 377-8
 Hilary, bp. of Arles, 532-3, 562
 Hilary, deacon, 536

- Hilgenfeld, 97n., 101, 114
 Himerius, sophist, 381
 Himerius, bp. of Tarragona, 520-1
 Hippolytus, 13n., 64, 105, 129n.,
 135, 136, 137, 138n., 142n.,
 148 and n., 168, 171n., 172,
 174, 244n., 255-9, 591, 598,
 615. See PHILOSOPHUMENA
 Hodgkin (Dr.), 380n., 392n., 394n.,
 399n., 410n., 412n., 414n.,
 415n., 423n., 425n., 431n.,
 439n., 449n., 450n., 468n.,
 512n., 514n., 523n.
 Holme, 506n., 508n., 517n., 561n.
 Holy Places, 323-4, 433, 581-3
 Holy Spirit, doctrine of, 171, 173-4,
 387, 390, 402-3, 544, 560;
epiclesis of in Eucharist, 577;
 in Gnostic system, 589, 591,
 593
 Homer, 186, 357, 368, 421;
 allegorized, 127, 272
 Homilies, Clementine, 95, 143
 Homoeans, 330, 344, 347, 350, 375,
 377
 Homoiousians, 344; see also SEMI-
 ARIANS
 homoiousion, 344n., 345 and n.,
 397n.
 Homöousians, 344, 347
 homöousion, 163, 167-8, 172,
 312-16, 327, 331, 336, 337,
 341, 343, 344n., 345 and n., 348,
 377, 388, 397n., 400, 402
 Honoratus of Lerinum, 562
 Honorius, emperor, 430, 434-5,
 479, 498, 501, 522, 523-5, 527
 Hooker, 397n., 473n.
 Hope, Christian, in catacombs, 605
 Hormuzd, king of Persia, 150
 Hort (Prof.), 32n., 34n., 37n., 40n.,
 95n., 100n., 115n., 130n.,
 132n., 142n., 144n., 146n.,
 147n., 210n., 314n., 389n.,
 395n.
 Horus, or Stauros, 593, 594, 595
 Hosius of Cordova, 288, 304, 313,
 322, 338, 339n., 343, 345n.,
 346
 hospitals, 581
 hospitality, 102, 221
 Hsi (Pastor), 241n.
 Human nature, doctrine of, 175
 Huns, 468, 469, 479, 534
 Hyginus, bp. of Rome, 138
 Hymenaeus, 132
 hymns, 424
 Hypatia, 270, 439 and n., 465 and n.
 Hyperion, 184
 hypostasis, 160, 163, 171, 298, 300,
 310, 313n., 336, 348n., 377,
 386, 473
 Hyrcanus (John) I., 8, 10, 16
 Hyrcanus (John) II., 10, 16, 17

 Ialdabaoth, 589-90
 Ibas, bp. of Edessa, 467, 469, 471-2,
 473, 546-7
 Iberians, 554, 555-6, 565
 iconoclasm, 405-8
 iconoclastic controversy, 321
iconostasis, 575
 Idatius, Spanish bishop, 410, 413
 idolatry, attitude of Christians
 towards, 51, 237, 238, 240
 Ignatius, bp. of Antioch, 40, 54,
 57-8, 96n., 101, 110-15, 172,
 190n., 209n., 220, 227n.,
 244n., 250-1
 Ignatian controversy, 112-15
 Ignatian Letters, 58 and nn., 101,
 112-13, 145, 268; recensions,
 113-14
 Illingworth, 157n., 209n., 302n.
 Illyricum, 84, 90, 295, 521, 528,
 531, 559
 Imaun, Manichaean, 151
 immersion at baptism, 576
 immorality of heretics, 132-3
 Incarnation, doctrine of, 156,
 158, 171, 172-3, 312, 391,
 402, 403, 451-78, 537; denied
 by Gnostics, 126, 128, 131,
 132, 452
 India, 126, 127, 181
 Innocent I., 462, 505, 518, 521-5
 Innocent III., 572
 Innocents, massacre of, 21
 Inquisition, 431
 inquisitors, 412n.
 inscriptions in catacombs, 602-4,
 610-12, 614-16
 Instantius, 409, 410, 411, 412
 Invention of the Cross, 324
 Ireland, 561-4, 565, 566
 Irenaeus, bp. of Lyons, 40, 60, 64,
 67n., 96n., 104, 105, 116, 117,
 118, 119, 120, 121n., 129n.,
 135, 136 and n., 138, 142n.,

- Irenaeus, bp. of Lyons (continued):**
 145, 146, 147, 148, 172, 173,
 176 and n., 177, 218n., 221n.,
 231n., 241n., 246, 251, 253,
 276, 312, 452n., 459, 521,
 591n., 592n.
- Isaac, 143; in catacombs, 608**
- Isabella of Spain, 431**
- Isaiah, book of, 3, 6n., 173**
- Isapostolus, Constantine called, 326**
- Isdegerd I., 550**
- Isdegerd II., 554**
- Ishmael, high-priest, 23**
- Isidore, an Alexandrian, 441**
- Isis, 136, 182, 183n., 184n.**
- Israelites, 3, 4, 10, 14, 33n.**
- 'israels', 295**
- Italy, 335, 416, 505, 507, 534, 540,
 558, 565**
- Ithacius, Spanish bishop, 410, 411,
 413**
- Izeds, 123**
- Jacob, 143**
- Jamblichus, 200, 202, 362**
- James (St.), 30n., 31-2, 37, 60,
 94, 95, 103, 106, 109, 117,
 134, 142, 143, 214, 245, 259;
 Epistle of, 11, 31n., 32n., 94,
 95n., 96n., 108n.; his chair,
 582**
- James, brother of John, 36**
- James (St.), of Nisibis, 544-5,
 550**
- Jansenists, 253**
- Jenkins (Canon), 115n., 375n.,
 389n.**
- Jeremiah, 3**
- Jericho, 18, 21**
- Jerome, 7n., 42, 71n., 97, 105,
 142n., 192n., 204, 227n., 271,
 296n., 320, 346n., 349, 394n.,
 410, 415, 420, 421, 445, 448,
 480-90, 504-5, 512, 514, 515,
 522, 529, 571, 583, 587, 598**
- Jerusalem, 4, 6, 17, 23, 29, 35, 59,
 269, 323-4, 363; siege of, 99;
 destruction of, 40, 100, 250n.;
 church of, 30-35, 39, 94,
 212, 214, 232, 319, 488, 568;
 Holy Places, 323-4, 582-3;
 Jerome at, 483; council of, see
COUNCILS**
- Jerusalem Codex, 107**
- Jesuits, 253**
- Jesus Christ, 15, 22, 24, 25-28,
 29, 199; honoured by Alex-
 ander Severus, 74; represented
 in catacombs, 607**
- Jesus, Gnostic views of, 142, 452,
 590, 592, 593, 594**
- Jesus imputabilis*, 151**
- Jesus patibilis*, 150**
- Jews, 3-14, 18-24, 30, 33 and
 n., 34, 37, 45, 46, 48, 51, 58,
 59, 61, 67n., 72, 122-3, 183,
 231n., 276, 362, 427**
- Jewish Christians, 32, 33, 37, 38,
 39, 60, 94, 99, 101, 103, 118,
 143**
- Joannites, 449**
- Johannine literature, 132, 134**
- John (St.), 11n., 32n., 37, 40, 42,
 50, 51 and n., 60, 112, 116,
 117, 119, 120, 142, 146, 157,
 178, 220, 251**
- Gospel of, 40, 94, 96n., 120,
 132n., 137, 144, 157, 232, 373,
 591, 592**
- 1st Epistle of, 96n., 118,
 132n.**
- 2nd and 3rd Epistles of, 96n.,
 132n.**
- Acts of, 144n.**
- See APOCALYPSE**
- John the Baptist, 25-6, 31, 144;
 disciples of, 228n.; festival of,
 580; eve, 584; his head, 582**
- John the Presbyter, 117, 178**
- John, bp. of Jerusalem, 488, 504,
 525**
- John, first bp. of Iberia, 554**
- John III., pope, 599**
- John (St.), of Damascus, 205**
- John, bp. of Antioch, 463, 465,
 466, 470, 546**
- Jonah, story of, 486; in catacombs,
 608**
- Jonathan, priest-king, 9-10**
- Joppa, 34**
- Jordan, river-god representation of
 in catacombs, 602**
- Joseph (St.), in catacombs, 609**
- Joseph, patriarch of Armenia, 554**
- Josephus, 5n., 6n., 7n., 11, 13n.,
 16n., 17n., 19n., 21, 22n.,
 23n., 26, 32n., 36n., 125, 247,
 250n.**
- Josiah, 36n.**

- Journal of Theological Studies*, 215n., 543n.
- Jovian, emperor, 376, 549-50, 554
- Jovinian, monk, 486-7
- Jovinus, master of horse, 361
- Jubilees, Book of*, 6n., 558
- Judaea, 17, 22, 35, 52n.; procurators, 23
- Judaism, 3, 5, 7, 10-14, 34, 58, 59, 93, 94, 100, 115n., 122, 127, 130n., 175, 270, 373, 595
- Judaizing Christians, 36, 39, 94, 131, 134, 142, 557
- Judaizing Gnosticism, 142
- Judas of Galilee, 23, 27
- Judas Iscariot, 30, 590
- Judas the Maccabee, 7, 9, 10
- Jude, the Lord's brother, descendants of, 53; Epistle of, 8n., 96n., 97n., 133
- Julia Domna, 197
- Julia, daughter of Drusus, 248-9
- Julian, emperor, 91, 180, 181, 196, 200, 333, 349, 351-74, 375, 376, 379, 381, 382, 404, 405, 417, 420, 427, 440, 480, 497, 542, 549, 554, 573
- Julian (Didius), emperor, 72
- Julian of Cos, 536
- Julian of Eclanum, 506, 510, 511, 530
- Julius, bp. of Rome, 334-5, 339, 341, 388, 587
- Julius II. rebuilds St. Peter's, 575
- Junias, 30n.
- Jupiter Pluvius, 69
- Justin Martyr, 65-6, 67n., 96n., 142n., 144, 146, 154, 158-60, 161, 173, 175, 177, 185, 189, 196, 203, 204n., 219, 233, 241n., 276; see APOLOGISTS
- Justina, empress, 392, 418, 422-6, 432
- Justinian, 195, 546
- Juvenal, 270n.
- Juventinus, a soldier, 371
- Kabbala, 124-5, 135, 589, 593
- Kaye (Bp.), 48n., 159n., 160n., 174n.
- King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, 124n., 125n., 137n., 150n., 151n., 152n., 184n., 185n.
- Kingdom of Heaven, 8, 13, 15, 25-7, 39, 53, 209
- Kingsley, 439n.
- kiss of peace, 235, 236, 577
- kneelers, order of penitents, 580
- Knight (Dr.), 130n.
- Kobad, 556
- Korah, 223
- Koré, 187
- Krebs (Dr.), 78n.
- Künstle, 412n.
- Kuriz, *Church History*, 151n., 165n., 166n., 167n., 171n., 233n., 242n.
- Labarum, 92 and n., 281-2
- Lactantius, 44n., 85, 87n., 90 and n., 174, 204, 208, 239n., 242n., 281 and n., 283n., 288, 325
- laity, 210, 236
- Lampridius, 185n.
- lamps in catacombs, 605, 606
- Lampsacus, synod of, see SYNODS
- Lanciani, 599
- Langlois, 553n.
- lanterns, 575
- Laodiceans, Epistle to, 141
- lapsi*, 259, 261, 267, 318
- Lararium, 74
- Lateran Palace, 322, 323, 519, 527
- Latin church, 327
- 'Latrocinium,' see COUNCILS
- Latronianus, Priscillianist poet, 412
- Laurence (St.), 615
- Laurence (Abp.), 558n.
- Law, Roman, 14, 44-5, 49, 217n., 405
- Law of Moses, 3, 10, 11, 12, 36, 37, 99, 125, 133, 139, 362
- Laws: of Constantine, 284-7; of Julian, 365-6; of Theodosius, 398-9, 401, 408
- Lazarus, his grave, 583
- Lazarus of Aix, 505, 526
- Le Blant, 50n., 68n.
- Lecky, 186n., 191n., 192n., 194n., 200n., 201n.
- Leitzmann, 453n.
- Lent, 398n., 584
- Leo I., pope, 468, 471, 472-4, 480, 518, 520, 529-40, 572
- *Tome* of, 471, 473, 474, 536-8
- Leonides, father of Origen, 72, 273-4

- Leontius of Caesarea, 553
 Leontius, bp. of Ancyra, 443
 Leontopolis, temple at, 6
 Lerinum, monastery of, 562
 letter of martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, 68, 221
 letters of commendation, 221-2
 Levites, 223
 Lias (Rev. J. J.), 227n., 395n.
 Libanius, sophist, 355, 356, 360, 373, 440, 578
libellatici, 78
libelli, 78n., 267
 Liberals, 344
 Liberian Catalogue, 105
 Liberius, bp. of Rome, 105, 341, 342-3, 346 and n., 376, 379
 Libius Severus, 540-1
 Licinius, emperor, 90, 91, 92, 283, 288, 295-6, 297, 303
 Licinius, Caesar, 321
 Liddon, (Canon), 156n.
 lighting of lamps, 580
 Lightfoot (Bp.), 13n., 37n., 38n., 42n., 44n., 52 and n., 54n., 57n., 60n., 61n., 62n., 65n., 66n., 68n., 69n., 70, 95n., 97n., 103, 104, 105n., 106, 107n., 108n., 109n., 110 and n., 111n., 112 and n., 113n., 114n., 115 and n., 116n., 118, 120, 125n., 126, 129, 146n., 157n., 172n., 190n., 192n., 204n., 210n., 213n., 216n., 217n., 220n., 233, 234, 244n., 245n., 246n., 247, 248n., 250n., 258, 271n., 307, 332n.
 Linus, 105, 246
literae communicatoriae, 222
 literalism, 277-8
 Liturgy, 233, 577; the 'Clementine', 219, 236; at Jerusalem, 577
 Livy, 421
 Δογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, treatise by Papias, 116
 Logos, doctrine of, 40, 94, 155-6, 157-67, 171, 173, 197, 301, 310, 312, 342n., 391, 452-78
 Δόγος ἀληθείης, Celsus' work, 198
 Loigaire, 561
 London, 293
 Long (G.), 70n.
 Lord's Prayer, 230; said thrice a day, 102
 Lucan, poet, 183n., 193
 Lucian, martyr of Antioch, 92, 168, 277 and n., 298 and n., 302, 330
 Lucian, chamberlain of Diocletian, 85
 Lucian, satirist, 188, 190-1, 240n.
 Lucianists, 332
 Lucifer, bp. of Calaris, 343, 378
 Lucilla, 292
 Lucina, crypt of, 249
 Lucius, bp. of Rome, 262
 Lucretius, 189 and n.
ludi saeculares, 75, 282
 Luke (St.), 13n., 37, 39, 40; writings of, 96n., 140 1, 142; see ACTS
 Lumby (Prof.), 395n.
 Lutetia Parisiorum, 357
 Luther, 476
 Lydda, 34, 505, 525
 Lyons and Vienne, martyrs of, 67-8, 70, 76, 78, 221, 225
 Macarius, bp. of Jerusalem, 324
 Macarius, presbyter, 334-5
 Macarius, proconsul of Africa, 497
 Maccabees, 3n., 7-10, 19; books of, 7n., 558; commemorated, 580
 MacCarthy, *Annals of Ulster*, 257n.
 Macedonia, 38, 295
 Macedonius, official, 411
 Macedonius, heretic, 349, 390, 394
 Macedonianism, 390, 399n., 401
 Macrianus, 79
 Macrina, grandmother of St. Basil, 381
 Macrina (St.), sister of St. Basil, 381
 Macrobius, 20n., 182n., 184
 'Macrostich' creed, 340
 Madaura, persecution at, 66
 Mafia, 50n.
 Magi in catacombs, 607, 608
 Magians, 151
 magic, 79
 Magnentius, usurper, 341, 342, 353, 354
 Magnesia, 111
 Magnesians, Ignatius writes to, 111
 Mahaffy, 5n., 182n., 269n.
 Majorian, 540
 Majorinus, rival bp. of Carthage, 292, 293
 Malan (S. C.), *St. Gregory*, 553n.

- Malcolm, *History of Persia*, 552n.
 Mamaea, 74
 Mamertinus, orator and poet, 359, 360
 Man: First, 159, 589; Second, 589
 Mandaeans, 150
 Manes, 124, 149-50, 151, 152
 Manichaeans, 149-52, 399n., 401, 409, 412n., 498, 548; Augustine, 135, 151, 491-3, 511
 Mansel (Dean), 137n., 141, 143, 144n., 146n., 147, 149n., 570n.
 Marcella, 512
 Marcellina, lady Gnostic, 252
 Marcellina, sister of St. Ambrose, 425
 Marcellinus, bp. of Rome, 262
 Marcellinus, martyr, 593; catacomb of, 610, 615
 Marcellinus, proconsul of Africa, 501
 Marcellus of Ancyra, 172, 306, 313, 317, 335, 336-7, 338-9, 340, 341, 387n.
 Marcellus of Campania, 342
 Marcellus, pope, 601n.
 Marchi (Padre), 599
 Marcia, 71
 Marcian, emperor, 469, 472, 473, 535-6, 541
 Marcion, 62, 96n., 121, 133, 134, 136, 137-41, 142, 143, 144, 146, 252
 Marcionites, 134, 543
 Marcomannic war, 64, 65, 69, 70, 71
 Marcus, first Gentile bp. of Aelia, 60
 Marcus, a Priscillianist, 409
 Marcus, a Valentinian, 137, 595
 Mardia, battle of, 295
 Mardonius, tutor of Julian, 352
 Mareotic commission, 388
 Mareotis, lake, 270
 Mariamne, wife of Herod, 16n., 17, 18, 19, 20, 36
 Mariamne, daughter of Simon, 22
 Marinus, bp. of Arles, 293
 Maris of Hardaschir, 546
 Mark (St.), 31, 36, 42, 246n., 271, 569; Gospel of, 96n., 117, 134, 246n.
 Mark of Arethusa, 347n., 352, 366
 marriage, 149, 225, 237-8, 256, 286, 543, 557; of clergy, 573
 Marsa, 444
 Marseilles, 90, 526
 Martin, *Le Brigandage d'Ephèse*, 472n.
 Martin (St.), bp. of Tours, 408-413, 562
 Martinus, 413
 martyrdom, 9, 194, 240, 307-8
 martyrology, 79, 240
 martyrs honoured, 140, 240, 267, 290-1
 Marucchi, 599
 Maruthas of Mesopotamia, 550
 Mary, the Blessed Virgin, 29, 112, 171, 458, 459, 464, 528, 539, 557, 608, 615
 Mary, mother of Mark, 31
 Mary of Cassobola, 101, 112n., 113
 Mason (Canon), 56n., 80n., 84n., 85n., 86n., 87n., 88n., 90n., 91n., 151n., 263n., 283n., 290n., 291n.
 Maternus of Cologne, 292
 Mattathias, 7, 23n.
 Matthew (St.), 42, 117, 118, 134; Gospel of, 39, 96n., 117, 118, 142
 Matthias (St.), election of, 29-30, 223; Gospel of, 144n.
 Mattidia, legendary mother of Clement of Rome, 106-7
 Maturus, martyr, 68
 Maxentius, 84n., 88, 89, 90, 92, 280, 282, 283, 284, 290
 Maximian, emperor, 84, 88, 89, 90, 283, 290
 Maximian, Donatist deacon, 498
 Maximianists, 498
 Maximilla, Montanist prophetess, 225
 Maximin the Thracian, 75, 258
 Maximin Daza, 86n., 88, 89, 90, 91-2, 283, 295
 Maximus, philosopher, 355, 360, 394-5
 Maximus (Magnus), usurper, 409, 411-13, 418, 423, 426-7, 432
 Maximus, senator, 534, 540
 Maximus, soldier, 371
 Mayor (Prof. Joseph B.), 32n., 95n., 133n.
 McGiffert (Dr.), 64n., 86n., 332n.
 Melania, 485n.
 Melchisedek or Miltiades, pope, 293
 Melchisedek, an angel, 169
 Melchizedek, priest-king, 223n.

- Meletian schism**, 318-19, 320
Meletius, bp. of Antioch, 378, 380n., 387, 392, 395-6, 403, 440
Melitene, quarters of twelfth legion, 69, 70
Melito of Sardis, 54, 59n., 60, 65n., 66
Memnon of Ephesus, 463
Memphis, 127, 409
Memra, 94, 155
Menaea, 110
Menelaus, 6
Meusurius, bp. of Carthage, 290-1
Mercury in catacombs, 602
Meropius, 550
Mesopotamia, 318, 542, 547, 548, 505
Mesrobes, 555
Messalina, 248
Messiah, 14, 27, 197
Messianic hopes, 2, 7-10, 15, 19, 21
Messianic kingdom, 15, 21, 30, 178
Metatron, 125
Methodius of Tyre, 168
Metrodorus, Marcionite martyr, 62
Milan, 283, 355-6, 357, 409, 410, 413, 416, 418, 422-7, 451, 518, 561; see EDICTS, SYNODS
Miletus, St. Paul at, 131
Mill (J. S.), 139n.
Millenarianism, 117, 118, 177-8
Milman (Dean), 47n., 53n., 58n., 74n., 79n., 85n., 114, 151n., 152n., 156n., 183n., 210n., 242n., 254n., 290n., 316n., 317n., 389n., 500n., 506n., 527n., 530n., 533n., 539n., 555n.
Miltiades or Melchiades, pope, 293
Milton on Ignatian Epistles, 113
Milvian Bridge, battle of, 92, 282
Minerva, 74
Minim, 142n.
Minucius Felix, Apologist, 65n., 66, 92n., 208, 241n.
miracles, belief in, 241 and nn., 242, 413, 425, 500n.
Miroclius, bp. of Milan, 293n.
Mishna, 10
Misogogon, 352, 353n., 357n., 369n., 371
Missa Catechumenorum, 236
Mithras, worship of, 184-5, 372, 407
Moberly, 216n., 310n.
Modestus, praefect, 380, 384
Moesia, 559
Mohl (M. Jules), 107
Mommsen, 547n.
Monad, 143, 164
Monarchianism, 163-72, 254, 261
monasticism, 152, 203, 270, 382, 393, 405, 408, 427, 445, 446-7, 468, 481, 485, 508, 564, 565, 581, 585-8
monks, 585-8; at councils, 574
Monnica, mother of St. Augustine, 491, 495, 496, 613
Monophysites, 277, 473, 474, 477, 547, 566
Monotheism, 2, 182, 300
Montanists, 101, 169, 170, 174, 177, 178, 221, 224-5, 233, 238, 254, 263, 264, 288
Montanus, 224
Montius, quaestor, 354
Morinus, 227n.
Morrison, *History of the Jews*, 21n.; *St. Basil and his Rule*, 581n.
mosaics at Ravenna, 602, 605, 607, 609; at Rome, 529; at Jerusalem, 576
Mosaism, 11, 34
Moses, 5, 8n., 25, 33, 143, 270, 608
Moses da Leon, 124
Moses of Chorene, 556n.
Mosheim, 133
mourners, penitential order, 579
Mozley (Prof.), 151n.
Muratorian fragment, 96n., 116n., 144n., 145, 244n.
Mursa, battle of, 341
Mysia, 38
Mysteries: Hellenic, 59, 187-8, 190, 355, 357; Christian, 230
myths, ancient, 136
Naaseni, see OPHITES
Naples, catacombs at, 597
Narbonne, 526
Narses, Persian king, 550n.
narthex, 580
natalitia of martyrs, 601, 611, 613, 614
Nathan (Rabbi), 10
Natures in Christ, 451-78, 546
Nazaraeans, 142n.
Neale, 463n.

- Neander, 30n., 38n., 42n., 45n.,
 52n., 60, 65n., 72, 75n.,
 76n., 77n., 79n., 134, 141,
 162n., 163n., 167n., 168n.,
 173n. 174, 175n., 176n.,
 178n., 207n., 241n., 267n.,
 269n., 282, 342n., 391n., 601n.
- Nectarius, bp. of Constantinople,
 396, 400-1, 441
- Nehemiah, 3
- Neo-Platonism, 86, 91, 162, 189,
 195-203, 300, 362, 419, 436
- Nephesh, 125
- Nepos, bp. of Arsinoe, 177-8
- Nepos (Julius), 541
- Nereus, Roman martyr, 247n., 598,
 611
- Nero, 46n., 48, 50-1, 64, 183n.,
 197, 242, 246, 249
- Nerva, 53, 195, 197
- Nestabus, martyr, 372
- Nestorianism, 277, 458-9, 461-7,
 473, 474, 528, 537, 545-6, 547,
 551-2, 565, 566
- Nestorius, 391, 451, 458, 461-4,
 466-7, 468, 469, 470, 528,
 546
- Neumann, 72n.
- Nevitta, consul, 359, 360
- Newman (Cardinal), 304n., 330n.,
 332n., 346n., 363n., 373n.,
 389n., 465n.
- New Testament, 24, 39, 40, 58,
 93-7, 107, 109, 127, 136,
 140, 151, 199, 202, 214, 216,
 232, 271, 373, 482, 547, 558;
 scenes in catacombs, 607-8;
 see CANON
- Nicaea, council of, see COUNCILS
- Nicanor, 7n.
- Nicé, Creed of, see CREEDS
- Nicene Creed, see CREEDS
- Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,*
Library of, 64n., 66n., 80n.,
 86n., 163n., 164n., 315n.,
 334n., 347n., 374n., 378n.,
 381n., 382n., 383n., 384n.,
 388n., 394n., 551n.
- Nicephorus, patriarch of Constan-
 tinople, 101
- Nicetas of Remisiana, 424n.
- Nicetes, 61
- Nicholas I., pope, 337n.
- Nicolaitans, 133
- Nicolaus the deacon, 33
- Nicomachus Flavianus, 419, 420
- Nicomedia, 83, 87, 355; proposed
 council at, 347n.
- Nina (St.), 555-6
- Ninian, 564
- Nirvana, 126
- Nisibis, 467, 542, 544, 545, 549,
 550n.
- Nitrian desert, 114, 446
- Noah, 143; in catacombs, 606,
 608
- Noetus, 141, 164, 170
- Nöldeke, 468n.
- Northcote and Brownton, *Subter-
 ranean Rome*, 240n.
- Not-Being, 591
- Noël, 162, 163, 593
- Novatian, 168, 172, 174, 226, 261,
 262, 265n., 268, 318
- Novatianism, 172, 224, 226, 259-62,
 268, 399n., 400-1
- Novatus, 261, 262, 266-8, 291
- Nubians, 564
- Numenius, 196, 197n.
- Numerian, emperor, 48, 74, 82
- Numidia, 263
- Oak (the), synod at, 448, 449, 522
- Oceanus in catacombs, 602
- Octavian, Augustus, 18, 20, 22, 48,
 70, 83, 326, 419
- Odenatus, husband of Zenobia, 167
- Odin, 559
- Odovacar, Gothic chieftain, 541
- Odyssey, 272, 436
- oecumenical, 304, 319
- Oehler, 155n.
- offerings at Eucharist, 235
- ogdoad*, 593
- oil at baptism, 576
- Old Testament, 2, 8, 127, 136,
 138-9, 140, 151, 154, 155, 159,
 160n., 199, 202, 208, 236, 373,
 482, 493, 508, 515, 547, 558,
 560n., 590; scenes in cata-
 combs, 608
- Olybrius, consul, 415
- Olybrius, emperor, 541
- Olympias, 475, 573
- Olympius, philosopher, 407
- omens, 85
- On, 127
- Onesimus, bp. of Ephesus, 111
- Onias, 6

- Onkelos, 155
 Ophites, 134, 135-6, 589-90
 Optatus of Melevis, 497, 501n.
optimi, 367
oranti, in catacombs, 608
 Orders, indelibility of, 259; Roman Catholic, 227
 Ordination, 226-8, 259-60, 482, 521-2, 609n.
 Origen, 46, 47n., 72, 75, 76, 77, 97, 99, 103, 142n., 144, 148, 154, 162-3, 164, 165, 168, 170n., 171-5, 178, 179, 184, 185n., 189, 198, 200, 203, 224, 226, 239n., 241n., 246n., 253, 271, 273-7, 302, 308, 313n., 336, 445-8, 452n., 458n., 475, 482, 486, 487-9, 490
 Origenists, 168, 438, 445-8, 456, 474, 487-9, 522
 origin of evil, 127-8
 Original Sin, doctrine of, 175, 504-11
 Ormuzd, 123, 184, 549
 Orsius, 406n., 504, 512n., 524
 Orpheus, 5, 74; in catacombs, 602
 Osiris, 136, 183n.
 Ostrogoths, 559
 Otley, 478
ovvia, 299, 313n., 347, 348, 377, 386
 Owen (Rev. John), 115n.
 Ozroene, 542
- Pachomius, 587
 Paganism, 323, 327, 351-74, 404-8, 413-16, 417-20, 436, 513, 524, 583
paganus, 406 and n.
 Palestine, 2-34, 35-6, 59, 274, 276, 382, 485, 503, 525, 547
 Palestinian-Syriac Version, 547
 Palladium, 74
 Palladius, biographer, 334n., 441n., 442n., 447n.
 Palladius, deacon, 563, 564, 566
 palm branch, emblem, 606
 Pamphilus, 168, 277
 Panaetius of Rhodes, 191n.
Panarion of Epiphanius, 446
 Pantaenus, 161, 271
 Pantheism, 154, 157, 170
 papal decrees, 521
 Paphnutius, bishop, 320, 573
- Papias, bp. of Hierapolis, 96n., 116-18, 177, 178, 246n.
parabolani, 581
 Paraclete: Manichaean, 151; Montanist doctrine of, 174, 225
 parishes, 119
 Parissot (Dom), 551
 Parker (Abp.), 308
 Parmenian, 497, 499
 Parry (Dr. St. John), 32n., 95n.
 Parseeism, 150
 Parthians, 17, 548, 552
 Paschal controversy, see EASTER
 Paschasius, bp. of Lilybaeum, 473
 Pass (H. L.), 551n.
 Pastoral Epistles, 96n., 131, 132n., 141, 213, 214, 217, 218, 221n., 573
 pastors, 214
 Patmos, 119
 patriarchates, 568-70
 Patricius, father of St. Augustine, 491
 Patrick (St.), 561-4, 566
 Patripassian doctrine, 141, 164, 165, 170, 340n.
 Patroclus, bp. of Arles, 526
 Paul (St.), 14, 30n., 31-42, 43, 49, 50, 51, 93-5, 99, 103-10, 116, 128-131, 139-43, 178, 192, 202, 203, 204, 212-15, 230, 232, 233-4, 244-6, 250, 285, 586, 592; Epistles of, 32, 38, 39, 51, 94, 95, 96n., 103, 115, 118, 129, 130, 131, 140, 151, 245, 593, 613, 615; his body, 598, 611; festival of, 580
 Paul I., pope, 599
 Paul, bp. of Emesa, 465
 Paul of Samosata, 81, 164, 166-7, 298n., 312, 313n., 320, 337, 342n., 346n.
 Paul, bp. of Constantinople, 334, 399, 400
 Paul, surnamed 'the Chain', 360
 Paul the Hermit, 482
 Paula, ascetic, 410, 482-3, 485, 486
 Paulicians, 151
 Paulina, 483
 Paulinian, Jerome's brother, 482, 488
 Paulinus, bp. of Antioch, 378, 387, 395-6, 482
 Paulinus, biographer of St. Ambrose, 416n., 421, 504
 Paulinus (St.) of Nola, 420, 503, 583

- peacock, emblem, 606
 Pearson (Bp.) on Ignatius, 114, 115
 Pelagius, 502-11, 525-6
 Pelagianism, 458, 461, 462, 474, 489, 490, 502-11, 525-6, 530, 563
 penance, 237, 256, 268n., 428, 579-80
 Pentateuch, 11n.
 Pentecost, 30; Christian festival, 580
 Peratae, 136
 Peregrinus Proteus, 188, 190-1
περι ἀρχῶν, Origen's, 488
 Peripatetics, 158
 Perpetua, martyr, 72-3, 225, 263. See ACTS
 Perry, *Second Council of Ephesus*, 472n.
 persecution: 44-46, 76, 220, 289, 431, 446, 499, 500; at Jerusalem, 33, 35; under Nero, 50-1; under Domitian, 51-3; under Trajan, 54-8; under Hadrian, 59; under Antoninus Pius, 60-2; under Marcus Aurelius, 65-8; at Madaura and Scillium, 66; at Lyons and Vienne, 67, 8, 76; under Septimius Severus, 72-3, 264, 271, 274; under Maximin the Thracian, 75, 258, 275; under Decius, 62, 76-9, 257, 261, 268; under Valerian, 79-80, 576; under Diocletian, 86-8, 196, 277, 279, 280, 289, 305, 381, 497; under Galerius, 89, 280; under Maximin Daza, 91-2; of the Priscillianists, 408-13
 Persephone, 187
 Persia, 42, 123, 133, 149-50, 184, 304, 373, 467, 548-52, 554, 555, 559, 565
persona, 377, 454
 Pertinax, emperor, 72
 Pescennius Niger, 72
 Peshittâ, 547
 pestilence, 65, 81
 Petavius, 603
 Peter (St.), 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 41-2, 50, 93, 95, 103, 105-110, 117, 120, 134, 143, 202, 244-6, 250, 260, 398, 538, 580, 592; 1st Epistle of, 30, Peter (St.) continued: 96n., 118, 246; 2nd Epistle of, 96n., 108n., 132-3; Gospel of, 144n.; his body, 598, 611; his chair, 422; festival of, 580; in catacombs, 605, 615
 Peter, bp. of Alexandria, 318, 392, 397n., 398
 Petilian, Donatist, 498-9, 500
 Pharisaic Christians, 31, 36, 37, 129
 Pharisees, 10, 11-12, 16, 20-1, 23, 25, 31
 Pheroras, 20
 Philadelphia, 111
 Philadelphians, Ignatius to, 112
 Philagrius, praefect, 334
 Philemon, Epistle to, 239
 Philetus, 132
 Philip the Apostle, 116 and n., 117
 Philip the deacon, 33, 34, 116 and n., 213, 228n.
 Philip the Arabian, emperor, 75
 Philip, son of Herod the Great, 22
 Philip, tetrarch of Iturea, 21, 22, 27
 Philip II. of Spain, 90, 281
 Philippi, 38, 103, 112; church of, 44, 214
 Philippians, St. Paul's Epistle to, 39, 44, 96n., 103, 106, 244; Polycarp's Epistle to, 119; Pseudo-Ignatius to, 113
 Philippopolis, synod of, 339
 Philo, 13n., 23n., 94, 99, 125, 127, 155-6, 157, 161, 196, 273, 300, 334n.
Philocalia of Origen, 382
 Philocrates, 5
 Philomelium, church of, 60, 119
 philosophers, 94, 158-9, 181, 188-9, 360
Philosophumena, 148, 169, 171, 257
 philosophy: Greek, 14, 126, 127, 135, 153, 159, 181-2, 189, 200, 269; Indian, 126, 127
 Philostorgius, Arian historian, 363n., 382n., 560n.
 Philostratus, 197
 Philoxenian version, 547
 Philoxenus, presbyter of Rome, 339n.
 Phoebadius of Agen, 348
 Phoebe, deaconess, 215
 Phoebus, 184
 phoenix, in catacombs, 606

- Photinus of Sirmium, 340, 341-2.
344, 346
- Phrygia, 38, 40, 116, 224
- φύσις*, 454
- Picts, conversion of, 564
- pictures in catacombs, 607-10,
614-15
- Pierius, 168
- Pilate, 23-4; in catacombs, 605;
his palace, 582
- pilgrimage, 582-3
- Pillet (Abbé), 68n., 73n., 217n.,
225n., 238n.
- Pinna, bishop, 80 and n.
- Pionius, martyr, of Smyrna, 62, 79
- Pius, bp. of Rome, 252, 519, 600
- Plato, 5, 159, 204, 283, 421, 513,
591, 595
- Platonism, 163, 194, 196, 495,
514
- Platonists, 159, 194, 196
- Plato-Pythagoreans, 196-7
- Plautius (Aulus), 248
- Pleroma, 593, 594
- Pliny the Elder, describes Essenes,
13n., 125
- Pliny the Younger, letter to Trajan,
45, 53n., 54-7, 233
- Plotinus, 200, 201, 300, 362, 494
- Plumptre (Dr.), 79n., 91n.
- Plutarch, 184n., 194n., 196, 269
- Pluto, 187
- Pollentia, battle of, 439
- Polybius, bp. of Tralles, 111
- Polycarp, bp. of Smyrna, 40, 46n.,
58, 60-2, 66, 96n., 111, 112,
116, 118, 119-21, 146, 177,
221, 251, 611; 'Martyrdom' of
610-11
- Polycrates of Ephesus, 66, 114
- Polyeuctes of Armenia, 79
- polytheism, 157, 303, 373
- Pompeianus, praefect, 523
- Pompeii, 239, 580
- Pompey, 17, 184
- Pomponia Graecina, 248-9
- Pontianus, Roman bishop, 258, 607
- Ponticus, martyr, 68
- Pontifex Maximus, 282, 362, 363,
392, 404, 416, 417, 616
- Pontitianus, 495
- Pontius Pilate, 23
- Pontus, 30n.
- poor, care of, 34, 218, 235
- popes, personal obscurity, 529
- Porphyry, 86, 200-3, 300, 362, 373
- Potammon, 308
- Pothinus, bp. of Lyons, 68
- Potitus, British presbyter, 562
- praescriptio*, 147n.
- Praetextatus (St.), Catacomb of,
598, 611
- Praetextatus, Roman noble, 415,
420
- praetorian guard, 72, 244
- Praxeas, 101, 164, 169-70, 174,
221, 254
- prayer, 237; for the dead, 612; for
the emperor, 219
- preaching, 578
- predestination, 152, 504-11
- presbyters, 117, 131, 212-13; 214,
218-27, 236, 237, 257, 266,
271, 571, 572
- presbyteresses, 573
- Prescott, 289n., 431n.
- Primal Man, see ADAM KADMON
- Primian, 498
- Prisca, Montanist prophetess, 225
- Prisca, wife of Diocletian, 44, 84n.,
85, 87, 91n., 283
- Priscilla, at Corinth, 38
- Priscilla (St.), Catacomb of, 244n.,
597, 609, 610
- Priscillian, 408-13
- Priscillianists, 408-13, 531
- Priscus (Helvidius), 52n.
- Proaeresius, sophist, 368, 381
- Probinus, consul, 415
- Probus, emperor, 82
- Probus, nobleman, 415-16, 432
- Procopius, usurper, 380
- Procula, Priscillianist, 410
- Proculus, Christian slave, 72
- Proculus, bp. of Narbonne, 526
- propheats: Hebrew, 5, 159, 173,
Christian, 102, 213, 214, 215,
219; Montanist, 225
- proselytes, 13, 25, 29, 34, 72
- Prosper, poet, 509
- Protasius, martyr, 425-6
- Proteus, 197
- Proverbs, Book of, 155
- Prudentius poet, 258n., 406n., 421
- Psalter, Jerome's revision, 482
- Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles, 112-13
- Psyche, in catacombs, 602
- Ptochotropheion, 581; of St. Basil
383 and n.
- Ptolemy I. (Soter), 182, 270n.

- Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), 5
 Ptolemy III. (Energetes), 182
 Ptolemy IV. (Philometor), 5n., 6
 Ptolemy VII. (Physcon), 6
 Ptolemy, a Valentinian, 137, 146, 595
 Pudens, 597
 Pulcheria, 432, 468-9, 472, 473, 535-6
 purgatory, 178
 Puritanism, 12, 112, 225, 253-62, 603, 604, 613
 purity of Christian life, 237-8
 Pythagoras, 5, 186, 202
 Pythagoreans, 158, 196-7
- Quadi, invasion of, 65, 69
 Quadratus, apologist, 59, 204
 Quakers, 225
 Quartodecimanus, see EASTER
 Quintus, 60
 Quirinus, propraetor of Syria, 23
- Rabbis, 3, 19, 22, 24
 Rabbulas, bp. of Edessa, 466-7, 545-6
 Rainy, 102n.
 Ramsay (Prof.), 38n., 46n., 50n., 52n., 53n., 56n., 57n., 58n., 65n., 72n., 383n.
 Ravenna; 523; mosaics at, 580, 583, 584
 Rawlinson, 151n., 550n., 552n., 555n.
 readers, 218, 236, 353n., 355, 570, 572
 re-baptism, 268-9
Recognitions, Clementine, 95, 106, 142-3
 Redemption, 176; Gnostic views of, 140, 151, 572; Celsus' views of, 199
 'Refutation of all the Heresies', see PHILOSOPHUMENA
 Regillus (Lake), anniversary of battle of, 320
 relics, veneration of, 203, 292, 422, 424-5, 581
religio illicita, 206
religio licita, 81, 91n.
 Renan (Mons.), 30n., 34, 46n., 67n., 68n., 71, 185n., 189n., 205, 217n., 250n., 270
- Rendall, 201n., 352n., 353n., 355n., 356n., 360n., 361n., 362n., 363n., 364n., 366n., 367n., 368n., 369n., 372n., 373n.
 Renouf, 184n., 346n.
 rescripts: Hadrian, 59; M. Aurelius, 60; Gallienus, 80; Constantine, 290
Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliae, 228n.
 Restitutus of London, 293
 Resurrection, doctrine of, 9, 12, 28, 132, 178-9, 275, 438. See also FUTURE LIFE
 Reticus, bp. of Autun, 292
 Revocatus, martyr, 72
 Rhipsime, virgin, 553
 Ricimer, 540-1
 Ritschl (O.), 268n.
 Robertson (Bp.), 2n., 76n., 282n., 315n., 324n., 347n.
 Robinson (Dean Armitage), 66n., 73n., 205, 217n.
 Rogatists, 498
 Rogatus, 498
 Rome, 38, 39, 51, 159, 404, 413-15, 421-2, 511-12, 518, 523-4, 575, 596-616
 — early bishops, 105
 — church of, 38-9, 40-1, 43-4, 50, 58, 64, 93, 107-9, 138, 164, 169, 172, 210n., 215, 216, 224, 226, 234, 243-62, 268, 319, 335, 460-1, 465-6, 482-5, 517-40, 568, 582, 614, 615
 — St. Peter at, 41
 Roman procurators, 23
 Roman confessors. letters to Cyprian, 78
 — empire, 17, 39, 73-4, 83, 207, 250, 285, 295, 404-5, 540
 — religion, 74, 186
 — see, supremacy of, 421, 433, 460, 517-22, 528, 529-40
 Romans, St. Paul's Epistle to, 28n., 38, 93, 95n., 108n., 215, 244, 246; Ignatius' Epistle to, 111, 112
 Romulus Augustulus, 479, 541
 round churches, 574
 Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, 85n.
 Rufinus of Aquileia, 306, 324, 369n., 377n., 445, 480-1, 485n., 487-9, 555, 556-7
 Rufinus, minister, 439

- Rufus (Annius), 23
 Rufus, martyr, 112
 Ruinart, 113, 373n.
 Russia, church of, 451
 Rusticus (Q. Junius), 65, 189
- Sabbath, Jewish, 102, 557
 Sabellius, doctrine of, 160, 162, 164-5 and n., 166, 170, 172, 298, 300, 311, 317, 332, 336, 340n., 341
 Sacerdos, British presbyter, 293
 sacrifices, 584
 Sadducees, 10-11, 12, 16, 25, 31, 32
 Sakya-Muni, 126
 Sallustius, praefect, 360, 370, 520
 Salmon, 118n., 119n.
 Salome, sister of Herod, 20
 Salvianus, bishop, 409, 410
 Samael, daemon, 125
 Samaria, 34; Samaritans, 11n., 22
 Sanctus, deacon and martyr, 67, 68
 Sanday, 270n., 334n.
 Sanday and Headlam, 210n., 246n.
 Sanhedrin, 17, 33
 Sapor, see SHAHPOOR
 Saracens, 556
 Saragossa, synod of, see SYNODS
 Saras, presbyter, 315
 sarcophagi in catacombs, 598, 605
 Sardica, council at, 228, 338-9; canons of, 527, 538
 Sardinian mines, 71
 Sardis, 111
 Sasima, Gregory of Nazianzus bishop of, 385, 395
 Sassanidae, dynasty of, 548, 552
 Satan, 150, 176
 Saturday, observance of, 580
 Saturninus, proconsul of Syria, 20
 Saturninus, martyr, 72
 Saul, king, 139, 140
 Saul (Sabbath), in Ireland, 563
 Sceva, sons of, 131
 Schepps, 412n.
 Scillium (or Scilla) persecution at, 66 and n.
 Scott (C. A.), 561n.
 scribes, 3
 sculpture in catacombs, 605-10
 Scutari, battle at, 296
 Scythia, 42, 304
 Scythians, 435
 Scythianus, 149-50
- Sebastian (St.), Catacomb of, 599, 611
 Secundulus, martyr, 72
 Secundus (Pedanius), 285
 Secundus, Arian bishop, 303, 307, 315
 Secundus, bp. of Tigisis, 292
 Secundus, a Valentinian, 137, 595
 Secundus, father of Chrysostom, 440
 Seleucia, see COUNCILS
 Seleucidae, 5, 9
 Seleucus Nicator, 5n.
 Seleucus (Mt.), battle of, 341
 Selwyn (Dr.), 38n.
 Semi-Arians, 309, 332n., 344, 345, 347, 349, 377-8, 379, 380, 386, 390
 Semi-Pelagians, 508-9
 Senate, the Roman, 48, 70, 83, 88, 417-18
 Seneca, 189, 192, 194, 195, 203, 204, 285, 493
 Senones, 418
 Sepsiroth, 124-5
 Septimius Severus, emperor, 72-3, 197, 264, 271, 274, 543
 Septuagint, 5, 106, 148, 154, 155, 249, 276, 277, 482, 486, 490, 515, 558
 Sepulchre, Church of Holy, 575
 Serapeum demolished, 406-8
 Serapion, bp. of Antioch, 144n.
 Serapion, archdeacon, 443
 Serapion, monk, 446
 Serapis, 182-4 and n., 270, 406-7
 Serena, 419
 Serennius Granianus, 59
 Sergius Paulus, 36
 sermons, 579
 Serpent, Gnostic, 135-6, 590
 Seth, 594
 Sethians, 136
 Severian, bp. of Gabala, 444
 Severus, emperor, 88, 89, 90. See ALEXANDER and SEPTIMIUS
 Severus (Claudius), philosopher, 189
 Severus, delator, 71n.
 Shahpoor I., king of Persia, 150, 549
 Shahpoor II., 549, 551, 554
 Sheol, 9n.
 Shepherd, see HERMAS
 Sibylline Oracles, 5, 6n., 69, 515
 'signa' taken into Jerusalem, 23-4

- signs of coming trials, 85
 Silence, 593
 Silvanus, 38
 Silvia, a pilgrim, 583
 Silvester, pope, 293, 304, 321, 519
 Simon, king of Judaea, 10
 Simon ben Jochai, 124
 Simon son of Kamith, 23
 Simon the Just, 3n., 6
 Simon Magus, 41, 95, 107, 129n.,
 135, 143, 244n., 252, 468
 Simonians, Nestorians called, 468
 Simplicianus, 495
 Siniatic-Syriac M.S., 547
 Singara, 542, 550n.
 Sinuessa, synod at, 262
 Siricius, bp. of Rome, 413, 520-1,
 564, 571, 573
 Sirmium, 344; see COUNCILS,
 CREDS, SYNODS
 Sisinnius, a Novatian, 400
 Sixtus II., bp. of Rome, 262, 598
 Sixtus III., bp. of Rome, 528-9,
 530
 slavery, 71, 195, 238-9, 285
 Smectymnus controversy, 113
 Smith (G. A.), 16n.
 Smith (Robertson), 2n.
 Smyrna, 60, 111, 112; church of,
 112, 119, 610
 Socrates, philosopher, 5n., 176
 Socrates, Church historian, 110,
 252n., 270n., 298 and n., 304n.,
 306, 307, 318n., 324n., 332n.,
 333n., 335n., 337n., 339n.,
 342n., 345n., 346n., 348n.,
 349n., 352, 360n., 363n., 366n.,
 368n., 369n., 370n., 372n.,
 377n., 380n., 391n., 392n.,
 393n., 395n., 399 and n., 400,
 407, 426, 441n., 442n., 443n.,
 446n., 447n., 448n., 449n.,
 450n., 458n., 461, 464n.,
 465n., 475, 584
sodalitates, 57n.
 Solomon, 21
 soothsayers, Etruscan, 523
 Sopater, 322, 323
 Sophia, Gnostic, 589, 590, 593,
 594
 Sophia, church of, 449 and n.
 Sosioch, 124
 Sosius besieges Jerusalem, 17
 Sotades, Egyptian poet, 300
 sources of Gnosticism, 122-3
 Sozomen, Church historian, 306,
 322n., 324n., 334n., 335n.,
 336n., 339n., 340n., 344n.,
 345n., 346n., 348n., 363n.,
 368n., 372, 373n., 374n., 377n.,
 379n., 407n., 408n., 440, 441n.,
 442n., 443n., 446n., 447n.,
 448n., 449n., 450n., 456n.,
 469n., 523, 552n.
 Spain, 84, 244n., 409-10, 479,
 520-1
 Spartianus (Aelius), 72n.
 Spiridon of Cyprus, 306
 Spirit (Living), Manichean, 150
 Spirit, Montanist doctrine of, 174
 spiritual gifts, see CHARISMATA
 Srawley (Dr.), 403n., 457n., 478,
 578n.
 Stanley (Dean), *Eastern Church*,
 253, 305n., 306n., 315n.,
 316n., 318n., 320n., 324n.,
 332n., 465n., 473n., 603
 Stanton (Dr.), 10n., 27n., 48n.,
 96n., 97n., 101
 Stauros, or Horus, 593, 594, 595
 Stephanus, assassin of Domitian,
 108n.
 Stephen (St.), 33, 34, 112; Festival
 of, 580
 Stephen, bp. of Antioch, 339,
 340n.
 Stephen, bp. of Rome, 262, 269,
 289
 Stephens (Dean), 441n., 442n.,
 444n., 447n., 448n., 475n.,
 522n.
 Stilicho, 419, 439, 523
 Stoicism, 65, 158, 189, 191-5,
 196, 200, 204
Stromateis, Clement's, 149
 sub-deacons, 218, 227
substantia, 377, 454, 456
 Sucat, see PATRICK
 Suetonius, 38, 43, 44n., 48, 51,
 52n., 247n.
 suicide approved by Stoics, 193-4
 Sulpicius Severus, 324n., 346n.,
 410n., 413n.
συνάφεια, 457
 Sunday, observance of, 287, 398n.,
 580
 sun-worship, 184; see ZOROASTER
 superstition, Christian, 240-2
 Sursum corda, 577
 Susanna, in catacombs, 608

- Swete (Dr.), 5n., 133n., 174n., 277n., 390n., 403n., 457n.
- Sychem, 158
- symbolism in catacombs, 606
- Symeon, bp. of Jerusalem, 58, 60.
- Symeon the Stylite, 468 and n.
- Symmachus, translator, 277
- Symmachus, Roman senator, 414—416, 418, 420
- Symmachus, praefect, 527
- synagogue, 3, 32, 56, 212, 219
- Syncellus, 8n.
- Synesius, bishop, 426, 434—9, 445, 573
- SYNODS: at Alexandria, 303, 368, 376, 378, 445; at Ancyra, 345, 346n.; at Antioch, 167, 456; at Biterrae, 377; at Bostra, 165; at Burdegala (Bordeaux), 411; at Carthage, 267, 268n., 504, 525, 526-7; at Circa, 292n.; at Constantinople, 349, 377n., 470; at Diospolis (Lydda), 505, 525; at Hippos, 498; at Lampsacus, 379; at Milevis, 525; at Milan, 342, 343, 356; of the Oak, 448, 449, 522; at Philippopolis, 339; at Rome, 294, 335, 456, 463; at Saragossa, 409-10; at Sirmium, 342, 344; at Telepte, 521; at Tyana, 386; at Tyre, 308, 317, 332n., 388. See COUNCILS
- Syracuse, catacombs at, 597
- Syriac MS. of Clement's Epistle, 107
- Syriac Letters of Ignatius, 114
- Syriac Version of N. T., 547
- Syrian Christianity, 40, 542—7, 566
- Syrian theology, 543-4
- Syrianus, praefect, 343
- Syzygies, doctrine of, 143
- Tabennesi, monastery, 587
- Tacitus, emperor, 82
- Tacitus, historian, 43, 47, 50n., 104, 182, 183n., 249, 285, 561n.
- Tall Brothers, 446
- Talmud, 24, 126
- Tara, 563
- Targums, 94, 155, 547
- Tarsians, Pseudo-Ignatius to, 113
- Tatia, nurse, 248
- Tatian, 66, 144, 543, 547, 555
- Tattam (Archdeacon), 114
- Taurobolium, Mithraic rite, 185
- Taurus, praefect, 348
- Taylor (Dr. C.), 102n., 103n.
- Te Deum*, 424
- teachers and prophets, 213, 214, 215
- Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, see DIDACHE
- Templars, Knights, 152
- Temple of Jerusalem, 6, 17, 18-19, 31, 32, 33, 48, 97n., 99; attempt to rebuild, 362-3
- temples (heathen), 365-6, 370, 405—8
- tenuiores*, 217n.
- Terebinthus, 149
- Tertullian, 8n., 42, 45, 46, 48, 51n., 53n., 54, 57, 63n., 64, 70, 72, 73n., 75-6, 92n., 105, 118, 120n., 138, 141, 146, 147 and n., 154, 164n., 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 179, 185, 189, 203, 204, 206-7, 208, 210n., 217n., 221n., 225, 230, 231n., 233, 235, 237, 238n., 241n., 258, 260, 263—5, 288, 313n., 406n., 454, 456, 471, 543n., 585, 600, 603, 610n., 613, 615
- Teutons, 559, 560, 566
- Thaddaeus, sent to Abgarus, 41
- Thalia*, Arius's, 303
- Thecla, 49 50 and n.; see ACTS
- Themistius, orator, 69, 359
- Theocracy, 9, 22, 23
- Theodora, 84n.
- Theodore Askidas, 546n.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia, 440, 447, 454, 457-8, 466, 469, 474-5, 506, 546
- Theodoret (bp. of Cyrus), historian, 110, 136n., 202n., 303n., 310n., 330n., 346n., 363n., 367n., 371n., 374n., 378n., 408n., 428, 442n., 443n., 456n., 464, 469, 470, 471-2, 473, 475, 546, 547n., 552n., 556n., 558n.
- Theodosian Code, 367, 580
- Theodosius, 392n.
- Theodosius I., emperor, 88n., 392—433 passim, 439, 451, 479, 520

- Theodosius II., 463, 464, 467-72, 534-5, 550
 Theodoti, namesakes, 164, 169-70
 Theodotion, Version of, 276, 277
 Theodotus, Gnostic, 137, 595
 Theognostes, Gallican bishop, 412
 Theognostus, 168
 Theologus, title of Gregory of Nazianzus, 402
 theology, scientific, 153, 156-7
 Theonas, bp. of Alexandria, 85
 Theonas, friend of Arius, 303, 307, 315
 Theophanies, 160n.
 Theophilus, bp. of Antioch, 65n., 161, 173, 208
 Theophilus, bp. of Alexandria, 406-8, 426, 438, 441, 444-449, 466, 488, 522
 Theophilus, Gothic bishop, 559
 Theophrastus, surname of Ignatius, 110
 Theophrastus of Tyana, 337
 Theotecnus, Neo-Platonist, 86, 91, 196
 Theotimus, Gothic bishop, 447n.
 θεοτόκος, 458, 459, 460, 464, 469
 Therapeutae, 270
 Thermane, Valerian at, 80
 Thessalonica: church of, 38; edict of, 398; riot and massacre at, 428, 439
 Thessalonians, Epistles to, 51n., 96n.
 Thomas (St.), 41, 42, 117, 543; Gospel of, 136, 144n.
 Thomas Aquinas, 54n., 476
 Thomas of Harkel, 547
 Thrasesas, martyr, 66
 'Three Chapters', 546 and n.
 Thucydides, 421
 Thundering Legion, 69-70 and n.
 'Thyesteian banquets', 67, 613
 Tiberias, city, 22
 Tiberius, emperor, 22, 23, 35, 48, 105, 106
 Tillemont, 75, 293n., 534n.
 Timothy (St.), 38, 116, 131, 213n.; Epistles to, 96n., 108n., 131
 Timothy, bp. of Alexandria, 395
 Tiridates, 552-3
 Titus, emperor, 104, 247
 Titus (St.), 37, 213n.; Epistle to, 38n., 131
 Titus, bp. of Bostra, 371
 Tixeront, 547n.
 Tobit, in catacombs, 608
 Toledo, Council of, 259, 260
Tome of Leo I., 471 and n., 473, 474, 536-8; of Damasus, 456
 tongues, gift of, 214
 Torquemada, 289
 'town coachman', 484, 490
traditores, 291-5, 497
 Trajan, emperor, 43, 54-8, 59, 77, 103, 119, 204, 542, 598; reply to Pliny, 45, 53n., 57
 Tralles, 111
 Trallians, Ignatius writes to, 111
 Transfiguration, 173
Travels of Peter, 143
 Trent, Council of, 486
 Trèves, 411, 417, 597
 Trim, 563
 Trinity: word first used, 161, 173; doctrine of, 167, 171-4, 230, 298, 308
 Tropici, 390n.
 Tryphaena, queen, 49
 Trypho, Justin's dialogue with, 159
 Tübingen, School of, 38n., 93-7, 106, 114, 118
 Turner (C. H.), 60n.
 Two Natures, doctrine of, 451-78
 Tychonius, Donatist, 499
 Typhos, 435n.
 Tyre; synod at, 308, 317, 332n., 388; church at, 575
 Ueberweg, 155n., 186n., 191n., 200n., 202n.
 Ulfilas, 301, 559-60
 Ulysses, 436
 Unction, 32
 ὑπόστασις, see HYPOSTASIS
 Ursacius, Arian bishop, 315, 345, 347-9, 376, 559
 Ursacius, Count, 294, 295
 Ursicinus, anti-pope, 527
 Ussher (Abp.), 113, 115
 Utch-Kilise, 553
 Vahan, 554-5
 Vaharan, see VARANES
 Valens, emperor, 376, 379, 380, 384, 391-2, 393, 394, 404, 417, 431, 440
 Valens, bp. of Mursa, 315, 342, 345, 347-9, 350, 376, 559

- Valentinian I., emperor, 286, 367, 376, 379, 392, 404, 409, 415, 422, 431
 Valentinian II., 392, 401, 409, 418-19, 422, 426, 430
 Valentinian III., 471, 516, 533-4, 540
 Valentinians, 129n., 137, 144, 146, 252, 312, 371
 Valentinus, 134, 137, 138, 141, 146, 312, 313n., 592-5
 Valeria, 84n., 85, 87, 91n.
 Valerian, emperor, 79, 87, 549, 579; second edict of, 80; persecution under, 80, 261, 598, 601, 611
 Valerian, Count of Africa, 505
 Valerius, bp. of Hippo, 496, 571
 Valesius, 146n., 347n., 366n.
 Valla (Laurentius), 322
 Vandals, 501, 515-17, 560-1
 Van Manen (Dr.), 93n.
 Varanes I., 150, 548
 Varanes V., 550, 554
 Varro, 513
 Vartan (St.), 554
 Varus, governor of Syria, 22
 Vatican collection, 616
 Vedelius, 113
 Vespasian, 51, 52n., 104, 158, 197, 247, 248
 Vestals, 418, 419
 Veturius, Roman general, 85
 Vickers, *History of Herod*, 21n.
 Victor, bp. of Rome, 121n., 169, 170, 251, 254
 Victor, Roman presbyter, 304
 Victoricus, friend of St. Patrick, 562
 Victorinus, rhetorician, 368, 495
 Victory, Altar of, 416, 417-19
 Vienne, 358, 526; see LYONS
 Vigilantius, 486-7
 Vigilius, pope, 599
 Vincent, bp. of Capua, 339, 342
 Vincentius, Roman presbyter, 304
 Vincentius of Lerins, 509, 560
 Vindicianus, proconsul, 492
 vine, emblematic, 602
 Virgil, 288, 421, 616
 Virgin Birth, 460, 476
 virginity, 109, 483
 Vision of Constantine, 280-1 and n., 361
Visions of Perpetua, 73n.
 Volkmar, 97n., 114
 Vopiscus, 183
 Voss (Isaac), 113
 Vulgate, 486
 Waterland, 232
 Wednesday observed as a fast, 102, 580
 Weismann, 510n.
 Weiss, 114.
 Weizsäcker, 97n.
 Wellhausen, 2n.
 Wesseley (Prof.), 78n.
 Westcott (Bp.), 3n., 8n., 9n., 11n., 27n., 34n., 40n., 96n., 108n., 115n., 116n., 118n., 134, 157, 159n., 166
 Westminster Abbey, 604, 611
 widows, 214, 218, 235, 573
 Williams, 130n.
 Wilpert (Mgr.), 599
 Wisdom of God, 143, 154, 155, 308, 571; see SOPHIA
 Woman, First, 589
 women, 572; ministry of, 573
 Woodham, 208n.
 Word, doctrine of, 161, 155-6, 176, 310, 340n., 452, 477, 537; see LOGOS, MEMRA
 Wordsworth (Bp.), 114, 212n., 213n., 215n., 216n., 217n., 220n., 227n., 394n., 570n., 572n., 573n.
 worship, 219
 Wright (A.), 478
 Wright (W.), 551n.
 Xenophanes, 186
 Ximenes, cardinal, 289
 Xystus, bp. of Rome, see SIXTUS
 Yoma, Indian god, 183
 Yetsirah, Book of, 124
 York, 89, 293
 Zacchaeus in catacombs, 608
 Zacharias, priest, 25
 Zacharias, pope, 337n.
 Zadok, 10
 Zahn, 342n.
 Zarvana Akarana, 123
 Zealots, 23

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Zechariah, prophet, 25
 Zend-avesta, 123-4, 184
 Zeno, emperor, 538, 541
 Zeno, martyr at Gaza, 372
 Zeno, philosopher, 191, 194
 Zenobia, queen, 81, 167
 Zephyrinus, bp. of Rome, 164, 170,
 254, 255, 257, 265, 598, 611
 zodiac, signs of, 150</p> | <p>Zohar, book of, 124
 Zonaras, 238n.
 Zoroaster, religion of, 123, 184, 467,
 548-9, 554, 555, 550
 Zosimus, martyr, 112
 Zosimus, bp. of Rome, 505, 525,
 526-7, 530, 538
 Zosimus, historian, 321, 322n., 417,
 523</p> |
|---|---|



